1983

Incidence of burnout in the student personnel services of a university

Susan C. Spencer
University of Northern Iowa

Incidence of burnout in the student personnel services of a university

Abstract

The topic of burnout has created its own little brushfire in professional publications. Since 1974, when the term "burnout" began to appear, it has stirred the interest of an increasing number of authors each year according to Savicki and Cooney (1982). Unfortunately, actual research on the topic has not been plentiful. Perlman and Hartman (1982) and Maslach (1978b) observed that burnout has been primarily a descriptive term and knowledge of the causes, preventions, and cures is still in the embryonic stage.

INCIDENCE OF BURNOUT IN THE STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES OF A UNIVERSITY

A Research Paper

Presented to

the Department of Educational Administration

and Counseling

University of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

---

by

Susan C. Spencer

June 1983

This Research Paper by: Susan C. Spencer

Entitled: INCIDENCE OF BURNOUT IN THE STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES OF A UNIVERSITY

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement for the Degree Master of Arts in Education.

Jack F. Kimball

7-6-83
Date Approved

Director of Research Paper

William Kline

7/6/83
Date Approved

Second Reader of Research Paper

Robert L. Frank

July 6, 1983
Date Received

Graduate Faculty Adviser

Robert Krajewski

7/8/83
Date Received

Head, Department of Educational Administration and Counseling

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables..... iii

Chapter

1. Introduction..... 1

   Importance of the Problem..... 1
   Statement of the Problem..... 2
   Basic Assumptions..... 3
   Limitations of the Study..... 4
   Definition of Terms..... 5

2. Review of the Literature..... 7

   Definitions of Burnout..... 7
   Symptoms of Burnout..... 10
   Causes of Burnout..... 12
   Effects of Burnout..... 16
   Intervention Strategies..... 17
   Supported Research..... 22

3. Design of the Study..... 25

   The Instrument..... 25
   The Instructions..... 27

4. Analysis..... 29

   Organization of the Data..... 29
   Analysis of the Data..... 30

5. Discussion..... 47

   Implications of the Findings..... 47
   Need for Modification of the Study..... 48
   Implications for Existing Research..... 50

6. Summary..... 53

References..... 55

Appendices

A. Questionnaire..... 61
B. Letter..... 64
C. Master Data Sheet..... 66

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Tedium Scores Per Student Personnel Department	32
2.	Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Tedium Listed by Categories	33
3.	Percentage of Respondents (Scoring Less Than 3) Who Indicated a Certain Job-related Problem	35
4.	Percentage of Respondents (Scoring 3 or More) Who Indicated a Certain Job-related Problem	36
5.	Chi Square Test for Independence Results Between Categories and High and Low Individual Tedium Scores	37
6.	Answers to the Job Stress Question* of Respondents Who Scored More Than 3.0 on Tedium Scale	39
7.	Answers to the Job Stress Question* of Respondents Who Scored Less Than 3.0 on Tedium Scale	41
8.	Concerns Expressed in Answer to the Question on Job Stress	44
9.	Job-related Problems Indicated by Members of the Various Student Personnel Departments	46

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Importance of the Problem

The topic of burnout has created its own little brushfire in professional publications. Since 1974, when the term "burnout" began to appear, it has stirred the interest of an increasing number of authors each year according to Savicki and Cooney (1982). Unfortunately, actual research on the topic has not been plentiful. Perlman and Hartman (1982) and Maslach (1978b) observed that burnout has been primarily a descriptive term and knowledge of the causes, preventions, and cures is still in the embryonic stage.

While a great deal of attention has been given to counselors in public and private agencies and hospitals, as recently as 1982, Forney, Wallace-Schutzman, and Wiggers bemoaned the lack of specific literature on burnout among professionals in the field of Student Services. They applauded the decision of Commission VI of the American College Personnel Association and the Middle Atlantic Placement Association to finance in part some research specifically aimed at the incidence of burnout, contributing factors, and preventative measures.

Increased knowledge of burnout is vital to the Student Personnel Field. Minahan (1980) and Kamis (1980) have pointed out that undetected and unchecked burnout can

cost offices substantial sums of money in interviewing, hiring, and training of new staff to replace those leaving. If the burned-out individuals remain, the costs of low staff morale, absenteeism, and poor delivery of services must be reckoned with. Freudenberger (1974, 1977) cautioned that unchecked burnout can spread through and depress an entire organization. Indeed, if a significant number of people are expressing dissatisfaction that could lead to leaving the field, then the conditions under which they work, their job preparation, and their individual needs should be explored.

Statement of the Problem

Because the Student Services of a university cannot hope to effectively fulfill its mission of student development if the effects of burnout seriously undermine the delivery of services, the task undertaken was to determine to what degree burnout existed in the Student Personnel Services of the university and what were some commonalities among the people affected. Some of the questions addressed were: Were there departmental differences in degree of burnout? Was there a relationship between a person's sex and burnout scores? Was there a relationship between age and burnout scores? Was there a relationship between amount of education and burnout scores? Was there a relationship between amount of student contact and burnout scores? Was there a

relationship between the job-related problem selected and burnout scores? Was there a pattern between stress-reducing measures suggested and burnout scores?

If relationships were found, it would help to validate the research of several burnout authors (Lynch, 1981; Maslach, 1976, 1978a, 1978b; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Pines, Aronson, & Kafry, 1981; Perlman & Hartman, 1980, 1982). In addition, such relationships would add to the minimal research on the problem in the Student Personnel Services field. If no relationships were found, the findings would raise questions about the generalization of burnout research data across helping professions.

Basic Assumptions

An important assumption made in this study was that the Student Personnel Services area of the university was sufficiently comparable to other helping professions found in the research literature. Without this assumption generalizations could not be made regarding the factors of sex, age, education, student contact, and job-related problems found in other burnout literature in studying the degree of burnout of Student Personnel Professionals. The assumption regarding the generalization of previous research is consistent with Wiggers, Forney, and Wallace-Schutzman (1982) who noted that Student Personnel Professionals are subject to many of the same situations, conflicts, pressures, and problems that evoke burnout in other helping professionals.

A second assumption made was that the measurement of tedium is an accurate assessment of burnout. Pines et al. (1981) stated that burnout was identical to tedium in terms of symptomology and definition, but was unique to people in helping professions.

Limitations of the Study

The Student Personnel Services of the university studied was uniquely structured and was not exactly like any other university's student services. No two institutions are alike. For instance, the departments considered part of Student Personnel Services, their internal structure, and the number of people per department can vary greatly from institution to institution. Thus, it becomes difficult to draw parallels between universities.

Additionally, the number of professionals working in the Student Personnel Services was small, only sixty-six. This small sample, coupled with the fact that only one university was studied make the results applicable only to the Student Personnel Services of the university in question.

A time constraint was also imposed. Questionnaires had to be filled out before the Spring vacation. After vacation, burnout symptoms might have been significantly reduced. In fact, varying the time of year the study was done could lead to varying results.

Definition of Terms

The following are terms used in this paper which may need to be clarified:

Burnout - A term unique to the helping professions. It is, according to prominent researchers (Maslach, 1982; Perlman and Hartman, 1982; Pines et al., 1981), a collection of responses to the chronic emotional stress of dealing with people over stretches of time. The responses consist of three prime characteristics: 1) emotional and/or physical exhaustion, 2) lowered job productivity, and 3) overdepersonalization.

Helping professions - According to Pines, et al. (1981) jobs which require a high degree of intense people contact over long periods of time (i.e. teaching, social work, nursing, counseling, law enforcement).

Student Personnel Services - According to the 1982 Thesauras of ERIC Descriptors, professional personnel who provide supportive, non-instructional services to college or university students in a school setting. The Student Personnel Services of the university in the study consisted of Academic Advising, Admissions, Financial Aids, Counseling and Career Services, Placement Services, Cooperative Education, Learning Skills Center, Student Activities, Registrar, the Department of Residence, and the Office of the Vice-President of Student Affairs.

Student Personnel Professionals - Staff of the Student Personnel Services who perform administrative

and/or counseling functions. Typical job titles are director, associate director, coordinator, assistant coordinator, counselor, adviser, specialist, physician, and nurse.

Tedium - Like burnout, tedium is a cluster of exhaustion responses. However, tedium can be the result of any prolonged chronic pressures, not necessarily those pressures associated with dealing with people over long periods of time according to Pines et al. (1981) and Pines and Kafry (1978).

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Definitions of Burnout

A comprehensive and coherent review of the literature is a difficult undertaking. According to Moracco (1981), the concept of burnout is new and there is currently no universally accepted definition. In fact, burnout has become an overused term describing everything from boredom to job stress. Many authors of burnout articles seem to have the point of view of Richard Bolles cited in Forney et al. (1982) who said, "Burnout is kind of like pornography. I'm not sure I can define it, but I know what it is when I see it" (p. 436). However, in surveys of the literature by Perlman et al. (1982) and Savicki and Cooley (1982), common threads in the definitions of burnout have been found. These commonalities revolve around burnout definitions as descriptors of patterns of symptoms and as being common to the helping professions. In the literature, the term "client" is often used, but for Student Personnel Services, and the purposes of this study, the term "student" could easily be substituted.

One of the first and most prominent definitions of burnout was proposed by Freudenberger (1974). He saw burnout as an individual's reality chronically failing to meet the individual's expectations until that person felt

worn out and exhausted by the excessive demands on his/her energy, strength, and resources.

Maslach and Jackson (1981) centered their definition around the pattern of symptoms of exhaustion and cynicism exhibited by individuals who do "people work" (p. 99). Central to Maslach's definition (1976, 1978a, 1978b, 1981, 1982) were physical exhaustion, emotional exhaustion (characterized by cynical and negative attitudes about work and clients), and a dehumanized perception of clients (evident in derogatory labeling and blaming clients for their own problems).

Physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion affecting people in the helping professions was the crux of the definition by burnout pioneers Pines, Aronson, and Kafry (1981). They reserve the term burnout exclusively for situations in which individuals are dealing with other people, and they consider burnout the result of constant, repeated emotional pressure brought about by intense involvement with people over periods of time.

The concept of stress was prominent in many definitions. Burnout was a label given to a subset of harmful stress reactions by Perlman and Hartman (1980). Lauderdale (1982) saw burnout as a disparity between role expectations and actual achievements which is intensified by the stress of rapidly changing modern times. Daley (1980) and Minahan (1980) saw burnout as a reaction to job-related stress which varies with the intensity and

duration of the stress. People could also experience burnout due to being understressed, underutilized and underchallenged according to Pines et al. (1981).

Stages of burnout figured prominently in the definitions of Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) and Veninga and Spradley (1981). The stages were described as an initial honeymoon period of enthusiasm, a stagnation or fuel shortage stage, frustration, then apathy, and finally a crisis or intervention stage where some new coping strategy was put into effect. Burnout progression in a stage definition is considered cyclical, but not inevitable. A person could go through the stages over and over or get hung up in one of the stages for long periods of time.

Many authors put interesting twists on their definitions of burnout. It was called an "ecological dysfunction" between a person and his work environment by Carroll (1979, p. 207). Bramhall and Ezel (1981a) likened burnout to the battle fatigue experienced by soldiers. Larson, Gilbertson, and Powell (1978) called it a "failure to muster reserves" (p. 563), and Kahn (1978) described it as a "syndrome of inappropriate attitudes towards clients and towards oneself" (p. 61). It should also be pointed out that some studies (Moracco & McFadden, 1980) identified organizational as well as individual burnout. And finally, in the only definition found specifically alluding to the Student Personnel Services (Carroll, 1982), burnout was defined as "the inability to

function effectively to facilitate the student's growth" (p. 7).

Perlman and Hartman (1982) pulled many definitions of burnout together to conclude that it is a multidimensional construct, not a single explanatory term. They ultimately defined burnout as a response to emotional stress which consists of emotional and/or physical exhaustion, lowered job productivity, and over-depersonalization. They concluded that all other symptoms have no real support in the research and cannot be considered prime components of the definition.

Symptoms of Burnout

A wide range of symptoms are believed to be linked to burnout, but because burnout is so individual in nature, there is no specific set of symptoms that characterize a burned-out person. Wiggers et al. (1982) found that the most notable aspect of the symptoms is a trend toward extremes (i.e. working too hard or working too little, not caring or caring too much).

Many authors (Cardinell, 1981; Carroll, 1979; Freudenberger, 1974, 1980; Maslach, 1976, 1978b, 1981, 1982; Pine et al., 1981; Welch, Medeiros, & Tate, 1982) took note of some common physical symptoms of burnout. Such symptoms include headaches, chronic colds, gastrointestinal upsets, sleep disturbances, physical fatigue, change in eating habits, change in sex drive,

and abuse of alcohol and/or drugs. As Bramhall and Ezell (1981a) observed, the people become "literally sick and tired" (p. 25).

Personality changes have also been the focus of some research (Freudenberger, 1974, 1977; Kamis, 1980; Moracco, 1981; Pines et al., 1981; Welch et al., 1981). Burned out employees have been described as quick to anger, suspicious, inflexible, cynical, depressed, paranoid, hostile, judgmental, unenthusiastic, isolated, and hopeless. Bramhall and Ezell (1981b) stated that one of the most common changes is that the person becomes a workaholic, but the increased effort does not increase the person's effectiveness.

Often the physical and behavioral symptoms also carry over into relationships in the office and at home. Maslach (1982), Daley (1979), and Bramhall and Ezell (1981a) all noted a tendency to dehumanize clients by physical distancing, failure to make eye contact, derogatory labeling, sick humor, and ridicule. There was also a tendency for burned-out individuals to "go by the book" (Maslach, 1976, p. 18) and abdicate any personal responsibility in their jobs by hiding in excessive rules and regulations. Maslach and Jackson (1981) also observed a tendency for marital and family problems to develop among those burning out.

People do not have to be aware of burnout to suffer from it. In fact, Freudenberger (1974) found that often

victims were unaware of what was happening to them. They did not view themselves as angry, depressed, or cynical, only as unappreciated.

Moracco (1981) and Moracco and McFadden (1980) discovered that organizations also develop symptoms of burnout. Low morale, high turnover, high absentee rate, lack of clearly defined goals, poor communication networks, low productivity, no development of programs, and no sense of mission can indicate an organization in the throes of burnout.

Causes of Burnout

There are no universal causes of burnout cited in the literature. Perlman and Hartman (1982) found that most researchers agreed that burnout is a unique product of the variables involving a person and the environment. A look at the people prone to burnout, the organizational factors which encourage burnout, and the unrealistic education often given to helping professionals may help clarify a complex problem.

Who is prone to burnout? Some authors (Bramhall & Ezell, 1981a; Carroll, 1979; Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980; Freudenberger, 1980; Pines et al., 1981) observed that such persons tend to be dynamic, charismatic, goal-oriented, and thrive on the intensity of working too much and too long. Their standards are high and their schedules are busy.

The helping professions attract just this sort of victim of what Pines and Kafry (1978) called the "dedicatory ethic" (p. 499). Such individuals have always been oriented toward people and see their work as a calling. Such sensitive, empathetic types have the attributes of sympathy, understanding, and helpfulness--the very attributes that create internal pressures that intensify their pain and make them more susceptible to burnout.

Other people vulnerable to burnout are those who adhere to certain myths about themselves or their professions. Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) commented that such myths are often common expectations of the novice. Beliefs that one's job is one's life, that one must be totally competent and perform at peak energy level, that one must be liked and respected by everyone, that negative feedback indicates poor work, that things must work out the way one wants, that others should be more supportive and less difficult, that one must have all the answers, and that one must be all loving and all understanding are common misconceptions presented by some burnout researchers (Baron & Cohen, 1982; Forney et al., 1982; Larson et al., 1978).

Carrol (1979) found certain traits which seemed to predispose certain people to burnout. Such people had unclear personal philosophies of human nature, overidentified with clients, possessed limited insight

into their own needs and motivations, and were unable to ask for help.

Maslach and Jackson (1981) and Pines et al. (1981) feared that many overestimate the importance of personal variables and ignore the need to identify situational (or organizational) variables that might be contributors to burnout. They observed that a dispositional bias (belief that burnout is a reflection of basic personality traits) rather than a situational bias (belief that burnout is a reflection of variables in the job setting) puts a heavy burden of guilt on the burnout sufferer.

One major aspect of the job setting is the client population. The types of clients seen and the manner in which they are handled in the organization are possible factors of burnout. Maslach (1976, 1978a, 1982) and Maslach and Jackson (1981) indicated that the client relationship can often be demanding and stressful. The content of the interaction can be embarrassing or hostile because the focus is on problems. Furthermore, there is often a lack of positive feedback from the client. A lack of criteria for measuring client progress, large caseloads, lack of time for interviews, and criticism of case handling from the community can also prove to be frustrating, as observed by Daley (1979) and Edelwich and Brodsky (1980).

A myriad of other organizational factors have been identified by various burnout writers (Carroll, 1979; Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980; Forney et al., 1982;

Hinshelwood, 1981; Lauderdale, 1982; Lawing, Moore, & Groseth, 1982; Moracco et al., 1980; Minahan, 1980; Pines et al., 1978; Warnath, 1979). Some common items were: low pay at all levels, inadequate funding, lack of flexibility in rules and regulations, lack of decision-making power (autonomy), work overload, poor communication networks, lack of variety, lack of feedback from coworkers and superiors, no feeling of significance in one's work, low status of the job in the community, inadequate number of staff, no clear career ladders, and no clear expectations or goals.

Boy and Pine (1980) and Warnath (1979) have all proposed that the professional roles envisioned and taught to those in school are unrealistic and inoperable in the real world. At particular issue is the fact that at no time during the education of most helping professions is there any examination of the role of counselor as employee. Warnath (1979) and Warnath and Shelton (1976) observed that during coursework, no one mentions the physical and psychological fatigue, the drudgery of similar problems, the lack of client appreciation, the lack of positive feedback from clients and superiors, the absence of power or status, and the often political nature of the work setting. In fact, Trachtenberg (1981) noted many jobs, especially in the educational field, are performed in a financial and political context. This is certainly true of the Student Personnel field.

Effects of Burnout

No matter what the cause of burnout, its effects can be devastating. Three targets of the effects of burnout can be found in the literature: the individual, the organization, and the society.

Kamis (1980) and Maslach (1976, 1978a, 1978b, 1981, 1982) outlined some effects on individuals. Burnout can have a detrimental impact on health. There can be a loss of income due to absenteeism or leaving the job. Burnout can have a ripple effect to other relationships outside the work setting resulting in family conflicts, divorce, and loss of friends. At the extreme, burnout can result in mental illness or suicide.

Kamis (1980), Minahan (1980), and Moracco (1981) noted organizational effects of burnout. For organizations, burnout can result in inefficiency, decreased productivity, absenteeism, high turnover, and the cost of training new employees. Development of a negative reputation can also act as a deterrent to attracting new staff.

Two researchers (Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980) have mentioned that society could certainly incur high costs. Burnout in individuals and organizations can compromise services to client. People would not be getting the help that they needed and funding would be wasted on ineffective institutions.

Intervention Strategies

Since burnout can be the result of a web of multiple individual and situational causes, and since it can have multiple effects on individuals and organizations, it is probably necessary to use a combination of personal and organizational strategies to combat it, observed Neville (1981). A number of strategies are discussed in the literature.

Pines et al. (1981) discussed some poor coping strategies in their work. For some, leaving the profession forever is a solution, although burnout can start anew in the next job. Others become "trapped in a gilded cage" (p. 26), afraid to give up financial security and angry and frustrated about their inability to escape. Some workers become deadwood, surviving without contributing until retirement. A few try to "quit upward" (p. 28) by moving up the administrative ladder away from work with people. And there are those who become broken in spirit, give up their dream of a helping profession career, and take less taxing, less meaningful work, never to try again.

Maslach (1976, 1978b) also discussed some coping strategies in her work. She noted that some helping professionals fall back on using jargon, derogatory labels, and excessive rules and regulations to alleviate burnout stress. Intellectualizing every uncomfortable event, minimizing physical involvement with clients, and increasing social outlets at the office (i.e. coffee

breaks, office chatter) are also ways of coping. Unfortunately, such coping strategies are neither efficient, healthy, or long term ways of managing burnout.

One of the intervention strategies most often mentioned by researchers (Bramhall & Ezell, 1981c; Forney et al., 1982; Freudenberger, 1974; Kahn, 1978; Kamis, 1980; Moracco, 1981; Pines et al., 1981; Welch et al., 1982) is the use of social support systems. Such systems can be a group of people in the same office or a group of people in the same professional area. The meetings can be formal or informal. The main criteria is that the individuals can discuss ideas, reactions, and feelings, and receive feedback in a safe environment of similarly concerned and caring colleagues. Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) cautioned not to let ventilation in such groups merely become a gripe session, or such groups serve no useful purpose.

Some prominent burnout authors (Maslach, 1976; Moracco, 1981; Pines et al., 1981; Welch et al., 1982) promoted the concept of timeout as a major tool in the combat of burnout. Timeout is guilt-free, agency-approved time away from the job. The essential element of timeout is that it is not at the expense of the client. For instance, during a timeout, a worker could catch up on paperwork or attend a conference while another worker agrees to take over the caseload. Skipping out for the afternoon or hiding in one's office are not examples of

timeout, but of escape, since it is done at the expense of one's clients and coworkers.

Maslach (1976) considered education another frontline defense against burnout. She believed that educational programs should train individuals to prepare for and handle repeated, intense emotional interactions with people. Warnath and Shelton (1976) added that the faculty of institutions involved in the education of helping professionals should become actively involved in actual counseling in order to present a more realistic picture to their students. Jones and Emmanuel (1981) felt that counseling realism could be enhanced by sharing failures and mistakes with students.

Workshops can provide valuable assistance to those suffering burnout symptoms. Pines et al. (1981) commented on what they called "the fallacy of uniqueness" (p. 35) which is the false assumption a burned out individual makes that he or she is the only one responding that way. Workshops help eliminate this fallacy and open up analysis of the situation as a contributor to the problem. Baron and Cohen (1982) and Bayerl and MacKenzie (1981) found in their workshops that participation helps depersonalize problems, since no one has to take public ownership of a problem. Furthermore, the experience provides emotional catharsis and knowledge of the harmful physiological effects of burnout, as well as instruction in coping techniques and positive attitudes. Edelwich (1980) warned

that individuals should be wary of the "workshop high" (p. 194). The temporary good feelings after the emotional high of a workshop are no substitute for putting intervention strategies into effect.

Individuals can enhance their ability to deal with burnout by employing many different techniques. Regular physical exercise, time management, relaxation techniques (biofeedback, yoga, meditation), logical reasoning, and flexible thinking were mentioned in the literature by several authors (Carroll, 1979; Freudenberger, 1974; Maslach, 1976; Welch et al., 1982). Bayerl and MacKenzie (1981) and Garte and Rosenblum (1978) proposed leading a more balanced life of work and play. They encouraged leisure activities and hobbies that are the exact opposite of the activities required of a person at work. For instance, a person who travels a great deal (such as an admissions officer) might want a hobby that could be done in one's home. A person tied to a desk (such as a financial aids officer) might want to take up tennis or soccer. Van Auken (1979) prudently stressed maintaining a sense of humor.

Organizations can certainly do their part to prevent or alleviate burnout by employing any number of measures. Careful screening of potential employees to determine suitability to the rigors of the profession and good training and orientation of new staff reduce the potential for burnout according to Kamis (1980) and

Freudenberger (1974). Limiting the amount of hours of work, rotating staff duties, and building morale and professional pride through awards, news releases and speaking engagements were found to be valuable by Bramhall and Ezell (1981c) and Carroll (1979). Forney et al. (1982) and Lawing et al. (1982) found that professional development can be encouraged by attendance at conferences and seminars and by a clear outline of possible career paths upward through the organization. For organizations such as group homes or residence halls where staff are required to live in, Freudenberger (1974) recommended a system of having every fifth week off or every fourth month off to relieve the constant stress of the job.

The ultimate goal of those who are burned out or who have the potential to burn out is to develop what is called "detached concern" (Pines et al., 1981, p. 54). An ideal balance must be struck between concern for the client and detachment for efficiency in dealing with the problem. In other words, the counselor must see more and understand more than the client but still be able to show empathy--a balancing act many find hard to manage.

The word of hope in the literature is that burnout can be overcome. It can be a valuable step to self-awareness and growth. Pines et al. (1981) noted that the people they studied who had overcome burnout had almost always ended up with a better and more exciting life.

Supported Research

The major problem with the research to date is a proliferation of speculation on the causes and remedies of burnout, with very little empirical investigation. Some researchers have made findings that have legitimate scientific support, and these are particularly noteworthy. Perlman and Hartman (1980, 1982) observed that older workers and workers with supervisory responsibility were less likely to burnout. Also, situations requiring large caseloads and observation of formalized rules were conducive to burnout. Longer working hours, higher frequency of staff meetings, and fewer opportunities to leave work were correlated with negative feelings about work and a predisposition to burnout.

Maslach (1976, 1978a, 1978b, 1981, 1982) is a pioneer in burnout research. She has found burnout to have significant correlates with low worker morale, absenteeism, high job turnover, alcoholism, mental illness, marital conflict, suicide, working overtime, taking work home, and being on call.

Maslach and Jackson (1981) in their work with the Maslach Burnout Inventory found significant relationships between burnout and feedback, task significance, growth satisfaction, meaningfulness, intention to leave, absenteeism, poor relations with family/friends, psychosomatic illness, use of tranquilizers, use of alcohol. Also the greater amount of time spent in direct

client contact contributed to burnout, and females and those in the first few years of their careers were more likely to burnout.

Pines et al. (1981) discovered that women are more likely to burnout than men. They attributed it to the role conflict that women experience in trying to work at the job and at home. Women were prone to observe less variety in their work, less autonomy, less challenge, and less of a positive work environment.

Lauderdale (1982) observed that people at high risk of burnout held jobs which were highly complex or redundant, possessed low status, and were low in autonomy. Such people also tended to be young, highly educated, and in the lower and middle organizational levels. They came from urban high density communities on the east and west coasts or from bedroom communities.

In studies more directly related to Student Personnel but indirectly related to burnout, Lawing et al. (1982) found a number of interesting characteristics about those who leave the Student Personnel Field. Married females were more likely to leave. Those who had not worked very long or held many positions or had no work experience before earning an advanced degree were likely to leave. Those who had not published or worked in larger institutions also tended to leave. The median age for stayers was 28, the median age for leavers was 33 (p. 23).

Also in the Student Personnel area, Gross (1978) found that the most likely to stay in the field were married men and unmarried women. Biggs, Barnhart, and Bakkenist (1975) noted that some significant correlates of job satisfaction in Student Personnel were clarity of job expectations and frequency of interoffice communication.

Burns (1975) in her study of those who leave the Student Personnel Field found relationships to potential for advancement, need for larger salary, desire for more responsibility, and need for more variety. She too found that women leave the profession in significantly higher numbers than men.

What the topic of burnout in the Student Personnel Services needs is clear conceptualization, strong methodology, and statistical analyses to make it relevant for planning strategies of prevention and intervention.

Chapter 3

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The target population of the study was the professional staff of the Student Personnel Services of a medium scope, public university in the Midwest who worked in the departments of Academic Advising, Admissions, Financial Aids, Counseling and Career Services, Placement Services, Cooperative Education, the Learning Skills Center, Student Activities, Registrar, Department of Residence, and the Office of Vice-President of Student Affairs. No clerical, food service, or maintenance staff were asked to participate. In addition, the faculty of the Department of Educational Administration and Counseling, the educational branch of the Student Personnel Work, was also included in the study population. At the request of the Director of Counseling, Placement, and Careers, the Cooperative Education Office and the Placement Office were considered to be one department and the Counseling and Careers Office was considered as a separate department.

The Instrument

For purposes of the investigation, an instrument was designed to measure the extent of the burnout in the Student Personnel Services, some characteristics of the individuals participating, and some job-related problems of particular concern. The questionnaire consisted of three

main sections. (See Appendix A.) The first section consisted of some questions on demographic characteristics and job-related problems. The second section was a type of burnout measure. The third section was a single question on the alleviation of job stress.

The questions concerning sex, age, degree earned, and contact with students were selected bacause these factors were found in some literature (Lauderdale, 1982; Maslach, 1976, 1978a, 1978b; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Pines et al., 1981) to be related to burnout. The question concerning which of ten items would be considered by the respondent to be an important job-related problem was derived from the research of Pines et al. (1981) who found relationships between those specific problems and tedium.

The second section of the questionnaire consisted of a tedium measure composed of twenty-one Likert-type questions asking how often one had a particular emotional or physical experience. The measure was devised by Pines et al. (1981) and is highly reliable (between .91 and .93) in measuring tedium/burnout (p. 204).

The third section was a single question asking "What do you see as specific measures that could be taken to reduce the stress of your job?" The question was added in the hopes of eliciting some common complaints and problems not made evident or covered in the first two sections. The Vice-President of Student Affairs also

requested such a question be included so that he could better assess the needs and problems of the Student Personnel Professionals on his staff.

The Instructions

Two weeks before the scheduled Spring break for the university, the questionnaires were hand delivered to each department. Each department head was personally asked to cooperate in encouraging the completion of the questionnaire by their professional staff. During the interview the director of the study and head of the department collaborated on exactly who in the department was eligible to receive the questionnaire. Then the questionnaire and a cover letter for each was left to be disseminated by the department heads at a staff meeting or was left in the departmental mailboxes of the professionals. The department heads were overwhelmingly enthusiastic about the study, and many promised to encourage maximum cooperation.

Although the heads of the departments were informed that the study involved the measurement of burnout, the cover letter to the individual professionals did not mention burnout in an effort to keep the study results from being contaminated by people afraid to admit to symptoms of burnout. (See Appendix B.) The cover letter mentioned the time required for completing the questionnaire (5 to 10 minutes), the method for returning

the questionnaire (via campus mail in an accompanying pre-addressed envelope), and the time limit involved (it had to be returned before the commencement of the Spring break). Confidentiality of all surveys was guaranteed and statistical results were made available to those who desired them.

Special markings were put on all the questionnaires so that they could be separated according to department after their return. These markings were meant only for the researcher and as a result the master sheet did not include tabulations by department to insure the confidentiality of members of some of the smaller departments.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS

Organization of the Data

Sixty-six questionnaires were distributed to the professionals in the Student Personnel Services of the University. By the last day before the Spring vacation, 53 people had returned their forms, giving a response percentage of 80.3%.

The first task was to score the tedium measure found in the second section of the questionnaire. According to Pines et al. (1981), to find the tedium score for each individual the values written next to items 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 21 were added to find Sum (A). Then the values written next to items 3, 6, 19, and 20 were added to find Sum (B). (B) was subtracted from 32 to get (C). (A) was then added to (C) to get (D) and (D) was divided by 21 to get the final tedium score.

The second step was to organize the questionnaires by departments. Using the special code found on each questionnaire, this was accomplished. Then the data were transferred to a Master Data Sheet (see Appendix C). The Master Data Sheet was arranged in a manner to make it as easy as possible to calculate means and standard deviations. Consequently, a person's score appears under each of the

categories of sex, age, education, degree of student contact, and job-related problem that the person indicated.

Analysis of the Data

The data tabulated on the Master Data Sheet mean nothing without an understandng of the meanings of the tedium scores. According to Pines et al. (1981), a tedium score of from 1 to 7 is theoretically possible. However, of the thousands who have taken the tedium measurement test, none have ever scored 1 or 7 because it is unlikely anyone could be as euphoric as indicated by a score of 1, and it is equally unlikely that a person with a score of 7 could even function long enough to take a test. Therefore, it is concluded that a person with a score of between 2 and 3 is doing well. People who score between 3 and 4 might be heading for trouble and should examine their work, lives, and priorities. If the score is over 4, then that person is experiencing burnout or tedium to the extent that some kind of action is necessary. A score of above 5 is an indication of an acute state of burnout and a need for immediate help.

Of the 53 questionnaires returned, 62.3% were completed by men and 37.7% were completed by women. This roughly matched the actual percentages of men and women professionals in the Student Personnel Services of the University (65.2% men and 34.8% women). Almost 40% of the respondents fell into the age 29 to 40 category. An

overwhelming percentage of the respondents had a graduate degree (30.8% with doctorates and 53.8% with masters). More than 51% of the professionals responding spent better than 60% of their time in direct contact with students. The highest tedium score for all respondents was 5.24, and the lowest score was 1.48.

In Table 1, the mean values of the tedium scores of members of the twelve departments were calculated. Professionals in Student Activities ranked highest with a tedium score mean of 3.27. Professionals in Academic Advising ranked lowest with a tedium score mean of 2.31. In addition, departments having 2, 3 or 4 professionals had a mean tedium score of 2.96, while departments with 6 or more professionals (Counseling, Placement, and Cooperative Education were considered one department for this) had a mean tedium score of 2.90.

Table 2 lists the mean values and standard deviations of the tedium scores of the respondents who fell into the different categories of sex, age, education, amount of time spent in direct student contact, and chosen job-related problem. Males scored only slightly higher than females on tedium, and both scored below the score of 3 which indicates the beginning of the tedium/burnout "danger zone." The mean tedium score of the age groups were also very similar and also under the score of 3. Mean tedium scores for degree of education were clustered below the number 3 danger point, with doctorate holders

Table 1

Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Tedium Scores Per Student Personnel Department

Department	N	Mean	S.D.
Student Activities	3	3.27	.37
Registrar	3	3.14	.44
Learning Skills	1	3.14	.00
Financial Aids	2	3.07	.26
Faculty	5	3.07	1.12
Counseling	5	2.94	.44
Placement & Coop. Ed.	5	2.92	.33
Health Services	8	2.87	.31
Residence	12	2.87	.73
Vice-President	3	2.84	.19
Admissions	4	2.75	.23
Academic Advising	2	2.31	.79

showing the highest mean value for tedium/burnout. Finally, in the category of time spent in direct contact with students those who spent 61-80% of their time with students broke the magic "3" barrier and were in the burnout danger zone. In the category of job-related problems, the category chosen by the most people (34%) was work overload. Lack of variety, relationships with students, bureaucracy, work overload and lack of autonomy

Table 2

Mean Values and Standard Deviations of Tedium

Listed by Categories

Categories	N	Mean	S.D.
SEX			
Males	33	2.93	.66
Females	20	2.90	.48
AGE			
29-40	21	2.99	.71
20-28	11	2.90	.69
41-54	16	2.86	.38
55+	5	2.83	.31
DEGREE			
Doctorate	16	2.99	.69
Masters	28	2.89	.60
Bachelors	8	2.84	.29
TIME WITH STUDENTS			
61-80%	14	3.11	.92
21-40%	6	2.94	.40
41-60%	10	2.90	.38
81-100%	13	2.83	.48
0-20%	9	2.80	.28
PROBLEMS			
Lack of variety	2	3.50	.74
Relationships with students	4	3.32	.34
Bureaucracy (rules and regs)	5	3.11	.19
Work overload	18	3.02	.72
Lack of autonomy	2	3.00	.00
Physical environment	6	2.79	.45
Relationships with coworkers	3	2.79	.09
New technology	2	2.76	.24
Relationships with supervisors	3	2.76	.41
No problems	8	2.45	.53

were the five job-related problems chosen by people whose mean tedium scores exceeded the score of 3.

Table 3 is a summary of the percentages of those respondents scoring less than 3 (the burnout health zone) who indicated a certain job-related problem. Table 4 is a summary of those respondents scoring 3 or more (the burnout danger zone) who indicated a certain work overload to be the major job-related problem. But the healthy group's next most indicated problem was no problems while the danger group indicated bureaucracy as a sore point. Those in the burnout danger zone were worried more about relationships with students and lack of autonomy according to the table, while those in the burnout health zone were more concerned with relationships with co-workers and supervisors. New technology and lack of variety did not seem to cause much concern in either group.

From the survey of the literature, the expectation was that males had a higher burnout rate than females, that people in the age group 29-40 were more prone to burnout, that the higher the degree of education the more likely the burnout, that the higher the degree of student contact the higher the degree of burnout, and that certain job-related problems were significant indicators of burnout. Unfortunately, these conclusions could not be statistically substantiated.

Because categorical data was used, the logical choice for statistical analysis was a Chi Square Test for

Table 3

Percentage of Respondents (Scoring Less Than 3)

Who Indicated a Certain Job-related Problem

Job-related Problem	Percentage
Work overload (too much to do, too little time to do it)	33.33%
No problems	22.22%
Physical Environment	11.11%
Relationships with co-workers	11.11%
Relationships with supervisors	7.40%
Bureaucracy (rules and regulations)	3.70%
Relationships with students	3.70%
New technology	3.70%
Lack of variety	3.70%
Lack of autonomy	0.00%

Independence between categories and scores on the tedium test. Scores were divided into two groups, those scoring below 3 and those scoring 3 or more. This high-low dichotomy helped insure that more than five scores could be assigned to each cell in a table. The high scores and low scores served as the column headings for the Chi Square tables, while the divisions in the categories of sex, age, degree held, time spent with students, job-related problems, problems versus no problems, and number of

Table 4

Percentage of Respondents (Scoring 3 or More) Who Indicated a Certain Job-related Problem

Job-related Problem	Percentage
Work overload (too much to do, too little time to do it)	34.62%
Bureaucracy (rules and regulations)	15.38%
Physical Environment	11.54%
Relationship with students	11.54%
Lack of autonomy	7.69%
No problems	7.69%
New technology	3.85%
Lack of variety	3.85%
Relationships with supervisors	3.85%
Relationships with co-workers	0.00%

professionals in the office served as row titles. A .05 level of significance was chosen, and as can be seen in Table 5, the null hypothesis of no relationship had to be accepted in each case.

If no statistical relationships could be found in the data, the next task was to analyze the responses to the question, "What do you see as specific measures that could be taken to reduce the stress of your job?" in the hopes of discerning some pattern between the responses and level of burnout.

Table 5

Chi Square Test for Independence Results Between Categories and High and Low Individual Tedium Scores

Category	Table	Chi Square Value	df	.05 Sig. Value	Null Hypoth.
Sex: Male Female	2x2	.4270	1	3.841	Accept
Age: 20-28 29-40 41-54 55+	2x4	.3159	3	7.815	Accept
Degree Held: Doctorate Masters Bachelors	2x3	.0656	2	5.991	Accept
Time Spent with Students: 0-20% 21-40% 41-60% 61-80% 81-100%	2x5	3.5428	4	9.488	Accept
Job-related Problems: 10 listed	2x10	10.6625	9	16.919	Accept
Problems vs. No Problems	2x2	2.1740	1	3.841	Accept
# of Professional/Office 2, 3, or 4 More than 6	2x2	2.4057	1	3.841	Accept

Table 6 chronicles the answers of respondents who scored 3.0 or more on the tedium measure. Table 7 lists the answers of those who scored below 3.0. Of the 26 people with scores in the burnout danger zone, 10 did not respond at all to the question. Of the 27 people with scores in the burnout health zone, 7 chose not to respond to the question. The person with the highest burnout score (5.24) was one of those who chose not to respond.

The comments of those on the higher level of the burnout scale clustered around need for time away from the job, and a need for more autonomy. In addition more items within the personal range of an individual were mentioned such as a desire for time management skills, relaxation techniques, daily exercise, organizational and planning skills, freedom from harmful substances, and daily exercise. One person mentioned leaving the job as the only solution for stress.

Comments of those on the lower level of the burnout scale noted more trivial items such as more variety, less paperwork, less detail, more planning. More positive comments about having the perfect range of stress and loving one's job were noted. Note especially the comment in Table 7 of the person who had the lowest burnout score of all the respondents.

Concerns about the need for more staff and better working environments were expressed by people at both the high and low levels of the tedium scale. This would be

Table 6

Answers to the Job Stress Question* of Respondents

Who Scored More Than 3.0 on Tedium Scale

Score	Response
4.24	Different living environment and more authority to dictate policy.
3.86	Eliminate discipline problems (not realistic!). More time away from the job (a live-in position makes it difficult to get away). Take a class in meditation and relaxation techniques.
3.38	Consistency from the people that make the rules and regulations.
3.33	More space or fewer functions performed in the office. More control over direction policy of office. More money.
3.29	More clerical support staff. Reducing the amount of change solely for experimental reasons.
3.19	The nature of the work I do makes it difficult to change stress level. Perhaps to find a new job?
3.14	Some of it can't be reduced, it comes with the territory and is an acceptable part of the job. More money for the department would allow changes that could reduce stress somewhat for me, but more so for the rest of the staff.
3.14	Networking/support relationships with co-workers. Support of significant other. Forcing myself to pursue intellectual activities. Freedom from addiction of harmful substances. Leisure activities. Daily strenuous exercise.
3.14	The most specific measure I see is internally. The best way to reduce stress is by doing things for yourself.

Table 6 (continued)

Score	Response
3.10	A leave for June to pursue travel interests and geneology research. All my life June has been a very important month to me--What happened?--I have a position that necessitates all the help the department can pull together in June. This becomes important as I have had my first experience with burnout...Burnout is an experience much different than I expected. I am excited about the goals of the Department and Division, yet I'm tired, not as productive as I would like and inundated with details. No resources for change!!
3.10	Additional staff in a few key areas. More attention to time management. Somehow avoid the conflicts between demands of personal life and professional life. PDL for administrators.
3.10	Take better care of myself. Contact and support from staff.
3.05	Better time management. Spend time educating myself on issues I need to know and confront. Somehow encourage more of a healthy work environment. Get people to stop smoking and complaining.
3.0	More cooperation between workers to get the task done.
3.0	Better communication and planning among people involved in making decisions. Better organization and planning skills for myself.
3.0	More accessibility to students by way of changing the working environment: direct access door, lounge for students. A window, some daylight. Totally enclosed rooms are for creeping things--not for people and certainly not for people expected to be creative, imaginative, efficient, personable, professional, etc., etc.

*Question: What do you see as specific measures that could be taken to relieve the stress of your job?

Table 7

Answers to the Job Stress Question* of Respondents

Who Scored Less Than 3.0 on Tedium Scale

Score	Response
2.90	Live out! More personal days allotted than 2! Graduate assistant help.
2.81	Provide adequate staffing to accomplish goals. More careful planning concerning moving into new technology and new organizational structure to allow for adjustment.
2.81	Additional staff. Additional office space.
2.76	Communication from supervisor before important decisions pertaining to my responsibilities are made.
2.76	Rotation to more varied assignments periodically. Completion of dissertation (more stress from this than all work-related factors together).
2.67	Provide a leave of absence with pay one summer every 5 years. However, I feel I have about the perfect range of stress on my job, not too much or too little.
2.67	Stronger staff support, clearer lines of authority between divisions and departments of the university, improved systems of information sharing for decision-making.
2.62	Keep at a minimum taking work home. After a full day's work get involved with spending time with your family and as time allows get involved with outside activities such as church and community functions. Take family vacations.
2.52	Less paperwork--more time for planning.
2.52	Greater space, fewer detail tasks, being able to find time to do more large projects and few small tasks.
2.52	None in particular.

Table 7 (continued)

Score	Response
2.48	Additional staff
2.48	More balance in scheduling of apointments--even distribution amongst staff in this responsibility when possible. Better and more timely communication of inter-office office affairs.
2.38	Open communication with professional colleagues. Relationships with others outside the profession. Time to get away (hiking with dog, fishing, camping, etc.)
2.24	Increase staff to responsibilities (ratio). Pay is generally inadequate.
2.19	It's difficult to answer, because I rarely feel stress on the job. When I do, it's usually my own fault--a matter of having taken on more than I should have.
2.14	If I could be triplets so we could all get more accomplished than I alone am able to do.
1.95	Good food intake--not rushed. Time for myself. Good exercise program--away from students.
1.52	I don't have stress on my job.
1.48	I don't feel an extreme amount of stress in relationship to my job. I attribute this to: being on a job I enjoy, with people I enjoy working with, at a place I enjoy being at. I still find challenges for myself and for others. And I have an extreme amount of support from my supervisor and colleagues.

*Question: What do you see as specific measures that could be taken to relieve the stress of your job?

congruent with findings in Tables 3 and 4 that work overload and environment were oft mentioned job-related problems by all levels of respondents.

Table 8 is a summary of the concerns expressed in answer to the question on job stress broken down by department. As would be expected, the people in the residence department expressed a great desire for time to themselves, and time away from the job. Additional staff, more money, more support were also common themes among all the departments. No strong patterns seemed to emerge about the functions of the department and the type of stress noted in each department, but the table could be valuable as a jumping off point in discussing possible burnout intervention strategies for professionals in each area. In conjunction with Table 8, Table 9, which lists the various job-related problems indicated by members of the various departments, could be used to determine the particular burnout stressors per department.

Table 8

Concerns Expressed in Answer to the Question on Job Stress

Department	Concerns
Academic Advisement	Too much work during a certain time of year. No resources to change the situation.
Admissions	Better working environment. More staff. More balance in scheduling appointments among staff. Better inter-office communication.
Financial Aids	Additional staff. Additional office space.
Faculty	Better communication with colleagues. Relationships outside the profession. Avoiding taking on too much work. Time away from the job.
V. P. Office	Additional staff, stronger staff support. Clearer lines of authority. Improved information sharing systems. Balance of professional life and personal life. PDL for administrators.
Residence	Time for myself. Time away from the job. Living away from the job. More authority to dictate policy. More communication from those making decisions. Instruction in time management, relaxation techniques.
Maucker	More support from others. More leisure time. More exercise.
Registrar	Less paperwork. More planning time. Consistency from superiors.
Counseling	More staff support. Better pay. More variety.

Table 8 (continued)

Department	Concerns
Placement	Leave of absence with pay. Greater space. More money. More control over policy.
Health Services	More cooperation. More leisure time.
Learning Skills	More money.

Table 9

Job-related Problems Indicated by Members of the Various Student Personnel Departments

Department	Concerns
Academic Advising	Work overload.
Admissions	Physical environment, work overload, relationships with supervisors.
Financial Aids	Work overload.
Faculty	Relationships with supervisors. Work overload. New technology.
V. P. Office	Work overload.
Residence	Relationships with students. Lack of variety. Work overload. Relationships with co-workers. Lack of autonomy. Physical environment. Bureaucracy.
Student Activities	Relationships with students. Relationships with supervisors.
Registrar	New technology. Bureaucracy. Work overload.
Counseling	Work overload. Bureaucracy. Relationships with co-workers.
Placement	Work overload. Physical environment.
Health Services	Work overload. Lack of autonomy. Bureaucracy.
Learning Skills	Work overload.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

Implications of the Findings

Although the survey did determine to what extent burnout existed in the Student Personnel Services of the University (51% of the respondents had scores in the burnout danger zone), it failed to find any commonalities among the people affected. Burnout did not appear to be dependent on such factors as sex, age, education, amount of student contact, job-related problems, and number of professionals per department.

A qualitative consideration of the written comments on job stress did reveal that people on the higher levels of the burnout scale were given to noting dispositional variables such as a need to learn relaxation, management, organizational, planning, and time-management skills. People on the lower levels of the burnout scale tended to note situational factors of paperwork, variety, and planning. This could be an example of what Maslach calls the "dispositional bias" of those suffering from burnout (1982, p. 10).

As a whole, the study did not seem to bear any relationship to previously published research. If it had, the results would have shown that females were more prone to burnout than males, that younger people were more prone

to burnout than older, that the more educated are less prone to burnout, and that the people who have the greatest amount of student contact are most prone to burnout. This was not the case.

Need for Modification of the Study

Established theory predicts that some relationships should have been found. The study was not significant in finding relationships because of the extremely small sample. Some of the departments had only two or three professionals in it, and the total number of respondents was only 53.

It might help to replicate this study at a number of colleges and universities throughout the country, especially at some of the larger institutions where there is a larger professional pool. Then small differences in characteristics and scores would not have such a great effect on the statistical outcome. A failure to show relationships with a range of samples could be more theoretically significant than the failure to show relationships in one small study.

Another instrument to measure burnout might have been more appropriate for this study. Many of the respondents complained that the tedium measure developed by Pines et al. (1981) did not include a time frame (in the last month, in the last year) for how often they had had the experiences listed. The Maslach Burnout Inventory

(Maslach & Jackson, 1981) discriminates between how often something is experienced (a few times a year, monthly, a few times a month, every week, a few times a week, every day) and how strong the experience is (very mild, barely noticeable, moderate, very strong, major). Consequently, it seems to be a more finely tuned instrument for measuring burnout. Unfortunately, it was not available at the time the study was done.

In the section on job-related problems, many people requested that the problems be more clearly defined. For instance, was the item on relationships with co-workers meant to pertain only to those people on the same job level or to all of the professional staff in a department? Some questioned the meaning of autonomy and new technology. The category of "other" could also have been inserted to give respondents more leeway in answering the question and to provide possible responses the researcher overlooked.

Finally, it might have been useful (and certainly could be useful in the future) to have correlated the tedium measure with another measure such as job satisfaction. Other categories could have been added to the questionnaire such as amount of hours worked per week, number of staff meetings, number of days of vacation taken, degree of perceived status of the job, etc. The possibilities are quite broad.

Implications for the Existing Research

The study did not coincide with the results of the existing body of research on burnout. However, if it was determined through several more studies with different samples that there were no relationships between burnout and the categories studied or that the relationships did not coincide with relationships found in the research, there would certainly be serious questions raised about the ability to generalize data from one helping profession to another. And it might be worth wondering why the Student Personnel Services did not fit the research mold.

The review of the literature revealed a scarcity of statistical research in the field of burnout. Many questions still remain unanswered about the antecedents, causes, incidence, intensity, and correlates of burnout. Studies in the field of Student Personnel Work are particularly sparse.

One important need is to obtain more valid measures of burnout. Pines et al. (1981) Tedium measure, Maslach's Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1981) and the Berkeley Planning Associates' (1977) burnout instrument are the only examples currently. Use of two measures in the same research might increase reliability and yield valuable insights on critical aspects of measurement.

Investigation of the different research methodologies might generate some important questions, such as: Do different methodologies yield different

results? Is an interview as valid as a questionnaire? Would longitudinal research be valuable? Are certain measurement procedures likely to increase the individual's awareness of burnout, or is the measurement helping to create and perpetuate the existence of burnout? Furthermore, should burnout even be viewed as a negative. Some, like Edelwich and Brodsky (1980), view it as a source of creative energy when managed correctly. It could even be considered as part of a natural selection process or "survival of the fittest."

There is also a need for the establishment of norm groups so that the level of burnout in a sample could be determined by comparison to norm groups. Such norm groups could be categorized by sex, education level, type of work, etc.

Since burnout has become such a popular term, it might also be helpful to determine what rewards a person receives for admitting to burnout. If only the most caring and committed people burnout, then isn't it to one's advantage to admit to burnout and thus admit to such endearing characteristics.

It could be interesting to study the people who have already undergone burnout. These "old-timers" might yield some clues to coping with burnout and staying in the field. How such people are doing presently might shed some light on the long term effects of burnout.

In this age of accountability, it might be useful to try to determine the monetary cost of burnout. How do organizations decide when turnover, absenteeism, inefficiency and other outcomes of burnout have reached the point that intervention measures are warranted? Who will decide what those measures are? In a field as new as burnout, the questions are endless and the opportunities are abundant.

Chapter 6

SUMMARY

Because of the scarcity of literature on burnout in the field of Student Personnel Services, a study was undertaken at a university to determine the degree of burnout existing in the departments of the Student Personnel Services. An effort was also made to determine some common characteristics of those people suffering burnout. A questionnaire consisting of a tedium/burnout measure; questions on sex, age, education, amount of student contact, and job-related problems; and a question pertaining to how stress could be reduced on the job was distributed to the 66 professional staff members of the Student Personnel Services of the university. Fifty-three questionnaires were returned. Analysis of the data using a Chi Square test for independence found that the occurrence of burnout did not depend on the various categories. An analysis of the answers to the question on job stress reducers indicated that there was a dispositional bias about burnout among those scoring high on the tedium/burnout measure. A surprising finding was that more than 50% of the respondents to the survey were suffering from a degree of burnout serious enough to require some action in the near future. However, most of the results of the study were only relevant to the Student Personnel Services of the

particular university and were not generalizable. The study could not be linked statistically to previously published research, but could be made more relevant by using a different burnout measure such as the Maslach Burnout Inventory, by clarifying some of the terms used in the job-related problems section, and by adding some other categories in an effort to find relationships. The study did point up the need for more valid measures of burnout, for more varied kinds of research methodologies, for establishment of norm groups for comparison purposes, for determination of who initiates burnout intervention and when, for study of those who have survived burnout, and for recognition of some positive aspects of burnout.

REFERENCES

Arnold, K. Career development for the experienced student affairs professional. NASPA Journal, 1982, 20(2), 3-8.

Baron, Jr., A., & Cohen, R. B. Helping phone counselors cope with burnout: A consciousness-raising workshop. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1982, 60(8), 508-510.

Bayerl, J. A., & MacKenzie, T. E. Unload, don't overload: A workshop model on stress in education. School Counselor, 1981, 29(1), 54-60.

Berkeley Planning Associates. Evaluation of child abuse and neglect demonstration project. 1974-1977. Volume IX. Project Management and Worker Burnout: Final Report, 1977, 2320 Channing Way, Berkeley, California.

Biggs, D. A., Barnhart, W., & Bakkenist, N. Job attitudes of student personnel workers and their work situations. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1975, 16, 114-118.

Boy, A. V., & Pine, G. J. Avoiding counselor burnout through role renewal. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1980, 59(3), 161-163.

Bramhall, M., & Ezell, S. How burned out are you? Public Welfare, 1981, 39(1), 23-27. (a)

Bramhall, M., & Ezell, S. Working your way out of burnout. Public Welfare, 1981, 39(2), 32-39. (b)

Bramhall, M., & Ezell, S. How agencies prevent burnout. Public Welfare, 1981, 39(3), 33-37. (c)

Burns, M. Who leaves the student affairs field? NASPA Journal, 1981, 20(2), 9-12.

Cardinell, C. F. Burnout? mid-life crisis? let's understand ourselves. Contemporary Education, 1981, 52(2), 103-108.

Carroll, J. F. X. Staff burnout as a form of ecological dysfunction. Contemporary Drug Problems, 1979, Summer, 207-225.

Daley, M. R. Burnout--smoldering problem in protective services. Social Work, 1979, 24(5), 375-379.

Edelwich, J., with Brodsky, A. Burnout: Stages of disillusionment in the helping professions. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1980.

Forney, D. S., Wallace-Schutzman, F., & Wiggers, T. Burnout among career development professionals: Preliminary findings and implications. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1981, 60, 435-439.

Freudenberger, H. J. Staff burn-out. Journal of Social Issues, 1974, 30, 159-165.

Freudenberger, H. J. Burn-out: The organizational menace. Training and Development Journal, 1977, 31(7), 26-27.

Freudenberger, H. J., with Richelson, G. Burn-out: The high cost of achievement. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press, 1980.

Garte, S. H., & Rosenblum, M. L. Lighting fires in burned out counselors. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1978, 57, 158-160.

Gross, S. J. Characteristics of student personnel workers: A review of the research. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1978, 19(3), 231-237.

Hinshelwood, M. Burnout--fact, fad, or fiction? Momentum, 1981, 12(3), 16-17.

Jones, M. A., & Emanuel, J. Preventing burnout through counselor training. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the North Central Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. Milwaukee, Wisconsin, October 16-18, 1981.

Kahn, R. Job burnout prevention and remedies. Public Welfare, 1978, 36, 61-63.

Kamis, E. An epidemiological approach to staff burnout. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association. 88th, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, September 1-5, 1980.

Larson, C. C., Gilbertson, D. L., & Powell, J. A. Therapist burnout: Perspectives on a critical issue. Social Casework, 1978, 59, 563-565.

Lauderdale, M. Burnout, strategies for personal and organizational life. San Diego, Cal.: University Associates, 1982.

Lawing, M. A., Moore, L. V., & Groseth, R. Enhancement and Advancement: Professional development for student affairs staff. NASPA Journal, 1982, 20(2), 22-26.

Lynch, J. J. Beating burnout. Paper presented at the annual convention of the New Jersey Education Association. Atlantic City, New Jersey, November 12-13, 1981.

Maslach, C. Burned-out. Human Behavior, 1976, 5(9), 16-22.

Maslach, C. The client role in staff burnout. Journal of Social Issues, 1978, 34(4), 111-124. (a)

Maslach, C. Job burnout: How people cope. Public Welfare, 1978, 36(2), 56-58. (b)

Maslach, C. Burnout: A social psychological analysis. In J. W. Jones (Ed.). The burnout syndrome: Current research theory and interventions. Park Ridge, Illinois: London House Press, 1981.

Maslach, C. Burnout--the cost of caring. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982.

Maslach, C. & Jackson, S. E. The measurement of experienced burnout. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 1981, 2, 99-113.

Minahan, A. Burnout and organizational change. Social Work, 1980, 25, 87.

Moracco, J. C. Burnout in counselors and organizations. Ann Arbor, Michigan: ERIC-CAPS, 1981.

Moracco, J. C. Burnout in counselors and organizations. Ann Arbor, Michigan: ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services, 1981. (ED195924)

Moracco, J., & McFadden, . Burnout in human service organizations: Prevention and remediation. Humanist Educator, 1980, 19(2), 59-66

Neville, S. H. Job stress and burnout: Occupational hazards for services staff. College and Research Libraries, 1981, 42, 242-247.

Perlman, B., & Hartman, E. A. An integration of burnout into a stress model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association. 26th, Washington, D. C., March 26-29, 1980.

Perlman, B., & Hartman, E. A. Burnout: Summary and future research. Human Relations, 1982, 35(4), 283-305.

Pines, A., & Aronson, E., with Kafry, D. Burnout: From tedium to personal growth. New York: Free Press, 1981.

Pines, A., & Kafry, D. Occupational tedium in the social services. Social Work, 1978, 23, 499-507.

Romero, D. & Pinkney, J. Role swapping: an antidote to professional burnout. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1980, 20(1), 6-14.

Savicki, V., & Cooley, E. J. Implications of burnout research and theory for counselor educators. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1982, 60, 415-419.

Tiedeman, D. V. Burning and copping out of counseling. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1979, 57, 328-330.

Trachtenberg, S. J. Not what it's cracked up to be. New Directions in Higher Education, 1981, 9(4), 3-9.

Van Auken, S. Youth counselor burnout. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1979, 58, 143-144.

Veninga, R. L., & Spradley, J. P. The work/stress connection: How to cope with job burnout. Boston: Little, Brown, 1981.

Warnath, C. F. Counselor burnout: Existential crisis or a problem for the profession? The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1979, 57, 325-328.

Warnath, C. & Shelton, J. Counselor burnout: The ultimate disappointment. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1976, 55, 172-175.

Welch, I. D., Madeiros, D. C., & Tate, G. A. Beyond burnout. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1982.

Wiggers, T. T., Forney, D. S., & Wallace Schutzman, F. Burnout is not necessary: Prevention and recovery. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1982, 23, 13-21.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

Please place an "X" to the left of the appropriate answer.

1. Sex: _____Male _____Female

2. Age: ____20-28 ____29-40 ____41-54 ____55+

3. Highest degree earned:

   ____Bachelors ____Masters ____Doctorate

4. Amount of time spent in direct contact with students:

   ___0-20% ___21-40% ___41-60% ___61-80% ___81-100%

5. From the following list, select the ONE job-related problem most important to you.

   _____Physical environment
   _____Work overload (too much to do, too little time to do it)
   _____Relationships with co-workers
   _____Relationships with students
   _____Relationships with supervisors
   _____Lack of autonomy
   _____Bureaucracy
   _____New technology
   _____Lack of variety
   _____No problems

How often do you have any of the following experiences? Please use the following scale and write the appropriate number next to the experience.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
NEVER	ONCE	RARELY	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	USUALLY	ALWAYS

1. ____Being tired

2. ____Feeling depressed

3. ____Having a good day

4. ____Being physically exhausted

5. ____Being emotionally exhausted

6. ____Being happy

7. ____Being "wiped out"

8. ____Feeling "burned out"

9. ____Being unhappy

10. ____Feeling rundown

11. ____Feeling trapped

12. ____Feeling worthless

13. ____Being weary

14. ____Being troubled

15. ____Feeling disillusioned and resentful about people

16. ____Feeling weak

17. ____Feeling hopeless

18. ____Feeling rejected

19. ____Feeling optimistic

20. ____Feeling energetic

21. ____Feeling anxious

What do you see as specific measures that could be taken to reduce the stress of your job?

APPENDIX B

February 28, 1983

Dear Student Personnel Professional:

I am a graduate student currently involved in writing a research paper for my Masters degree requirement. May I ask you for a small amount of your time to help me in this research? By contributing your attitudes, feelings, and perceptions to the attached questionnaire, you will be furthering an important body of knowledge in the Student Services field.

The questionnaire is designed to measure your response to the work environment. For maximum reliability, the research requires as many people to respond as possible. Would you take 5 to 10 minutes to fill the survey out? Then you can return it to me in the envelope provided via the campus mail any time before March 11, 1983.

All questionnaires will be completely confidential, and the results will apear in my paper as statistical data only. A copy of my final statistical results will be available to those people surveyed, if they so desire.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely,

Susan C. Spencer
Graduate Student
Educational Administration and Counseling

SCS/ss

Attached: Questionnaire and envelope

APPENDIX C

MASTER DATA SHEET

Person	M	F	20-28	29-40	41-54	55+	BA	MA	PhD
1		3.10			3.10				3.10
2	1.52			1.52				1.52	
3		3.0			3.0		3.0		
4		2.48		2.48				2.48	
5		2.57	2.57				2.57		
6	2.95				2.95			2.95	
7	3.33			3.33				3.33	
8		2.81		2.81			2.81		
9	2.38				2.38				2.38
10	2.52					2.52			2.52
11	5.24			5.24					5.24
12	2.19				2.19				2.19
13	3.0					3.0			3.0
14	3.10				3.10				3.10
15	2.67			2.67					2.67
16	2.76					2.76			2.76
17	3.14			3.14					3.14
18	2.24			2.24					2.24
19		3.10			3.10			3.10	
20	3.57				3.57				3.57
21	2.76			2.76				2.76	
22		3.05			3.05			3.05	
23	2.67			2.67					2.67
24		3.29		3.29					3.29
25		2.52			2.52			2.52	
26	2.81			2.81				2.81	
27	3.33			3.33				3.33	

MASTER DATA SHEET (continued)

Person	M	F	20-28	29-40	41-54	55+	BA	MA	PhD
28		3.24		3.24			3.24		
29		3.05	3.05				3.05		
30	3.19			3.19					3.19
31		3.0			3.0		3.0		
32		2.81			2.81		2.81		
33	2.62				2.62			2.62	
34	2.81				2.81				2.81
35		2.24			2.24		2.24		
36	3.14		3.14					3.14	
37		2.95	2.95					2.95	
38	4.24		4.24					4.24	
39		1.48	1.48					1.48	
40	2.14			2.14				2.14	
41	2.81			2.81				2.81	
42	3.0			3.0				3.0	
43	2.81			2.81				2.81	
44		3.19	3.19					3.19	
45	1.95		1.95					1.95	
46		3.86		3.86				3.86	
47		2.90	2.90					2.90	
48	3.14		3.14					3.14	
49	3.33		3.33					3.33	
50	3.33					3.33		3.33	
51	2.52					2.52		2.52	
52		3.38			3.38				
53	3.52			3.52				3.52	
Total	96.73	58.02	31.94	62.86	45.82	14.13	22.72	80.78	47.87

MASTER DATA SHEET (continued)

Person	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	80+	Envir.	Work Overload	Rel/ Cowork
1			3.10				3.10	
2				1.52				
3			3.0			3.0		
4			2.48				2.48	
5					2.57			
6	2.95						2.95	
7					3.33		3.33	
8					2.81		2.81	
9				2.38				
10			2.52					
11				5.24			5.24	
12			2.19					
13			3.0					
14	3.10						3.10	
15		2.67					2.67	
16	2.76							
17	3.14					3.14		
18				2.24			2.24	
19					3.10			
20				3.57			3.57	
21			2.76				2.76	
22				3.05				
23	2.67							2.67
24			3.29				3.29	
25		2.52				2.52		
26	2.81						2.81	
27				3.33		3.33		

MASTER DATA SHEET (continued)

Person	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	80+	Envir.	Work Overload	Rel/ Cowork
28					3.24			
29					3.05		3.05	
30					3.19		3.19	
31					3.0			
32					2.81			
33								
34					2.81		2.81	
35					2.24			
36					3.14			
37				2.95				
38				4.24				
39					1.48		1.48	
40	2.14							
41	2.81							2.81
42		3.0						
43	2.81					2.81		
44				3.19				
45				1.95		1.95		
46				3.86				
47				2.90				2.90
48				3.14				
49			3.33					
50			3.33					
51		2.52						
52		3.38						
53		3.52					3.52	
Total	25.19	17.61	29.	43.56	36.77	16.75	54.4	8.38

MASTER DATA SHEET (continued)

Person	Rel/ Stud	Lack of Autonomy	Bureauc.	Tech.	Lack of Variety	Rel/ Superv.	No Prob.
1							
2							1.52
3							
4							
5						2.57	
6							
7							
8							
9						2.38	
10							2.52
11							
12							2.19
13				3.0			
14							
15							
16					2.76		
17							
18							
19			3.10				
20							
21							
22			3.05				
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							

MASTER DATA SHEET (continued)

Person	Rel/ Stud	Lack of Autonomy	Bureauc.	Tech.	Lack of Variety	Rel/ Superv.	No Prob.
28							3.24
29							
30							
31		3.0					
32			2.81				
33							2.62
34							
35							2.24
36							3.14
37	2.95						
38					4.24		
39							
40							2.14
41							
42		3.0					
43							
44			3.19				
45							
46	3.86						
47							
48	3.14						
49	3.33						
50						3.33	
51				2.52			
52			3.38				
53							
Total	13.28	6.0	15.53	5.52	7.0	8.28	19.61