

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COUNSELOR EDUCATORS' LEADERSHIP
EXPERIENCE AND COMPETENCE AND BURNOUT

by

John Jonathan Suroshan Harrichand

Liberty University

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Liberty University

April, 2018

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COUNSELOR EDUCATORS' LEADERSHIP
EXPERIENCE AND COMPETENCE AND BURNOUT

by John Jonathan Suroshan Harrichand

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

2018

APPROVED BY:

John C. Thomas, Ph.D., Ph.D., Committee Chair

Joy M. Mwendwa, Ph.D., Committee Member

Nicole M. DiLella, Ph.D., Committee Member

ABSTRACT

Mentorship and servant leadership are requirements of quality counselor educators. Recognized as leaders in the field of counseling, counselor educators exert great influence on students, clients, peers, and society at large. However, it is apparent from the paucity of research on the subject that attention and resources examining the impact leadership has on burnout in counselor educators is lacking. This study examined the relationship between a counselor educator's experience and competence of leadership and dimensions of burnout. The results from this pilot study indicated no significant correlations between the Principles and Practices of Leadership Excellence Experience subscale and each of the burnout subscales: personal, work-related, and student-related. The study also revealed no significant correlation between the Competence subscale and the student-related burnout subscale, reported by counselor educators. However, significant correlations were found between the Principles and Practices of Leadership Excellence Competence subscale and two of the burnout subscales: personal and work-related. This study also examined the extent to which a counselor educator's leadership experience and competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load predicted burnout. Results from the regression analyses indicated no significant contributions from the predictor variables in relation to each burnout subscale. Implications, limitations, and recommendations for future research are discussed as they relate to current and future counselor educators, higher education administrators, and counselor education preparation programs with the goal of minimizing burnout.

Keywords: counselor education, counselor educator, servant leadership, counselor educator experience, counselor educator competence, burnout, personal burnout, work-related burnout, student-related burnout.

© John Jonathan Suroshan Harrichand, 2018

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my beloved father, the late Reverend James Jai Prakash Harrichand (April 5, 1953–January 7, 2018), who inspired me to pursue higher education and who left this world far too soon before seeing me realize our shared dream. Rest in peace dad; I am grateful for your self-sacrifice and the example you embodied in being a servant leader for my brothers, James Japheth Sudarshan Harrichand and Joel Joshua Suvachan Harrichand, and me.

I would also like to dedicate this dissertation to my incredible mother, Jennie Rosita Harrichand, the woman who taught me and my brothers the true meaning of being a servant first. I love you mom.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this dissertation to the past, current, and future counselor educators, who have been, are, and will continue shaping the face of our profession. May we continue striving in pursuit of excellence, seeking always to mentor and model ethically and competently. But more importantly, may we seek to first care for ourselves so that we can in turn care for others.

To serve well, one must lead from a place of wellness. – *John Harrichand*

Acknowledgments

Give thanks to the LORD, for he is good; his love endures forever – 1 Chronicles 16:34 (NIV)

It is still somewhat of a dream, completing my dissertation. Reflecting on earlier this year, when my dad passed away, and the pain of his loss left me depressed and grieving, the possibility of completing my dissertation was unlikely. It is by the indescribable grace and abounding love of my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ I was able to make it to the finish line. He orchestrates all things for the good of His children, and I am a testament of His faithfulness. Thank you, Lord!

A Guyanese proverb states, “one, one dutty does mek dam”; this means “every little bit adds up,” and this is certainly the case for the dissertation process. My success would not have been possible without the exceptional people the Lord has intentionally placed in my life to shoulder the load of life in academia. This section honors the many women and men who contributed to my success by partnering with me on the doctoral journey. I am a better son, brother, advocate, researcher, counselor, and educator because of each of you.

First, I would like to thank my family. Dad, Mom, Jay, and Josh, you have been my cheerleaders and prayer warriors. Thank you for believing in me and for allowing me to move away from home during the most intense times of dad’s illness. Because of your care for dad, who now watches over us all, I was able to stay focused on my studies, and for that I am sincerely grateful to each of you. I love you all so very much, and I thank the Lord for allowing me to be part of your family.

Second, I would like to thank my dissertation committee for carrying me through the lows and highs, and for supporting and encouraging me to step forth with confidence into the space carved out for me as a counselor educator. Your mentorship and heart for God and those

you serve as educators will forever be the foundation on which I model my identity as a counselor educator.

To Dr. John Thomas, you are my savior and surrogate dad. I can still remember calling you with the request to be my dissertation chair, listening to you outline your expectations, and being extremely grateful for your approval. I remember my initial days as a teaching assistant, having the opportunity to work with you and developing a fondness for your humor not knowing that it was the humor with which you face life that would become the spring from which I would process my dad's death. You were central to the completion of my dissertation and for everything you have done and *will do in future for me*, thank you. I pray that I can be the educator you have been to me to the students I have the honor of educating.

To Dr. Joy Mwendwa, tears of joy stream from my eyes as I write this section. I still remember the day I first sat down in your office and the wisdom you imparted after my first VACES conference presentation. You commented on the strengths you saw in me and the hope of what God was going to accomplish through me. It is because of your steadfast mentorship that I am the advocate and mentor I am today. You are an amazing educator and your passion for your students is evident not only in your teaching but in the countless hours you spend preparing them for conferences and serving our CSI Chapter. Thank you for allowing me to feel safe and vulnerable in your office and in the classroom and for attentively listening to my struggles and tears. I pray that I can be the mentor you have been to me to the students I have the honor of mentoring.

To Dr. Nicole DiLella, it is your willingness to see others succeed, your kindness, and your contagious personality that inspired me and helped me make it through the dissertation process. Thank you for helping me be a better writer, a better supervisor, and a better educator.

Thank you for modeling professionalism and grace while manoeuvring dual relationships, and thank you for giving your time at the end of long workdays to allow me the space to vent. Your passion for and knowledge of the field has shaped my voice as an educator, and I pray this passion continues inspiring the students I have the honor of educating; for that I am immensely grateful.

To Dr. Lisa Sosin, professor extraordinaire, Yeshua-lover, and surrogate mom. Words cannot begin to express how thankful I am the Lord placed you in my life. Five years ago, I was oblivious to the numerous experiences He was going to facilitate through you. You have been a remarkable mentor, teacher, and now friend. You inspired me to care deeply for others, as demonstrated in your care for me. I pray that I can remain passionate for our field, as you have been for the past 30 years, when I am 30 years in. Thank you for praying for and with me, for your regular check-ins, for making me feel valued as a teaching assistant, and for mentoring me into a strong qualitative researcher and administrator. You will forever be my role model.

To Dr. Steve Nielsen, thank you for being my supervisor and helping me learn strong clinical skills and interventions. Your sense of humor and easy manner of communication provided the perfect environment for me to develop clinical acumen as a counselor. I aspire to be the wise clinician and supervisor you are to the students and counselors I have the honor of teaching and supervising.

To Mike Kunzinger, Michael Trexler, and the entire Student Counseling Services staff, thank you for making the past two and a half years a pleasure. Each of you have played a pivotal role in supporting, educating, supervising, and encouraging me as an intern, doctoral student, and resident in counseling, and for that I am extremely grateful. Thank you also to all of the students (clients) who trusted me to work with them as a college counselor; your willingness to move into

sacred and often uncomfortable space with me allowed both of us to experience growth and the power of human connection, while progressing towards wellness.

To the faculty and staff in the Department of Counselor Education and Family Studies at Liberty University, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to experience various professional roles as a teaching assistant and for trusting me with mentoring and educating our master's students. Special thanks to Dr. Fred Volk for his encouragement to engage in research and to Dr. Anita Knight who saw the researcher in me during the infancy of my doctoral years and invited me to be part of her research team. Dr. Knight, your mentorship has been a blessing in my life, and for that I am thankful. Special thanks are also in order for Dr. Mary Deacon, the embodiment of a strong, passionate, and knowledgeable counselor educator. You are the reason I fell in love with the topic of leadership and service in counseling. I pray that I can channel your deep commitment to our profession by training competent counseling professionals.

To Dr. David Ford, thank you for your constant check-ins and encouragement throughout this doctoral journey. Your passion for our profession and sincere desire to mentor future leaders in the field is something to be admired. Our profession is stronger because of your leadership.

To Dr. Christian Chan, thank you for selecting me to be a VCA Emerging Leader and for facilitating my desire to become more involved in serving the counseling profession. You have been a constant source of support and encouragement throughout my doctoral journey, from challenging my negative self-talk, to writing recommendation letters, providing feedback on my personal statements, and coauthoring book chapters. You embody the term *mentorship* and I am thankful to have you in my life and to call you friend. I look forward to learning from you and working with you, and I am absolutely thrilled to see what the future holds, knowing our profession is in good hands with leaders like you. Thank you for advocating for the rights of the

marginalized and underserved populations in our community and for being a voice for the voiceless. Your passion and service inspire and remind me of my call to service as a counselor and educator.

To Dr. Monica Band, the year your co-chaired VACES was the year I told myself that one day I would be in that role. Your passion for our profession and your desire to see others succeed has been refreshing and encouraging. I am thankful to have you in my life and to call you mentor and friend. Your desire to cultivate a more multicultural society is admirable, and I look forward to the leadership you will provide our profession in the years to come.

To Dr. Ramya Avadhanam, two years ago our paths crossed with the help of our mutual friend Dr. Band at VCA in your school town of Williamsburg, Virginia. I am thankful you have become a friend and colleague. Your constant check-ins and encouragement were just the boost I needed during challenging dissertation days. I am thankful to have your voice representing the East Indian community and look forward to serving our profession together.

I would also like to thank some amazing and inspirational counselor educators and counselors who have encouraged, supported, and/or inspired me throughout the doctoral and dissertation journey. They include: Dr. Rod Buxton, Dr. Rodolfo Nolasco, Dr. Edward Wahesh, Dr. Melvin Pride, Dr. Rick Gressard, Dr. Richard Watts, Dr. Anita Neuer Colburn, Dr. Thomas Sweeney, Dr. Kevin Snow, Dr. Amanda Flora, Dr. Stacy Litam, Dr. Karena Heyward, Dr. Nathaniel Brown, Dr. Michelle Wade, Dr. Panagiotis Markopoulos, Dr. Daniel St. John, Dr. Thelma Duffy, Dr. Catherine Roland, Dr. Gerard Lawson, Dr. Barbara Herlihy, Dr. DiAnne Borders, Dr. Richard Balkin, Dr. Jeffrey Kottler, Dr. Taunya Tinsley, Dr. Helen Runyan, Dr. Stephanie Dailey, Dr. Sandi Logan-McKibben, Dr. Brande Flamez, Dr. S. Kent Butler, Dr. Marsha Riggio, Dr. Kim Lee Hughes, Dr. Adrienne Erby, Dr. Don Trahan, Dr. Stephen

Kennedy, Dr. Tatyana Cottle, Dr. Jeffrey Boatner, Dr. Laura Farmer, Dr. Becky Bowers-Lanier, Dr. Janelle Bettis, Dr. Shanice Armstrong, Dr. A'tasha Christian, Dr. Sally Lau, Hillary Press, Linda Grubba, Anne Henry, Dan West, Bryn Davis, Khristian Salters, and Norma White. The profession of counseling is stronger and better because of each of you. Thank you for your service to our society, the profession, and our clients. I have so much to learn from each of you.

To my accidental cohort: Drs. Theresa Allen, Morais Cassell, Deborah Driggs, Alyssa Gavulic, Patricia Kimball, Krista Kirk, Brittany Lashua, Kerley Perminio Most, Lucy Phillips, Maureen Ponce, Tiffany Arrows Price, Amanda Rockinson-Szapskiw, and Michael Tackas. Our doctoral journey together reminded me I am not alone. Thank you for listening to and tolerating my many moments of frustration and joy. Also, thank you for collaborating with me on projects and helping me sharpen my clinical and research skills. Each of you have contributed to the development of the counselor and educator I am today. I look forward to what the future has in store of each of us and the value we will add to the profession of counseling.

To the doctoral students, future counselor educators, who inspire me: Ashlee Lakin, Michael Trexler, Joey Gude, Melva Hartzog, Henry Bruns, Jennifer Vinces-Cua, Zoricelis Devila, Sharon Lewis, Kristen Liesl, Eric Camden, Sandra Noble, Sam Landa, Louis Alvey, John Toliver, Melanie Howard Popiolek, Letitia Browne-James, Nakpangi Thomas, Kathryn Williams, Tiffany Foreman, Tiffanie Sutherlin, Mina Attia, Laura Pignato, Melanie Burgess, Brandy Smith, Chi Li, Peace Ningabire, Justin Smith, and Betsy Zimmerman keep on persisting. Your voices are needed in our profession.

Finally, to my extended family, the Chu-A-Kongs and Harrichands, thank you for the encouragement and support you provide to my family, but more importantly, thank you for your prayers. I am blessed to call you family.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	3
Dedication	5
Acknowledgments.....	6
List of Tables	17
List of Abbreviations	19
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	20
Background of the Problem	22
Burnout and Other Licensed Helping Professions.....	23
Burnout and Professional Counseling.....	23
Burnout and Counselors-in-Training	24
Burnout and School Counselors.....	25
Burnout in Higher Education	26
Burnout and Counselor Educators	27
Burnout and Servant Leadership.....	28
Statement of the Problem.....	30
Purpose of the Study	30
Research Questions.....	31
Research Question 1	31
Research Question 2	31
Assumptions and Limitations	31
Definition of Terms.....	33
Significance of the Study	35

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework.....	36
Greenleaf's Servant Leadership Theory	36
Kristensen, Borritz, Villadsen, and Christensen's Burnout Theory.....	38
Organization of the Remaining Chapters.....	39
Chapter Summary	40
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	41
Burnout	41
Burnout Explained	42
Burnout in Occupational Fields	47
Leadership.....	56
The Evolution of Leadership Theory	57
Leadership Theories.....	58
Servant Leadership and Chi Sigma Iota Components	62
Servant Leadership in Counseling and Counselor Education.....	64
Research Questions and Theoretical Model	65
Chapter Summary	66
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS	67
Research Purpose	67
Research Questions and Hypotheses	68
Research Question 1	68
Research Question 2	70
Research Design.....	70
Population and Sample	73

Selection of Participants	74
Research Instruments	75
Research Procedures	78
Data Processing and Analysis	79
Ethical Considerations	79
Chapter Summary	80
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	81
Data Screening	81
Participant Demographics	83
Age	83
Gender	84
Ethnicity/Racial Background	84
Relationship Status	84
Sexual Orientation	85
Perceived Social Support	85
Teaching Load	86
Labor Union Employee	86
Type of Higher Education Institution	86
Employment Status	87
Current Rank	87
Current Salary for Nine-Month (Minimum) Contract	87
Graduation from a CACREP-Accredited Doctoral Program	88
Number of Years in Current Academic Position	88

Number of Years as a Counselor Educator	88
Counseling Specialization.....	89
ACES Regional Affiliation	89
Membership in Professional Organizations	90
Sample Means	91
Data Analysis	91
Correlations	92
Simultaneous Multiple Regressions.....	93
Chapter Summary	98
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	99
Summary of Findings and Implications	99
Summary of Demographics	99
Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables	101
Leadership: PPLES Experience Subscale	101
Leadership: PPLES Competence Subscale	102
Personal Burnout Subscale	102
Work-Related Burnout Subscale.....	103
Student-Related Burnout Subscale	103
Discussion	104
Research Question 1	104
Research Question 2	107
Limitations of the Study.....	108
Suggestions for Future Research	111

Counselor Education Implications	113
Counselor Educators	114
Higher Education Administrators	114
Implications for Counselor Education Preparation Programs	116
Chapter Summary	118
Summary of the Study	119
REFERENCES.....	121
APPENDIX A: IRB Approval	136
APPENDIX B: Recruitment Email/Post to Counselor Educators	137
APPENDIX C: Informed Consent Document	138
APPENDIX D: Screening Questions	140
APPENDIX E: Demographic Questionnaire	141
APPENDIX F: Permission to Use the PPLES Assessment	146
APPENDIX G: Principles and Practice of Leadership Excellence Survey (PPLES)	147
APPENDIX H: Copenhagen Burnout Inventory	148

List of Tables

Table 4-1 Participants' Age Range	83
Table 4-2 Participants' Ethnicity/Racial Background	84
Table 4-3 Participants' Relationship Status	85
Table 4-4 Participants' Sexual Orientation	85
Table 4-5 Participants' Perceived Social Support.....	85
Table 4-6 Participants' Teaching Load	86
Table 4-7 Participants' Carnegie Classification Work Setting	86
Table 4-8 Participants' Current Nine-Month (Minimum) Contract Salary	88
Table 4-9 Participants' Counseling Specialization	89
Table 4-10 Participants' ACES Region Affiliation	89
Table 4-11 Participants' Professional Organization Memberships.....	90
Table 4-12 Descriptive Statistics of All Subscale Measures Used in This Study.....	91
Table 4-13 Correlations Among Study Variables.....	93
Table 4-14 Counselor Educators' Personal Burnout Regression Model Summary	94
Table 4-15 Counselor Educators' Personal Burnout Regression Model Coefficients	94
Table 4-16 Counselor Educators' Work-Related Burnout Regression Model Summary .	95
Table 4-17 Counselor Educators' Work-Related Burnout Regression Model Coefficients	95
Table 4-18 Counselor Educators' Student-Related Burnout Regression Model Summary	96
Table 4-19 Counselor Educators' Student-Related Burnout Regression Model Coefficients	96

Table 4-20 Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results.....	97
---	----

List of Abbreviations

American Counseling Association (ACA)

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES)

Chi Sigma Iota (CSI)

Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI)

Counsel for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)

Principles and Practices of Leadership Excellence (PPLE)

Principles and Practices of Leadership Excellence Survey (PPLES)

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Over the past twenty years, the American Counseling Association's (ACA, 1995, 2005, 2014) *Code of Ethics* has stipulated the role of counselor educators serving as models and mentors for students as they develop and engage in ethical practices. Under Section F: Supervision, Teaching and Training, Subsection 7: Responsibilities of Counselor Educators, ACA's *Code of Ethics* states:

Counselor educators who are responsible for developing, implementing, and supervising educational programs are skilled as teachers and practitioners. They are knowledgeable regarding the ethical, legal, and regulatory aspects of the profession; are skilled in applying that knowledge; and make students and supervisees aware of their responsibilities. Whether in traditional, hybrid, and/or online formats, *counselor educators conduct counselor education and training programs in an ethical manner and serve as role models for professional behavior.* (2014, p. 14, emphasis added)

Institutions of higher education are assigned the tasks of educating people, engaging in research activities, and disseminating information to the general public; however, public and economic forces are changing the landscape of higher education (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Kok, Douglas, McClelland, & Bryde, 2010). Institutional constraints are impacting faculty, with expectations for them to be more efficient as determined by their productivity (Gappa et al., 2007) in areas of teaching, research, and service (Hill, 2009; Lazarus, 1999, Mintz, 1999). This is especially true in counselor education, where faculty members are finding it challenging to balance teaching, research, and institutional service (Coaston, 2013; Niles, Akos, & Cutler, 2001) with their obligations and responsibility to the counseling profession as mandated by the ACA's *Code of Ethics* (ACA, 2014; Moate, Gnilka, West, & Bruns, 2016; Sangganjanavanich &

Balkin, 2013). For example, counselor educators often teach three to four classes per semester while being expected to engage in research, advise and mentor students, participate in advocacy efforts, provide service to the university, and serve in leadership roles in ACA national and/or state branches.

Counselor education can be considered a unique discipline within the larger field of education because of the multiple institutional and professional roles counselor educators fulfill on a daily basis: counselor, educator, supervisor, researcher, advocate, leader. It is therefore important for counselor educators to foster their own personal and professional growth, as prescribed by the wellness model outlined by the ACA (2014) and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2015). Counselor educators are also tasked with the responsibility of modeling wellness and appropriate coping methods (Wester, Trepal, & Myers, 2009). The responsibility for ensuring counselors-in-training are examining their own wellness and seeking to engage in personal development “with a belief that well counselors are competent counselors who promote the client’s well-being” (Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013, p. 67) also falls under the purview of counselor educators. Therefore, counselor educators not only influence the well-being of counselors-in-training, but the clients they work with as well (Moate et al., 2016; Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013). For counselor educators who are not practicing appropriate self-care and wellness strategies, there is a greater likelihood of experiencing stress, which can lead to burnout and impairment. As such, the quality of the teaching and the modeling they provide their students/counselors-in-training is affected, as is the quality of the services received by the clients who are counseled by their students and by the counselor educators themselves (Hill, 2004). According to Moate et al. (2016), stress can negatively influence the ability of a counselor educator to engage in and

maintain wellness. This is especially true in terms of gatekeeping and remediation practices when addressing student/counselor-in-training concerns (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). For example, situations may arise that can lead to legal confrontation, which can be costly for the student, faculty, and institution (Hutchens, Block, & Young, 2013; McAdams, Foster, & Ward, 2007).

Drawing on the writings of Lazarus (1999), Moate et al. (2016) stated that individuals “experience stress when they interpret an imbalance between a level of threat a demand poses and the perceived coping resources available for meeting a demand” (p. 161). Examining this thought in light of a counselor educator’s career, it is likely one will encounter multiple institutional, professional, and personal demands that can result in stress (Coaston, 2013; Hill, 2004, 2009; Niles et al., 2001; Moate et al., 2016; Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013). When stress becomes prolonged, burnout is a likely result. Harrison (1999) defined burnout as “a state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion that results from long-term involvement in work situations that are emotionally demanding” (p. 25). Recent research has addressed job satisfaction (Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013) and perfectionism (Moate et al., 2016) in relation to burnout for counselor educators, but there is a paucity of research on how the “demands of the counseling profession” (Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013, p. 68) influence burnout for the counselor educator.

Background of the Problem

In the field of clinical mental health, burnout has been and continues to be of concern specifically during the first three years of clinical practice (Maslach, 2003; Wardle & Mayorga, 2016). The counseling profession holds to codes and standards that stipulate the importance of

self-care and wellness to ensure clients receive ethical care; counseling regulations specifically address the importance of preserving the counselors' well-being (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2015).

Burnout and Other Licensed Helping Professions

Licensed helping professionals (e.g., psychologists, social workers, nurses, and doctors) are highly involved with clients or patients on a daily basis, which increases their susceptibility to burnout (Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013). Research on the association between burnout and occupations in the helping profession is well documented (Dewa, Loong, Bonato, Thanh, & Jacobs, 2014; Emery, Wade, & McLean, 2009; Lim, Kim, Kim, Yang, & Lee, 2010; Rice, Rady, Hamrick, Verheijde, & Pendergast, 2008; Sánchez-Moreno, de La Fuente Roldán, Gallardo-Peralta, & Barrón López deRoda, 2015). Accordingly, researchers (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996) have addressed the potential for health professionals to experience chronic occupational stress, resulting in burnout, because of the provision of physical and/or psychological care to clients or patients. For health professionals, personal wellness is usually sacrificed in meeting the responsibility of providing care and services to clients or patients (Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013). From the literature, one can infer that the personal wellness of counselor educators can be easily sacrificed when considering the multiple roles they are required to perform on a daily basis. In other words, by diligently providing care to clients or students, counselors and counselor educators often neglect their own well-being, which negatively impacts their ability to provide quality mental health treatment/teaching and training.

Burnout and Professional Counseling

Professional counselors utilize their emotions to inform their work daily (Eatough & Smith, 2006). They demonstrate the ability to provide ethical and effective counseling through

resilience (i.e., having a firm sense of self, clinical expertise, confidence, flexibility, insight, empathy, and the willingness to advocate for others) while participating in self-care practices (Edward, 2005). According to several researchers (Lent & Schwartz, 2012; Oser, Biebel, Pullen, & Harp, 2013; Paris & Hoge, 2010; Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013), burnout is one of the challenges of the helping profession, as it not only impacts the counselor, but also the counselor's place of employment and clients. Mental and physical health problems, including anxiety, depression, headaches, insomnia, low self-esteem, and lower quality of life, have been identified in counselors who experience burnout (Lent & Schwartz, 2012; Paris & Hoge, 2010). The negative impact of burnout is also felt by counseling agencies through lower levels of productivity, increased interpersonal conflict, missed work, and counselor turnover, which culminates with agencies having to expend financial resources to recruit and train new counselors (Lent & Schwartz, 2012; Paris & Hoge, 2010). For the clients who receive counseling services, counselor burnout translates into feelings of frustration related to the care and services received, decrease in commitment to treatment and recovery, and premature termination (Oser et al., 2013).

Burnout and Counselors-in-Training

Counselors-in-training are not immune to the effects of burnout, which can result in these newer counselors feeling reluctant to meet with clients on various levels. These counselors-in-training may experience hesitation to see clients, difficulty building rapport, avoidance of emotionally charged topics, and an aversion to facilitating negative affect by the client within the therapeutic milieu (Romero & Pinkney, 1980). A study conducted by Hughes and Kleist (2005) on doctoral counselor education students found that in addition to the academic rigors, personal pressures including stress and isolation contribute to burnout. The researchers stressed the

importance of counselor education programs (master's and doctoral) preparing quality students who actively engage in wellness practices, since they are the future of the counseling profession. The responsibility then falls on counselor educators to adequately prepare students to face the pressures associated with being a professional counselor.

Burnout and School Counselors

The American School Counselor Association's (ASCA) National Model (2012) provides the framework from which professional school counselors practice (Mullen & Gutierrez, 2016); however, school counselors are often tasked with performing multiple duties, not all of which are delineated by the ASCA model (Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006). Some of the duties school counselors are tasked with focus on priority setting and decision making related to their jobs, which can result in increased stress (Wilkerson, 2009). ASCA (2012) states that school counselors are to "spend 80 percent or more of their time in direct and indirect services to students" (p. xii). The remaining 20 percent is to be made up of other services, including referrals, consultations, collaborations, and leadership interactions that seek to support students. This includes meetings with parents, teachers, and community members. The large variety and quantity of their roles result in school counselors having multiple job responsibilities, high caseloads, role ambiguity, lack of resources, and limited supervision. These stressors negatively impact the quality of the services rendered, specifically with regard to the students with whom they work (Mullen & Gutierrez, 2016; Steele, 2014; Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006).

Researchers (Bardhoshi, Schweinle, & Duncan, 2014; Lee, 2008; Mullen & Gutierrez, 2016; Wilkerson, 2009; Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006) have identified a relationship between burnout and the multiple roles and responsibilities that school counselors perform. However, it is important for school counselors to be aware of and engage in self-care practices that allow

them to manage stress so that it does not go unchecked and lead to burnout and the reduction of the administration of services to students (Mullen & Gutierrez, 2016). Likewise, it is important for counselor educators to have an awareness of and participate in wellness practices that aid in managing stress that can lead to burnout.

Burnout in Higher Education

In higher education, the work environment is unique. Holding a professorate position involves good control and use of technology; presenting original research and publications; obtaining grants; engaging in professional service; evidencing leadership skills; and having the capacity to implement and disseminate effective education (Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013). On the other hand, burnout is likely for faculty due to a taxing work environment involving high loads of advising and teaching, conflict with leadership or governance, and challenging students (Lackritz, 2004; Lease, 1999).

Previous research has explored stress and burnout in faculty. While investigating the sources of stress for faculty in 80 doctoral-granting institutions, Gmelch, Lovrich, and Wilke (1984) identified issues related to limited time and lack of resources as most stressful, while teaching was rated as more stressful than service and research activities. Faculty also indicated that self-imposed high standards were also stress-inducing. Circumstances that can lead to burnout include “pressures, conflicts, demands, and too few emotional rewards, accomplishments, and successes” (Harrison, 1999, p. 26). Today, the demands that stem from being a faculty member (e.g., challenging work environments, stress of having limited resources, and being expected to do much) coupled with ambiguous workplace expectations can result in greater distress, burnout, and possible turnover for faculty (Barkhuizen, Rothmann, & van de Vijver, 2014; Coaston, 2013; Gappa et al., 2007; O’Meara, Terosky, & Neumann, 2008;

Tümekaya, 2006). Instructors in higher education are candidates for burnout due to being responsible for and having to engage in relationship with large numbers of students, staff, and administrators (Hogan & McKnight, 2007). It is therefore likely that counselor educators experience burnout due to the multiple responsibilities they are required to fulfill as counselors, educators, supervisors, researchers, and administrators.

Burnout and Counselor Educators

The educational standards set by CACREP (2015) emphasize wellness for counselors; however, there is a dearth of empirical research that has examined the impact of stress and occupational wellness on counselor educators (Coaston, 2013; Hill, 2004, 2009; Leinbaugh, Hazler, Bradley, & Hill, 2003). Even though research on burnout on faculty in higher education has been conducted (Barkhuizen et al., 2014; Gappa et al., 2007; Gmelch et al., 1984; Hogan & McKnight, 2007; O'Meara et al., 2008), few studies have investigated burnout and faculty in counselor education. Coaston (2013) hypothesized that this lack of research on stress, burnout, and occupational wellness in counselor educators stems from the field of counselor education and supervision being a young academic profession. However, in 2003, Leinbaugh and colleagues commented on the projected need for more counselors in our society as it continues to develop in complexity, and looking to the future, they allude to the importance of counselor education programs seeking “to attract and retain high-quality counselor educators” (p. 53). CACREP’s (2018) website highlights the movement of counseling programs gaining accreditation, and indicates the need for CACREP-accredited faculty to teach in these programs. There is, therefore, reason for those in the counseling profession, particularly administrators, to establish practices that ensure counselor educators are treated with care and respect with the intent of minimizing the possibility of them experiencing burnout. The counselor educator’s

quality of life, specifically his or her affect, is impacted by both personal and professional dimensions; therefore, it is important for the counselor education profession to recognize both dimensions (Leinbaugh et al., 2003).

Burnout and Servant Leadership

In addition to the teaching, supervising, and mentoring roles of counselor educators, leadership roles can also be associated with burnout. The world of business characterizes leadership as a hierarchical structure with a formal leader at the top overseeing operations (McDoughle, 2009). Some researchers (Schuyler & Branagan, 2003) hold the belief that this style of leadership influences the psychological health of employees negatively. Others (Bhindi & Duignan, 1997; Feeney, 1998; Jeffries, 1993) have asked for another model of leadership characterized by teamwork between the leader and his or her followers.

In the introduction of his book, *Insights on Leadership*, Spears (1998) noted:

As we near the end of the twentieth century, we are beginning to see that traditional, autocratic, and hierarchical modes of leadership are yielding to a newer model—one based on teamwork and community, one that seeks to involve others in decision making, one strongly based in ethical and caring behavior, and one that is attempting to enhance the personal growth of workers while improving the caring and quality of our many institutions (p. 1).

Servant leadership, a term coined by Robert Greenleaf (1970), is the model to which Spears refers; it is characterized by leadership that is shared throughout the organization (McDoughle, 2009). To apply servant leadership to the profession of counseling, a counseling leader is an individual who envisions his or her life as embodying service that positively reflects on the counseling profession and seeks to communicate a message of empowerment and service to all

who identify with the counseling profession through service initiatives (Greenleaf, 2003; Sweeney, 2012). Servant leadership can be performed by counselor educators in institutions of higher education (colleges and universities); however, as Sendjaya and Sarros (2002) comment, servant leadership can be perceived as an oxymoron. When servant leadership is practiced correctly (e.g., counselor educators caring for, mentoring, and empowering their students and exhorting them to meaningfully engage in the counseling profession), there is a smaller likelihood of counselor educators experiencing burnout. However, when counselor educators use their power and influence in coercive and self-serving ways, burnout is a likely result (Coaston, 2013; Rude, 2004).

CACREP's 2016 doctoral standards (2015) outline five core areas that doctoral counselor education and supervision programs must address in the training of future counselor educators and leaders: 1) counseling, 2) supervision, 3) teaching, 4) research and scholarship, and 5) leadership and advocacy. In addition to the roles of teacher, supervisor, researcher, advocate, and counselor outlined by CACREP (2015), counselor educators also engage in the roles of advisor to students, leader in counseling professional organizations, and volunteer on institutional committees and boards (Coaston, 2013). It appears that when a counselor educator's institutional roles align with his or her ethical role, work is experienced as meaningful and results in a commitment to the institution (Lindholm, 2003) and active involvement in the workplace (Siegall & McDonald, 2004), which causes the likelihood of burnout to decrease. However, research has yet to establish this connection between burnout and the counselor educator's roles (e.g., leadership experience and competence).

Statement of the Problem

Burnout has many negative consequences. Researchers (Alexander-Albritton, 2008; Alexander-Albritton & Hill, 2015; Coaston, 2013; Hill, 2004, 2009; Leinbaugh et al., 2003; Moate et al., 2016; Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013) indicate that burnout can pose serious challenges for counselor educators due to the multiple roles they perform and people they influence daily.

Research in the field of counselor education is lacking, especially regarding the relationship between burnout and counselor educators' leadership experiences and competencies. Coaston (2013), Hill (2009), Moate et al. (2016), and Sangganjanavanich and Balkin (2013) believe that research addressing the relationship between burnout and counseling educators' leadership experiences and competencies can provide insight into the way(s) in which counselor educators model leadership through mentorship, and subsequently. Additionally, research could reveal the wellness practices that act as protective factors against burnout for counselor educators who participate in leadership opportunities engage in. Overall, the paucity of research exploring the relationship between counselor educators' leadership experience and competence and burnout exposes a gap in the understanding of this area. Burnout and counselor educators' leadership experiences and competencies may be useful constructs to explore in the hopes of helping ensure the future of the profession by training counselor educators who are able to model healthy leadership practices, thereby minimizing their probability of burnout.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to: (a) examine the leadership behaviors of counselor educators, (b) determine if burnout is associated with a counselor educator's leadership behaviors (experience and competence), and (c) determine to what extent counselor educators'

leadership experience and competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load predict burnout. Quantitative data will be used to examine the relationship between counselor educators' experience and competence and burnout.

Research Questions

In this study, the relationship between a counselor educator's experience and perceived competence of leadership and subdimensions of burnout was examined. Specifically, the researcher examined the relationship between each of the ten Chi Sigma Iota (CSI) Principles and Practices of Leadership Excellence (CSI Academy of Leaders, 1999) and burnout using the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI; Kristensen, Borritz, Villadsen, & Christensen, 2005). The following research questions guided this investigation.

Research Question 1

Do significant correlations exist between the principles and practices of leadership excellence (experiences and competencies) as measured by the Principles and Practices of Leadership Excellence Survey (PPLES; Wahesh & Myers, 2012) and burnout (personal, work related, student related) as measured by the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI; Kristensen et al., 2005) among counselor educators?

Research Question 2

To what extent do counselor educators' leadership experience and competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load predict burnout?

Assumptions and Limitations

This study utilized a sample of counselor educators from CACREP-accredited programs as identified on the CACREP (2018) website who participate in professional service opportunities on the institutional, local, state, regional, national, and international levels. As a

result, the findings of the study are limited in their application to other populations because the sample used may not be representative of all counselor educators. However, the assumption is that participants recruited would be representative in terms of diversity (e.g., ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and age) since CACREP (2015) encourages counselor education programs to “recruit, employ, and retain a diverse faculty to create and support an inclusive learning community” (p. 7). It is also assumed that the participants recruited for this study are representative of counselor educators with varying degrees of leadership experience and competence and levels of burnout.

There are a number of servant leadership assessments available that are used in business organizations. However, for the purposes of this study, counselor educator leadership was examined using the PPLES (Wahesh & Myers, 2013) because it was created for counseling professionals, and is endorsed by Chi Sigma Iota – Counseling Academic and Professional Honor Society International (CSI Academy of Leaders, 1999). The assumption is that the PPLES measure adequately captures counselor educators’ leadership experience and competency as demonstrated in the world of work through counseling, teaching, research, supervision, and service (CACREP, 2015).

All research, including this study, contains inherent strengths and weaknesses. The following limitations exist and should be considered when interpreting findings. The study utilized a cross-sectional correlational design, making it impossible to test causality between the variables assessed. Another limitation of the study involves data collection through SurveyMonkey based on the list of CACREP counselor education (master’s and doctoral) programs; it is possible that the sample obtained is not representative of the larger population of counselor educators. For example, individuals who respond to the survey may not be as

involved in counseling, teaching, research, advocacy, and leadership compared to those who do not choose to respond, and this population may experience lower levels of burnout due to being less involved in the various counselor educator roles. In addition, the possibility exists that the sample recruited does not contain participants who experience varying degrees of leadership experience or identify as possessing the various leadership competencies or burnout levels that might be observed in the general counselor educator population. Finally, the researcher acknowledges that the assessments used are all self-report. Therefore, the nature of the study could be influenced by social desirability or by the participants' desire to support the results they hope the research will uncover.

Definition of Terms

The following is a list of operational definitions for the relevant terms used in this research study.

Counselor Education. For the purposes of this study, the CACREP (2015) definition of counselor education will be used, “a distinct academic discipline that has roots in educational and vocational guidance and counseling, human development, supervision, and clinical practice . . . [focusing on] the training and preparation of professional counselors . . . [and/or] future academic professionals” (p. 44).

Counselor Educator. The definition of counselor educator used in this study is taken from the 2016 CACREP standards (2015) that specifically address core faculty: “one who is employed by the institution [college/university] and holds a full-time academic appointment in the counselor education program for at least the current academic year” (p. 44).

Counselor Educator Competence. This is defined as one's *perceived ability* to embody the 10 PPLE (i.e., philosophy of leadership; commitment to mission; preservation of history;

vision of the future; long range perspective; preservation of resources; respect for membership; mentoring, encouragement, and empowerment; recognition of others; and feedback and self-reflection) when serving in a leadership role and/or deciding to take on a leadership role (Wahesh & Myers, 2012).

Counselor Educator Experience. In this study, the definition of counselor educator experience is based on *actions* that represent the 10 PPLE when one serves in a leadership role or decides to take on a leadership role (Wahesh & Myers, 2012).

Servant Leadership. The definition of servant leadership used in this study is based on the definition provided by Sweeney (2012) as the actions performed by persons in professional counseling that contribute to the realization of our individual and collective capacity to serve others competently, ethically, and justly as helping professionals . . . [and] can be found in all settings [and] . . . levels from local through international (p. 5).

Burnout. In this study, burnout is defined as “a state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion that results from long-term involvement in work situations that are emotionally demanding” (Harrison, 1999, p. 25).

Client-Related Burnout. Client-related burnout is defined as a state of prolonged physical and psychological exhaustion, which is perceived to be related to the person’s work with clients, e.g., patients, social service recipients, elderly citizens, or inmates (Kristensen et al., 2005).

Personal Burnout. This is defined as a state of prolonged physical and psychological exhaustion (Kristensen et al., 2005) which is perceived to be related to the person’s life outside the workplace.

Work-Related Burnout. In this study, work-related burnout is defined as a state of prolonged physical and psychological exhaustion, which is perceived to be related to a person's work (Kristensen et al., 2005).

Significance of the Study

The field of counselor education acknowledges mentoring and servant leadership as responsibilities of counselor educators (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2015). Counselor educators are recognized as leaders in the field of counseling and thereby exert great influence on students, clients, peers, and society at large. However, it is apparent from the paucity of literature on the subject that researchers are not studying the impact leadership has on burnout for counselor educators, an area that is important to ensuring the longevity of the profession. Therefore, this study was intended to further the dialogue about counselor educators' susceptibility to experiencing burnout and potential changes in leadership standards and practices for counselor educators to focus more on increasing wellness. Since no research prior to this study had examined counselor educators' leadership experience and competence and burnout, this study explored the relationship between these constructs. The researcher is hopeful that this study offers helpful information for current and future counselor educators and higher education administrators. For current and future counselor educators, the research may help to better understand the leadership experiences and competencies expected from one who holds the title of counselor educator and how these factors influence burnout. For higher education administrators, the research may help to better conceptualize workplace standards and practices seeking to minimize counselor educator burnout, i.e., increase health and wellness practices. During this time of increased demand for counselor educators, that is, the increase in CACREP-accredited institutions and programs requiring counselor educators as core faculty (CACREP,

2015, 2018), it is important to better understand the roles that counselor educators perform so programs and institutions can care for them well.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

Two theoretical frameworks guide the design of this study: Greenleaf's (1970, 1977, 2008) servant leadership theory and Kristensen et al.'s (2005) burnout theory.

Greenleaf's Servant Leadership Theory

In 1970, Robert Greenleaf, an organizational theorist, published on the topic of servant leadership, which spurred the reexamination of a leadership approach based on service.

According to Greenleaf (1977),

The servant leader is servant first. . . . It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. The best test, and difficult to administer, is: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or, at least, not be further deprived? (p. 14)

The servant leadership model proposed by Greenleaf (1970, 1977, 2008) applies to the field of counselor education in that it specifies that a servant leader is an individual who is less preoccupied with the organization and more concerned for his or her followers. From this perspective, the assumption is that the organization will function from a position of health because the leader and followers are collaborating with each other and hold a shared vision (Johns & Moser, 2001; Smith, Montagno & Kuzmenko, 2004).

In 2004, Greenleaf's successor at the Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership, Larry Spears, developed ten characteristics of servant leadership that encompassed preliminary

research on the subject. The ten characteristics are as follows:

1. *Foresight* – having the ability to learn from lessons (past and present) in order to determine an appropriate course of action for the future.
2. *Commitment to the growth of people* – a recognition of the intrinsic value of people and encouragement of their development.
3. *Conceptualization* – having the capacity to recognize and communicate core values to others.
4. *Persuasion* – defined as a gift, it involves the ability to motivate others to institute change through convincing and not coercing or positional authority.
5. *Listening* – the capacity to identify the needs of an individual and/or group combined with the ability to reflect upon one's inner voice.
6. *Acceptance and empathy* – the ability to treat others with dignity and respect while recognizing their special gifts.
7. *Awareness* – having the ability to accurately perceive one's current strengths and weaknesses, including one's surrounding conditions.
8. *Community building* – the capacity to cultivate a spirit of cooperation and teamwork.
9. *Stewardship* – the ability to wisely distribute resources thereby serving the needs of others before oneself.
10. *Healing* – the ability to attend to the emotional needs of others (Spears, 2004).

In 2003, Paul Wong and Don Page further defined the characteristics of servant leadership, organizing them into four categories: (a) character orientation, including integrity, humility, and servant-hood; (b) people orientation, including caring for others, empowering others, and developing others; (c) task orientation including visioning, goal setting, and leading;

and (d) process orientation, including modeling, team building, and shared decision-making.

Chi Sigma Iota seeks to develop leaders based on the servant leadership model as evidenced by the PPLE (CSI Academy of Leaders, 1999; Herr, 2010; Lewis, 2012). More so, the characteristics outlined by the servant leadership model seem to be compatible with the counseling profession (Fulton & Shannonhouse, 2014), and by association, the duties of counselor educators, that is, guiding behavior and reflecting the servant leader philosophy (Greenleaf, 2008). Although these leadership principles and practices are intended to promote client wellness (Sweeney, 2012) there has still been no research on the impact that they have on counselor educator wellness—hence, this research study.

Kristensen, Borritz, Villadsen, and Christensen's Burnout Theory

According to Kristensen et al. (2005), at the core of burnout lies fatigue and exhaustion, an idea which is based on previous research conducted by Schaufeli and Greenglass (2001) and Shirom (1989), leading experts on burnout. Schaufeli and Greenglass (2001) defined burnout as “a state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion that results from long-term involvement in work situations that are emotionally draining” (p. 501). However, fatigue and exhaustion are not the only concepts associated with burnout. Kristensen et al. (2005) stated that “an additional key feature [of burnout] is the attribution of fatigue and exhaustion to specific domains or spheres in the person's life” (p. 197). They identify three types of burnout: personal burnout, work-related burnout, and client-related burnout. Personal burnout accounts for the physical and psychological fatigue and exhaustion an individual experiences. Work-related burnout accounts for the degree to which personal burnout is perceived by an individual to be related to his or her work. Client-related burnout accounts for the degree to which personal burnout is perceived by an individual to be related to his or her work with clients (Kristensen et al., 2005).

Burnout, according to Kottler (2003), is “the single most common personal consequence of practicing therapy” (p. 158). Because of the impact that burnout can have on the personal and professional life of an individual, it is important for counselors and counselor educators to be concerned about this phenomenon (Lawson, 2007). Since counselor educators are tasked with the responsibility of modeling professional health and wellness, it is even more important for them to have an awareness of burnout. By engaging in personal and professional health and wellness practices, counselor educators model healthy servant leadership practices and mentor counselors-in-training (i.e., future counselors and counselor education leaders) on them. Therefore, this research study sought to determine the relationship between the PPLE, endorsed by CSI’s Academy of Leaders (1999) and developed based on the servant leadership model, and burnout (personal, work-related, and client-related). Research findings better inform the development, dissemination, implementation, and evaluation of leadership training counselor educators receive and transmit to future counselors and in the process minimize the risk of burnout.

Organization of the Remaining Chapters

This dissertation consists of five distinct chapters. The current chapter has introduced the reader to the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, limitations and delimitations, definitions of terms, significance of the study, and theoretical framework. Chapter Two will consist of a review of the literature. Chapter Three will present the research design and the methodology for this study, including sampling procedures, instruments, and research procedures. Chapter Four will contain the results of the data analysis. Finally, Chapter Five will be comprised of the discussion of the results, implications for the field, limitations of the study, and recommendations for future research.

Chapter Summary

This chapter provides a rationale for the study of the relationship between the servant leadership experience and competence and burnout, as well as the extent to which counselor educators' leadership experience and competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load predict burnout in counselor educators. A background of the salient literature is reviewed and links between the variables are established. A review of the extant literature generated an interesting question concerning how servant leadership experience and competence may influence burnout for counselor educators. The research that was conducted to answer this question has limitations, which were outlined briefly in this chapter and will be described in greater depth in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between counselor educators' leadership and burnout. Specifically, the first research question examined the correlations between the subscales of these two variables. Counselor educators' leadership was hypothesized to be significantly related to burnout. The second research question examined the significance of five predictor variables, PPLE experience, PPLE competence, gender, tenure status, and teaching load, in predicting each burnout subscale. It was hypothesized that all five variables would significantly predict or account for each burnout subscale score. It appears that a key component of leadership focuses on intrapersonal and interpersonal experiences. More so, burnout seems to be a phenomenon resulting from both intrapersonal and interpersonal experiences. Therefore, it is important to study these two constructs to better understand if they relate to each other.

This chapter will begin with an overview of key aspects of burnout: the constructs, dimensions, symptoms, and associated outcomes. Four specific professions will also be examined: the helping professions, higher education, counseling, and counselor education. After reviewing the literature on burnout, this chapter will focus on leadership theories, outline servant leadership and the ten components endorsed by CSI (1999), and then discuss servant leadership in counseling and counselor education. Finally, the research question and theoretical model will be presented.

Burnout

Maslach and Freudenberger first published burnout research, independently of each other, in the mid-1970s (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). First discussed as a social problem, burnout was labeled, defined, and presented as a reaction to significant stress in the workplace (Maslach & Schaufeli, 1993). A psychiatrist, Freudenberger, while working at a health clinic,

appropriated the term *burnout* from the drug culture (Schaufeli, Leiter, & Maslach, 2009). Freudenberger (1974) reported on young clinic volunteers presenting with signs of burnout, including depleted energy, various mental and physical problems, low motivation, and decreased commitment to the job (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). Maslach (1993), while interviewing human service workers around the same time, observed the burnout phenomenon in workers who described feeling distance, detachment, and emotional exhaustion and held a negative assessment of work performance.

Burnout, however, was at first considered a fad. According to Maslach and Jackson (1984), reviewers rejected a psychometric manuscript describing the Maslach Burnout Inventory, stating that they did “not publish ‘pop’ psychology” (p. 139). A lack of consensus on what defined the construct of burnout limited the impact of the early literature. In the scholarly community, Maslach and Jackson (1984) found that research on “job stress” was more easily accepted than research on “burnout.”

Today, researchers recognize burnout as a global phenomenon affecting personnel from all areas of work at pandemic proportions (Coaston, 2013; Golembiewski, Boudreau, Sun, & Luo, 1998). Understood as a multidimensional phenomenon, burnout is comprised of three core components: emotional exhaustion, cynical attitudes toward the recipients of one’s services, and dissatisfaction with one’s job accomplishments (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Burnout Explained

Dimensions of burnout. In 1993, Maslach defined burnout as “a psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with other people in some capacity” (p. 20). This tripartite concept differs from unidimensional frameworks like the Burnout Measure (Pines &

Aronson, 1988), which provides a single global burnout score to identify if someone is burned out. Maslach's (1993) tripartite conceptualization of burnout provides greater detail on the construct by focusing on the interpersonal work experience. Today, the three labels related to an individual's work-related burnout are exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced professional efficacy (Maslach et al., 1996).

Exhaustion. Identified as the individual stress dimension of burnout, exhaustion occurs when an individual's resources are depleted, leaving the individual feeling overstretched (Taris, Le Blanc, Schaufeli, & Schreurs, 2005). Exhaustion, formerly termed *emotional exhaustion*, is thought to be the result of excessive psychological and emotional stressors in helping professions leading the individual(s) feeling drained or used up (Jackson, Schwab, & Schuler, 1986). Maslach (1993) conceptualized exhaustion as stress, and it is frequently the first reaction an individual experiences to stress in the work place. An individual's coping mechanisms usually determine how he or she succeeds when experiencing exhaustion (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). For human service workers, emotional demands can lead to distancing oneself from clients (Maslach et al., 2001); on the other hand, professionals in other spheres of employment may foster an attitude toward work that can be described as cold and detached (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). This means that professionals in other fields who experience exhaustion might have the opportunity to detach from others. Human service workers, on the other hand, rely on close interpersonal relationships to fulfill their responsibilities, making it difficult to detach from others when exhaustion is experienced. For the purpose of this study, exhaustion is a component of burnout that occurs across all three subscales of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Kristensen et al., 2005).

Cynicism or depersonalization. Another construct of burnout is depersonalization, which signifies detaching from other individuals (Maslach, 1993). According to Maslach and Gomes (2006), depersonalization denotes a detachment from one's profession, not from professional relationships at work. Having a distant and apathetic attitude toward work is also referred to as cynicism (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998), which is identified as the interpersonal dimension of burnout (Taris et al., 2005). Employees who feel cynical about work may reduce their involvement on the job and in their lives as a whole, which can negatively impact well-being and the employee's ability to perform effectively (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). For the purpose of this study, cynicism or depersonalization is defined as a construct of burnout that occurs across all three subscales of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Kristensen et al., 2005).

Reduced professional efficacy or personal accomplishment. Maslach (1993) defined reduced professional efficacy or personal accomplishment, the third burnout dimension, as a decline in an individual's feelings of proficiency or achievement in the workplace. Professional efficacy or personal accomplishment at work is inversely related to exhaustion and cynicism. It can be demotivating for workers to feel ineffective on the job, which Jackson et al. (1986) referred to as learned helplessness. A professional environment that places overwhelming demands on employees can contribute to exhaustion and cynicism, which can in turn lead a worker to feel ineffective in the job (Maslach et al., 2001). Reduced efficacy is said to be independent of exhaustion and cynicism. However, it can occur simultaneously with them (Leiter, 1993; Schutte, Toppinen, Kalimo, & Schaufeli, 2000). For the purpose of this study, reduced professional efficacy or personal accomplishment is considered to be a construct of burnout that occurs across two subscales (work-related burnout and student-related burnout) of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Kristensen et al., 2005).

As a result of this inverse relationship between exhaustion and cynicism and personal accomplishment (that is, the more exhausted and cynical an individual is the less accomplished he/she feels), some researchers have questioned the validity of the idea that reduced professional efficacy or personal accomplishment dimension of burnout contributes to one's overall burnout. However, confirmatory factor analysis found the fit for the three dimensions superior to other models, such as two-factor models (Schutte et al., 2000). Other researchers also support the three-factor model of burnout over two- or four-factor models (Byrne, 1991; Demerouti, Bakker, Vardakou, & Kantas, 2003). Drawing on previous research, this study used a three-factor model of burnout: personal burnout, work-related burnout, and student-related burnout employing the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Kristensen et al., 2005).

Symptoms and outcomes of burnout. Burnout is a unique phenomenon manifesting in feelings of helplessness, powerlessness, inflexibility, and emotional exhaustion (Lee et al., 2007). Schaufeli and Enzmann (1998) organize burnout symptoms into five categories:

1. affective symptoms, which include low energy, anxiety, low mood, and irritability;
2. cognitive symptoms, which lead the individual to become cynical, feel out of control, have a sense of failure from making minor mistakes, become forgetful, or have difficulty during decision-making;
3. physical symptoms, which include anxiety with hyperventilation, chronic fatigue, physiological reactions like hypertension, and psychosomatic disorders (e.g., ulcers or other gastrointestinal complaints);
4. behavioral symptoms, which are evidenced by heightened arousal leading to impulsiveness and/or procrastination and uncertainty; use of substances to minimize unwelcome symptoms (e.g., caffeine, tobacco, alcohol, or other drugs), increasing the

- probability of addiction; and interpersonal problems resulting from withdrawn or aggressive behavior; and
5. motivational symptoms, which affect the individual's enthusiasm in the workplace and leads to discouragement and disenchantment with the image of the job that one once held.

According to Schaufeli and Enzmann (1998), each individual experiences burnout symptoms differently; therefore, treatment should be individualized based on the specific problem(s) presented (Farber, 2000). This is a logical approach to treatment since people's experience of burnout differs in terms of number, intensity, and timing of stressors (Golembiewski et al., 1998). As a result, the outcomes people experience at work also vary. For example, a work environment where burnout is widespread will experience declines in employee health and, by association, employee job performance (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). According to research, burnout can lead an employee to absenteeism, deciding to leave a job, searching for a new job, and/or leaving a place of employment (Du Plooy & Roodt, 2010; Kalliath, O'Driscoll, Gillespie, & Bluedorn, 2000). Productivity in the workplace is reduced when employees who are burned out choose to remain in their positions (Maslach et al., 2001), which results in greater probability of interpersonal conflict with administrators and clients (Fujiwara, Tsukishima, Tsutsumi, Kawakami, & Kishi, 2003).

Section summary. Burnout encompasses feelings of exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced efficacy in the work environment. Various theoretical frameworks have been used over the last 35 years to conceptualize burnout. Burnout manifests differently in each individual; however, five symptom categories have been identified: affective, cognitive, physical, behavioral, and motivational. Burnout negatively impacts not only the life of the individual, but also his or her

place of employment. In the next sections, burnout will be examined in relation to helping professions, followed by burnout in higher education, and then burnout in counseling and counselor education.

Burnout in Occupational Fields

Burnout in the helping professions. Licensed helping professionals employed in environments where there is client involvement daily have an increased risk of burnout, according to research by Sánchez-Moreno et al. (2015) and Sangganjanavanich and Balkin (2013). Dewa et al. (2014) conducted a systematic literature review to examine how burnout affected physician productivity. Upon reviewing the extant literature, the researchers found 870 unique citations that addressed the impact of physician burnout on productivity, thereby recognizing burnout as a global phenomenon. Dewa and colleagues concluded that an inverse relationship exists between physician productivity and burnout. In other words, as burnout increases, physician productivity decreases and vice versa. The researchers stated that physician wellness is important in minimizing burnout and maintaining productivity. It appears that more research is needed to better understand burnout since it negatively impacts employees in the helping professions, which was the goal of this study.

Another study conducted by Emery et al. (2009) examined therapist beliefs, personal resources, and burnout in 190 clinical psychologists. They found that therapist beliefs about distress, inflexibility, and control were associated with lower levels of personal accomplishment. In addition, predictors of emotional exhaustion included being female, having fewer personal resources, and endorsing therapist beliefs in relation to control. In other words, the presence of these factors indicated an increased risk of burnout in clinical psychologists. Higher levels of personal accomplishment were associated with more personal resources, more flexibility, and a

lower need for control. The presence of these factors resulted in a decreased risk of burnout in clinical psychologists. It seems that having more personal resources and the ability to be flexible and less controlling minimizes a psychologist's risk of burnout. Applying these findings to the current study, it would be interesting to examine how much these findings generalize to counselor educators.

As further examination of burnout and helping professions, research conducted by Sánchez-Moreno et al. (2015) using a cross-sectional study analyzed the relationship between burnout, informal social support, and psychological distress in 189 social workers in Spain. They found a high rate of psychological distress and burnout related to emotional exhaustion. They also found that informal social support significantly negatively interacted with distress, even when burnout was present. This study indicates that informal social supports appear to act as a buffer and minimize the risk of distress and burnout in social workers. It would be interesting to determine if these findings also hold true for counselor educators.

Finally, Rice et al. (2008) sought to determine the prevalence and contributing factors of moral distress in 260 medical and surgical nurses. They found that it was common for these nurses in acute medical and surgical units to experience moral distress due to ethical conflict related to practice standards, care, deception, and euthanasia. Also, nurses could encounter distressing situations from a variety of circumstances at work; nursing experiences intensified the incidence of moral distress. The researchers concluded that it is important for hospitals to create environments that minimize exposure to morally distressing situations for nurses, which could increase job satisfaction and retention, thereby minimizing burnout. To apply these findings to this study, it seems that when morally distressing situations are minimized in institutions of higher education, faculty are more likely to be satisfied at work and choose to remain at their

place of employment. For example, administrators should ensure that counselor educators feel supported by their departments and schools, especially when addressing ethical dilemmas, gatekeeping, and remediation procedures with students, and ensuring that counselor educators experience minimal exposure to situations where the institution's position conflicts with their code of ethics.

Burnout in higher education. Accessibility and educational philosophy, according to Coaston (2013), have undergone significant changes and developments throughout American history. This section provides a brief overview of the history of academia in the United States, followed by an analysis of the impact of burnout in higher education. Further, this section reviews burnout in counseling and counselor education in the context of current literature.

Initially, education in the United States was a luxury afforded only by the wealthy members in society. The Basic Educational Opportunities Grant, otherwise known as the Pell Grant, was created by the federal government in 1972 and has paved the way for prospective students to have greater access, choice, and affordability in higher education (Thelin, 2004). With increased provisions to higher education came a number of challenges impacting course delivery, public opinion, and university administration. Higher education, according to Lucas (2006), in the 1960s and 1970s was categorized by civil rights battles, political activism, and student dissatisfaction. This resulted in increases in academic accountability, equity, and effectiveness. However, as officials in government and the general public began losing confidence in higher education, some education officials predicted the closing of many colleges and universities, which partially came to pass (Thelin, 2004). Institutions of higher education utilizing distance technology, like the University of Phoenix, rose in popularity by attracting students and federal funding away from traditional institutions (Coaston, 2013; Lechuga, 2006;

Lucas, 2006).

During the 1960s and 70s, institutions of higher education gained more criticism from the public because of the media's depiction of faculty as "content, lazy, and arrogant" (Hagedorn, 2000, p. 6) with careers that are "low-pressured, complete with short working hours, high salaries, and lifetime job security" (Hagedorn, 2000, p. 6). Civic scrutiny of public and state legislatures led to changes in the administration of institutions of higher education. Therefore, faculty development committees recommended curriculum changes focused on increasing the quality of teaching and multicultural sensitivity (Millis, 1994). As a result, there were increases in financial provisions, and institutions of higher education recovered. In order to meet the demands of state government in the 1990s, university presidents tried to attract the best faculty, doctoral students, and athletes (Thelin, 2004). During this time, faculty shortages began to raise concerns, which led to research on faculty satisfaction and work life (Johnsrud & Heck, 1998). Although the United States has not experienced extensive faculty shortages, financial constraints have created uncertainty for prospective faculty with doctoral degrees seeking employment because institutions of higher education rely heavily on adjunct and non-tenured instructors (Lechuga, 2006; Zusman, 1999). Based on the current educational environment, graduate students desirous of entering the sphere of academia appear to have uncertain futures (O'Meara et al., 2008; Zusman, 1999). Researchers (Gappa et al., 2007; O'Meara et al., 2008) have found that faculty who are exposed to poor work environments, unclear expectations, and the stress of being expected to accomplish more teaching, research, and service activities with less time and financial resources can experience increased distress and potential turnover. On the other hand, some faculty find themselves trying to retain their positions by further developing their expertise

in efforts to be better prepared for an uncertain career future (Coaston, 2013; O'Meara et al., 2008).

In a study of 265 university faculty members conducted by Lackritz (2004), approximately 20% of the sample experienced burnout. In addition, Lackritz (2004) found female faculty members were more likely to endorse emotional exhaustion related to burnout, while male faculty members were more likely to endorse depersonalization related to burnout. The number of students taught and time that faculty members spent in institutional activities were also related to burnout. These findings are meaningful in relation to this study; for instance, it would be interesting to see if female counselor educators are more likely than male counselor educators to endorse emotional exhaustion related to burnout. Equally interesting would be exploring if male counselor educators experience depersonalization to a greater extent than female counselor educators. Should these relationships hold true, it might imply that institutions of higher education have not made much progress since 2004 in addressing these concerns. Lackritz (2004) recommended that instead of reacting to faculty burnout when it occurs, institutional administrators should instead develop preventative strategies that anticipate faculty burnout. For example, periodic screening of faculty and reductions in teaching load and number of students allocated to each faculty might be helpful in reducing burnout in educators. Applying all of Lackritz's (2004) recommendations to counselor educators might not be viable; however, decreasing the faculty-to-student ratio for faculty who decide to teach more classes, minimizing teaching loads for faculty who decide to advise more students, or providing wellness packages (e.g., spa or weekend retreats) to faculty might assist in minimizing or preventing counselor educator burnout.

A study on 403 female and 664 male higher education faculty at a Dutch university

conducted by van Emmerik (2002) postulated that emotional exhaustion, a dimension of burnout, will be accounted for by faculty as a result of the demands of the academic setting. van Emmerik (2002) found that having a supervisor or colleagues who provided coping assistance while one faced the demands of work helped to reduce emotional exhaustion, particularly in female faculty. These findings supported an earlier study conducted by Talbot (2000) that employed a sample of 63 community college nursing faculty. This study found that 40% of the faculty reported experiencing burnout, while almost three quarters of the faculty (73%) reported decreased personal accomplishment. The use of humor coupled with lower workloads accounted for lower levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (i.e., lower burnout in faculty) (Talbot, 2000).

From this brief review of the literature, it is evident that burnout is a phenomenon experienced by faculty at higher education institutions, similar to other working professionals. To this end, there is an ongoing need for additional research investigating the occurrence between burnout in faculty in higher education (Bartley 2005; Coaston, 2013); this study sought to address this area in counselor educators.

Burnout in counseling and counselor education. Burnout appears to be prevalent in the mental health professions. Approximately 50% of mental health workers surveyed by Blankertz and Robinson (1997) reported they were between “somewhat” and “extremely likely” to leave the field within the next two years. A review conducted by Paris and Hoge (2010) of burnout in the mental health workforce referenced the metanalysis conducted by Mor Barak, Nissly, and Levin (2001), who found professionals in community mental health, social work, and child welfare had turnover rates ranging from 30% to 60% in any given year. These percentages remain valid today, especially for nonprofit community mental health organizations, based on a

meta-analytic review conducted by Heavey, Holwerda, and Hauskencht (2013) and dissertation research by Gomel (2015). Due to the high turnover rates of mental health workers, agencies are finding it difficult to provide counseling services required to meet state mandates to avoid institutionalization of clientele and protect their communities (Paris & Hoge, 2010). Researchers have identified: (a) stress, (b) introversion, (c) neuroticism, (d) being a new counseling professional, (e) poor health practices, (f) unrealistic expectations, (g) working long hours, (h) difficult work settings and interpersonal interactions with clients, and (i) the lack of positive feedback related to competence and mental health outcomes as potential factors leading to burnout in mental health professionals (Lent & Schwartz, 2012; Rössler, 2012; Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013).

In addition to the negative personal consequences stemming from burnout, professional counselors are also impacted by ethical implications, that is, the possibility of being incapable of meeting the psychological needs of their clients as a result of depletion in their own emotional reserves (Maslach et al., 1996). The ACA's *Code of Ethics* states, "counselors monitor themselves for signs of impairment from their own physical, mental, or emotional problems and refrain from offering or providing professional services when impaired" (2014, p. 9). If counselor educators who are experiencing burnout themselves are not modeling and mentoring counselors-in-training on appropriate wellness practices and establishing healthy professional boundaries, the likely result is a mental health workforce filled with professional counselors who are burned out, ineffective, and unable to meet ethical practice standards.

Additional research supports the need for counselor educators to educate counseling students in self-care. A recent study on counselors-in-training conducted by Wardle and Mayorga (2016) found that over 85% of participants had some awareness of burnout, gave

attention to it, and/or were actively burned out as a result of a situation they interpreted as threatening their well-being, both physical and mental. This statistic is concerning; if counseling students in practicum and internship who are not working full time in the field are already burned out, how prepared are they to address the mental health concerns in society? It is likely that the counseling profession is causing harm rather than reducing it. This leads one to question the role of counselor educators in addressing the wellness and preparedness of such counselors-in-training to engage in ethical and effective practice. This study sought to bring awareness to these issues by addressing the relationship between counselor educators' leadership roles and burnout. Challenges of maintaining academic, professional, and personal obligations are not new for counselors-in-training; however, research indicates that counseling students are in need of more instruction on personal wellness and prevention of counselor burnout (Thompson, Frick, & Trice-Black, 2011; Wardle & Mayorga, 2016). The results from Thompson and colleagues' study indicate that counselors-in-training perceived their burnout as stemming from their education and training (i.e., counseling programs did not adequately address counselor wellness practices and self-care strategies). This becomes problematic if counselors-in-training are developing a professional identity that includes decreased compassion for clients and excitement for counseling, lack of balance in personal and professional responsibilities, and unhealthy boundaries (Thompson et al., 2011). It can be inferred that counselor educators, who are themselves finding it difficult to manage the pressures of being in their leadership position, are preparing a future generation of counselors with inadequate skills and resources to manage workforce pressures. This idea adds importance to the findings of this study and has the potential to raise awareness of counselor educators' levels of burnout, which may be negatively impacting counselors-in-training.

Upon examination of the current literature on counselor educator leadership and burnout, one finds that little research exists to date that specifically addresses demographic characteristics and occupational satisfaction (Hill, 2009; Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013), work-life fit and turnover intention (Coaston, 2013), and personality characteristics related to stress and burnout (Moate et al., 2016). This lack of research might stem from the fact that counselor education is only a little over 100 years old, although it continues to grow and develop well-trained professionals committed to healthy human development, while acknowledging the distinct challenges faced by each individual in society (Coaston, 2013). *Social advocate* was the term used to describe the pioneering members of the profession, and today, counselors' identity as advocates is evident in our code of ethics (ACA, 2005, 2014). Since 1991, Myers has promoted the wellness model in the field of counseling, which is recognized on the ACA's (2002) website. Counselors are also required to gain educational training on counselor wellness to adhere to the 2016 CACREP standards (2015).

An additional concern for the profession is managed care (Gladding, 2009). Although accountability and quality of services has increased as a result of managed care, there is little recognition for the challenging work counselors are tasked to complete, compensation to counselors as providers of mental health services is often inadequate. It is the responsibility of a counselor educator to remain knowledgeable of contemporary issues and trends facing society so they are equipped to address and meet the needs of clients and students (Coaston, 2013). As leaders in the field of counseling, counselor educators are agents of change (Lee & Rodgers, 2009). Therefore, they are expected to model a counselor identity based on wellness, prevention, and human development (Mellin, Hunt, & Nichols, 2011).

According to Coaston (2013), higher education differs from other educational

environments because faculty are evaluated based on teaching, scholarship, and service (Davis, Heller Levitt, McGlothlin, & Hill, 2006). In other educational environments, student achievement mostly dictates the evaluation of teachers (Farber, 2000). A number of researchers have reported that workload, time constraints, and balancing multiple roles are repeatedly associated with work-related stress (Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998; Bartley, 2005; Coaston, 2013; Doyle & Hind, 1998; Hogan, Carlson, & Dua, 2002; Rush, 2003). This study extended previous research on burnout by examining counselor educators to determine if they experience similar stressors reported by other researchers based on the multiple roles they hold in higher education institutions and organizations.

Section summary. Similar to other faculty members, counselor educators are tasked with balancing multiple professional and personal roles that can result in burnout. The importance of and time allotted to each role varies for each faculty member and is to a large extent dictated by institutional mandates. For counselor education faculty, stress can also arise from balancing roles at home and work. In addition, stress can also arise from the leadership responsibilities and positions that counselor education faculty fulfill. In the following sections, leadership as a construct will be examined, followed by a discussion of leadership theories and an examination of servant leadership in counselor education. Finally, servant leadership will be considered in relation to CSI's principles and practices.

Leadership

Leadership is a complex concept that continues to be studied with little consensus, even though a number of theories have been proposed (Eberly, Johnson, Hernandez, & Avolio, 2013; Lewis, 2012, McKibben, 2015). This section provides a review of the evolution of leadership theory before describing some of the leadership theories. This information is followed by the

implications of various theoretical approaches on leadership and a discussion of current views of leadership theory and its applicability to counseling and counselor education.

The Evolution of Leadership Theory

A study conducted by Gallup (Crabtree, 2004) using the Employee Engagement Index found that American workers can be categorized into three main groups: truly engaged (29%), not engaged (54%), and actively disengaged (17%). Based on these statistics, it appears that an estimated 22 million employees in the United States in 2004 were classified as being actively disengaged, which suggests they were unhappy at work and acting out their unhappiness by undermining the accomplishments of their engaged coworkers (Crabtree, 2004). If accurate, this estimate would equate to approximately \$250–300 billion dollars of loss in productivity each year, which could reach over one trillion dollars when absences, fraud, injury, illness, and turnover are taken into account (Rath & Clifton, 2004). According to Rude (2004), there appears to be a growing crisis in the workforce in that employees are finding it increasingly difficult to cope due to accumulating pressures, which results in cynicism, dissatisfaction, fatigue, and suboptimal personal effectiveness. Based on these findings, one is left to ask, what is the responsibility of leaders and administrators in addressing the workforce pressures that employees face?

During the infancy of leadership theory development, individuals tried to place labels on theories of leadership. For example, one researcher at Columbia University developed his own list of traits to identify leadership (Tead, 1935), while other researchers challenged this view of leadership in favor of the idea of leadership as a process that changes contingent on the individuals involved and their particular situations (McDougle, 2009). Johns and Moser (2001) stated that the term *participative leadership* came into use between the 1960s and 1970s and was

described as a leadership movement focused on reducing or eliminating power differences between leaders and staff within organizations. During this time, Robert Greenleaf's (1970, 1977) servant leadership concept took shape, which shared some participative leadership's philosophical ideas (McDoughle, 2009).

Leadership Theories

Situational leadership. Developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1979), the theory of situational leadership conceptualizes leaders as being involved with and providing direct supervision of tasks and responsibilities, especially when followers are learning that task or responsibility. Situational leaders can step back from a given task or responsibility as followers develop more skill and understanding, such as by providing less direct supervision. Kirby, Paradise, and King (1992) have questioned the effectiveness of situational leadership regarding the ability of leaders to adapt their leadership style based on the situation present. However, Hershey and Blanchard (1979) responded to this idea by stating situational leaders have the capacity to develop the ability to adapt to different situations with appropriate training (McDoughle, 2009).

Transactional leadership. Founded on a reward structure is transactional leadership (Barnett & McCormick, 2004). Under this leadership style, leaders provide clarification of expectations from followers and, in return, provide rewards that are of value to followers (Smith et al., 2004). Some researchers (e.g., Giampetro-Meyer, Brown, Browne, & Kubasek, 1998; Stone, Russell, & Patterson, 2004) state that transactional leadership is useful in bureaucratic organizations where it is necessary to maximize short-term financial returns. However, if transactional leadership is not utilized carefully, unethical behavior on the part of either the leader or the follower can result, depending on how strongly one desires the outcome or the

reward (Giampetro-Meyer et al., 1998).

Transformational leadership. In contrast to transactional leadership, transformational leadership places the responsibility on the leader to develop a vision and cultivate an environment where followers are inspired (Kirby et al., 1992; Lewis, 2012; McDougale, 2009; Smith et al., 2004). Motivation is bidirectional for transformational leaders and followers with an expectation of morality (Barnett & McCormick, 2004). According to Bass (2003), transformational leaders have the capacity to instill admiration, respect, and trust in followers. Transformational leaders motivate their followers to go beyond what is expected (Parry & Proctor-Thomson, 2002).

Transformational leadership appears to share some common characteristics with servant leadership, and the ideas have been compared (Lewis, 2012). For example, transformational leaders allow followers to participate more fully in tasks and responsibilities than situational and transactional leaders. In addition, transformational leaders attend to the needs for growth and advancement of their followers by providing opportunities for them (Smith et al., 2004). However, transformational leadership differs from servant leadership in that the former usually produces charismatic leaders. For servant leaders, personality is not regarded as the primary focus for followers (Giampetro-Meyer et al., 1998; McDougale, 2009).

Servant leadership. Servant leadership, as stated above, is oftentimes compared to transformational leadership. However, some fundamental differences exist. For instance, a servant leader embodies the role of a servant to his or her followers, while a transformational leader is viewed as the central figure by his or her followers (Smith et al., 2004). Another difference is that servant leaders demonstrate more concern for their followers, viewing them as integral to the achievement of organizational goals, while transformational leaders tend to place

the goals of the organization above their followers (Johns & Moser, 2001; Lewis, 2012; McDougale, 2009; Smith et al., 2004).

During Robert K. Greenleaf's (2002) career at the American Telephone & Telegraph Company, he recognized the need for leadership that is more person-centered. The traditional top-down, pyramid style of leadership was not an especially successful method for instigating and developing healthy relationships and organizational communities that are leader-led (Greenleaf, 2002). Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership embraced a leadership style that prioritized serving others over the leader's desire for power. This empathetic, human-centered servant leadership model was intended to honor the human spirit by recognizing all community members and motivating "them with the desire to serve others and to create healthy, thriving relationships, organizations, and communities" (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 5).

A weakness of the servant leadership model is that Greenleaf never provided a strong conceptual framework of servant leadership that could be tested (Valente, 2015). However, Larry Spears, the former president and CEO of the Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership, built on Greenleaf's work by creating a model that provides further guidance on the components of servant leadership (Spears, 2010). Spears (2010) outlined 10 characteristics to distinguish a servant leader, including "empathy, listening, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community" (p. 27).

According to Spears (2010), effective leaders must listen, not only to their own inner voices, but also the voices of those they serve, which involves personal reflection and understanding of self and others. Whitelaw (2012) stated that empathy is one of "the most powerful tools an effective leader can use when listening" (p. 2). Through empathy, a leader is

able to reflect the thoughts and feelings of his or her followers accurately, which then allows him or her to provide appropriate support (Spears, 2010). The ability to improve the conditions of followers and self is identified as healing. This means that a servant leader must have insight into his or her environments and display the motivation to change, allowing himself/herself and others to experience healing (Spears, 2010). Empathy provides the space for healing to occur by establishing trust and respect between the leader and his or her followers. Servant leaders develop strength of conviction through self-awareness and the trust of followers, which then allows him or her to become more open to the feedback of others (Spears, 2010). The openness of a servant leader, coupled with the ability to engage in personal reflection, facilitates the emergence of self-knowledge. This allows the servant leader to make choices that are intentional and consistent with his/her beliefs and values, although they are not necessarily easier (Spears, 2010). In order for the servant leader to demonstrate self-awareness, he or she must possess objective knowledge in addition to personal opinion-based beliefs. A servant leader must not demonstrate coercion but persuasion, that is, the ability to convince one's followers that a course of action is in the group's best interest and should be actively pursued (Spears, 2010).

According to Spears (2010), a servant leader demonstrates conceptualization through a capacity to distinguish relationships in the environment based on pertinent ideas and objects that others may not recognize. Foresight is the ability of the servant leader to correctly recognize future prospects, dangers, and penalties associated with alternate action pathways. The servant leader is better positioned to arrive at the most accurate and plausible course of action by understanding past and present circumstances. In addition, a servant leader's actions are always in relation to the future. Another characteristic of the servant leader is stewardship, a desire to protect the community's needs for eternity, which surpasses generations and demonstrates the

servant leader's commitment not only to present but future followers. Servant leaders are also committed to the growth of followers, and therefore the growth of the community.

Consequently, servant leaders have the ability to attract, develop, and retain people by facilitating a sense of belonging through the building of community. Community building can occur through volunteering of time and resources, both by the servant leader and his or her followers, which provides support for the good of the public (Spears, 2010). As a result of these characteristics, servant leadership is the leadership model to which members of the counseling profession, specifically CSI Counseling Academic and Professional Honor Society International (Herr, 2010; Lewis, 2012), subscribe and the leadership model that was examined in this study.

Servant Leadership and Chi Sigma Iota Components

In 1985, CSI was established, according to Wahesh and Myers (2012), with the mission to enhance excellence in the counseling profession. CSI's Strategic Plan specifically addresses the need for counselor leadership "to develop exemplary leaders for the counseling profession" (CSI, 2018, para. 5). This goal has been addressed through CSI's Chapter Leadership Manual, which guides chapter leaders in program development for members, the annual chapter leader and chapter faculty advisor trainings at conferences, and a seminal paper on the values related to CSI's servant leadership (Herr, 2010).

The Principles and Practices of Leadership Excellence (PPLE; Wahesh & Myers, 2012), developed by CSI's Academy of Leaders (1999), include 10 principles. These 10 principles describe "the characteristics of exemplary leaders and provide guidance for decision making for those in leadership positions" (Wahesh & Myers, 2012, p. 2). Practice statements accompany each principle and provide direction for leaders and members pursuing excellence in leadership

positions. In addition, these guidelines serve as the only statement of leadership ethics for the counseling profession (Wahesh & Myers, 2012).

The ten principles and practices were examined in this research study using the Principles and Practices of Leadership Excellence Survey (PPLES). The following section outlines 10 PPLE taken from Wahesh and Myers (2012, p. 4).

1. *Philosophy of leadership* - Exemplary leaders recognize that service to others, the profession, and associations are the preeminent reasons for involvement in leadership positions.
2. *Commitment to mission* - Exemplary leaders show evidence of a continuing awareness of and commitment to furthering the mission of their organization.
3. *Preservation of history* - Exemplary leaders respect and build upon the history of their organization.
4. *Vision of the future* - Exemplary leaders use their knowledge of the organization's history, mission, and commitment to excellence to encourage and create change appropriate to meeting future needs.
5. *Long-range perspective* - Exemplary leaders recognize that service includes both short- and long-range perspectives.
6. *Preservation of resources* - Exemplary leaders act to preserve the human and material resources of the organization.
7. *Respect for membership* - Exemplary leaders respect the needs, resources, and goals of their constituencies in all leadership decisions.
8. *Mentoring, encouragement, and empowerment* - Exemplary leaders place a priority on mentoring, encouraging, and empowering others.

9. *Recognition of others* - Exemplary leaders assure that all who devote their time and talents in service to the mission of the organization receive appropriate recognition for their contributions.
10. *Feedback and self-reflection* - Exemplary leaders engage in self-reflection, obtain feedback on their performance in leadership roles from multiple sources, and take appropriate action to better serve the organization.

Servant Leadership in Counseling and Counselor Education

Lewis (2012) stated that the missing component to other leadership models is an emphasis on service. This led CSI to adopt and endorse the servant leadership philosophy to promote leadership development in the counseling profession (Herr, 2010). In addition, CSI and other ACA national and state divisions provide leadership opportunities for counselors-in-training, counselors, and counselor educators through committees, task forces, and elected offices. These counseling organizations also provide leadership training each year to students and faculty through emerging leaders programs with the intent of developing future leaders who will serve the counseling profession and society at large (Lewis, 2012). Although leadership is fundamental to the future of the counseling profession (Lewis, 2012; Paradise, Ceballos, & Hall, 2010), “little focus has been given to training for leadership” (Lewis, 2012, p. 37). Currently, one text (Chang, Minton, Dixon, Myers, & Sweeney, 2012) endorsed by CSI specifically addresses leadership and advocacy in the counseling profession, which is one of the five standards that doctoral students in CACREP-accredited programs are required to meet (CACREP, 2015). Since little attention has focused on researching leadership in the counseling profession (McKibben, 2015), this study set out to meet this need.

Extant counseling research on leadership in the counseling profession has focused on demographic characteristics and occupational satisfaction for counselor educators (Hill, 2009; Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013), work-life fit and turnover intention for counselor educators (Coaston, 2013), leadership scale development (McKibben, 2015), psychological hardiness and occupational satisfaction in counselor educators (Logan, 2016), and personality characteristics related to stress and burnout in counselor educators (Moate et al., 2016). More research is needed specifically examining the relationship between leadership and burnout in counselor educators, particularly as they relate to the PPLE (Fulton & Shannonhouse, 2014). The current study sought to meet this need by examining the construct of burnout in relation to the PPLE using the PPLES with counselor educators as opposed to graduate students (McKibben, Webber, & Wahesh, 2017; Wahesh & Myers, 2012).

Research Questions and Theoretical Model

The research questions that guided the current study are: Do significant correlations exist between the principles and practices of leadership excellence (experiences, competencies) as measured by the Principles and Practices of Leadership Excellence Survey (PPLES; Wahesh & Myers, 2012) and burnout (personal, work related, and student related) as measured by the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI; Kristensen et al., 2005) among counselor educators? And to what extent do counselor educators' leadership experience and competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load predict burnout? The theoretical model used to test the first research question is the Pearson's r correlation. It was used to determine if any relationship exists between the subscales of the two constructs and the nature of the relationship(s), if any. Simultaneous multiple regression was used to answer the second research question to determine

the significance of the variance accounted for in each burnout subscale using the predictor variables.

Chapter Summary

Burnout appears to be a fairly common phenomenon, especially among the helping professions. Research indicates the likelihood of burnout in the counseling profession is high, which the researcher believes also extends to counselor educators. Several studies have examined burnout and counselor education, specifically in relation to job satisfaction, demographic variables, psychological hardiness, and personality characteristics. Although previous studies indicate the possibility of a relationship between burnout and leadership style for counselor educators, to date, there is no research examining the relationship between counselor educators' leadership experiences and perceived competencies and burnout. This study sought to bridge this gap in the literature and proposed several hypotheses. The next chapter of this paper will focus on the methodology of the study.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

The first and second chapters provided a review of the literature related to burnout and leadership with respect to the field of counselor education. This chapter focuses on the study's methods of assessing the relationship between counselor educators' leadership experiences and perceived competencies and burnout. The chapter briefly reviews the research purpose and presents the research questions and hypotheses. Following is an explanation of the process of obtaining participants, along with descriptions of the measures used in the study. Finally, the research procedures are described, followed by an explanation of the statistical tests used to analyze the data and test the hypotheses.

Research Purpose

The purpose of this study was to assess the association of counselor educators' leadership characteristics with burnout. Specifically, the researcher examined the counselor educator's experience and perceived competency related to the PPLE (CSI Academy of Leaders, 1999) in relation to burnout (Kristensen et al., 2005). The researcher used quantitative data to determine the relationship between counselor educators' leadership experience and perceived competency and burnout.

There is a need for research examining the role of leadership and the relationship it has with burnout for counselor educators. Counselor educators are, by title, leaders in the field of counseling and therefore exert great influence on future counselors as they educate and/or supervise clients, colleagues, and peers. Thus, the leadership experience and competency of counselor educators has significant implications for future counselor educators, counselors, and supervisors. The knowledge gained by investigating the leadership experience and perceived competency of counselor educators and their relationship with burnout can help influence

professional leadership practice and service for current and future counselor educators, supervisors, counselors, and counselors-in-training, as well as the counseling profession as a whole. This in turn will allow for the development of research-based interventions to help counselor educators function more effectively in leadership capacities and minimize their risk of burnout (Coaston, 2013; Hill, 2004, 2009; Leinbaugh et al., 2003; Lindholm, 2003; Siegall & McDonald, 2004). By identifying the relationship between leadership and burnout, this research will also help counselor educators and program administrators promote and model wellness practices that can be extrapolated to the students, clients, peers, and the general public.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question 1

Do significant correlations exist between the principles and practices of leadership excellence (experiences, competencies) as measured by the Principles and Practices of Leadership Excellence Survey (Wahesh & Myers, 2012) and burnout (personal, work related, student related) as measured by the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Kristensen et al., 2005) among counselor educators?

Hypothesis 1a. There will be a significant correlation between the principles and practices of leadership excellence experience reported by counselor educators and personal burnout.

Null hypothesis 1a. There will not be any relationship between the principles and practices of leadership excellence experience reported by counselor educators and personal burnout.

Hypothesis 1b. There will be a significant correlation between the principles and practices of leadership excellence experience reported by counselor educators and work-related burnout.

Null hypothesis 1b. There will not be any relationship between the principles and practices of leadership excellence experience reported by counselor educators and work-related burnout.

Hypothesis 1c: There will be a significant correlation between the principles and practices of leadership excellence experience reported by counselor educators and student-related burnout.

Null hypothesis 1c: There will not be any relationship between the principles and practices of leadership excellence experience reported by counselor educators and student-related burnout.

Hypothesis 1d. There will be a significant correlation between the principles and practices of leadership excellence competence reported by counselor educators and personal burnout.

Null hypothesis 1d. There will not be any relationship between the principles and practices of leadership excellence competence reported by counselor educators and personal burnout.

Hypothesis 1e. There will be a significant correlation between the principles and practices of leadership excellence competence reported by counselor educators and work-related burnout.

Null hypothesis 1e. There will not be any relationship between the principles and practices of leadership excellence competence reported by counselor educators and work-related burnout.

Hypothesis 1f. There will be a significant correlation between the principles and practices of leadership excellence competence reported by counselor educators and student-related burnout.

Null hypothesis 1f. There will not be any relationship between the principles and practices of leadership excellence competence reported by counselor educators and student-related burnout.

Research Question 2

To what extent do counselor educators' leadership experience and competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load predict burnout?

Hypothesis 2. There will be significant contributions of counselor educator leadership experience and competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load to the prediction of counselor educator burnout, as measured by the CBI subscales (Kristensen et al., 2005).

Null hypothesis 2. There will be no significant contributions of counselor educator leadership experience and competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load to the prediction of counselor educator burnout, as measured by the CBI subscales (Kristensen et al., 2005).

Research Design

This study utilized a cross-sectional survey design with the intent of exploring how counselor educators' leadership experiences and perceived competencies relate to burnout. A cross-sectional study, according to Cherry (2000), is based on observations representing data collected at one point in time, in contrast to a longitudinal study, which collects data over an

extended period of time. A cross-sectional design was deemed appropriate for this study since the intent was to assess the relationships among the abovementioned variables in counselor educators at one point in time.

Given the economy of the design and the fast turnaround time in the data collection process (Creswell, 2014), employing a survey was the most appropriate research design for this study. Even though the use of online surveys warrants caution based on the type of information that is of interest, an online survey appeared to be an operative means to collect data. Likewise, given the target population being counselor educators and the research topic, it was the researcher's held belief that these potential participants would willingly participate in the study, which Sax, Gilmartin, and Bryant (2003) noted as likely to be more important than any other factor when viewed in relation to response rates. Although the literature documents that online surveys receive a lower participation and completion rate than paper-pencil surveys (Sax et al., 2003), there is greater convenience in gathering data online. Moreover, because recruitment of participants is to occur through email correspondence, it is anticipated that participants will have the means (i.e., a computer with internet capabilities) to complete the survey. Cost reduction is another strength of online survey methods in data collection. Cost effectiveness was an important consideration for the researcher since no funding was provided for this study. Furthermore, online surveys allow for the availability of more survey capabilities than any other type of self-administered questionnaire (Dillman, 2007). For instance, the researcher has the capability of making the survey more visually appealing and interactive for the participant. Pop-up boxes, according to Dillman (2007), can be created to provide special instructions or creative media at specific points when needed in a survey. Commenting on the online surveys, Granello and Wheaton (2004) identified the following advantages: flexibility and control over format,

reduced time, participants' acceptance of the format, ease of data entry, software available to collect data, and the ability to obtain additional information about participants answering process (e.g., when a survey is viewed, the date and time a survey is completed).

Although there are several advantages to an online survey design, there are also some disadvantages. Surveys, Dillman (2007) acknowledges, assume a certain level of technological ability from the user. Considering the population of interest and the work responsibilities they perform on a daily basis, there was a small possibility this would pose a challenge to potential participants in this research. Also in relation to technology, it is possible that due to differences in technological devices used by the participants, the online survey may have screen configurations that are visually inconsistent (Dillman, 2007). The memory capabilities of a participant's computer must also be taken into consideration. According to Dillman (2007) researchers need to be aware that the more features embedded in an online survey, the more likely that these features may impact the computer's performance, and conceivably effect the data collection process. Compromising the representativeness of a sample is another significant weakness of an online survey (Granello & Wheaton, 2004; Heppner, Wampold, & Kivlighan, 2008). Finally, valid email addresses are necessary when recruiting online participants, which can become troublesome, leading Fowler (2002) to identify this as a potential disadvantage. The researcher acknowledges that acquiring valid email addresses can be difficult since counselor educators email addresses may not be easily accessible or published online and may change as place of employment changes. Providing personal information online is also a potential and valid security concern and therefore poses a potential weakness. However, online platforms like SurveyMonkey have designed their platforms to use strong encryption and other security measures to protect data (SurveyMonkey, 2017).

Equally important to identifying the advantages and disadvantages of the survey design is describing the pros and cons of self-reporting instruments. Simplicity describes the completion of most self-report instruments since they require minimal training, which makes self-report measures appealing to researchers. According to Heppner and colleagues (2008), the method used in self-reporting is compatible with phenomenological views of counseling, making it an advantage. This refers to the notion that clients themselves, when examining their own thoughts and feelings, are the best data source. Conversely, disadvantages to collecting self-report data exist. Heppner et al. (2008) contended there must be consideration that participants' responses are vulnerable to intentional or unintentional distortions. For instance, it is possible for participants to provide answers they believe are going to support the researcher's hypothesis. Also, it is possible for participants to decide to answer in a socially desirable manner to convey an overly positive or optimistic view of themselves. On the opposite end of the spectrum, participants may decide to answer in a less favorable manner, which casts them in an overly negative or stressed way that could lead to further support or intervention from the researcher. All of these disadvantages identified by Heppner et al. (2008) were important considerations in the design of this study. Further limitations to an online survey stem from a lack of accessibility to computers for persons with disabilities and the possibility of measurement error (Granello & Wheaton, 2004).

Population and Sample

The population of interest for this study was comprised of full-time counselor educators, currently employed in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs in the United States. A counselor educator is defined as an individual who possesses a doctoral degree in counseling, counselor education, or closely related field and fulfills the primary responsibilities of a full-time

faculty member (teaching, research/scholarship, and service). There are multiple CACREP-accredited programs in every state, according to the CACREP website (2018). In addition, Shallcross (2009) states that all 50 states have a licensure process for professional counselors; therefore, the working assumption is that there are training programs operating in every state. By selectively recruiting counselor educators currently employed in CACREP-accredited institutions, one can have some level of certainty that the participants' work responsibilities might include some homogeneity, which, according to Heppner et al. (2008), is desirable when the researcher is considering the generalizability of research findings.

Participants for the study were selected from a national sample of counselor educators who met the sampling criteria. Prospective participants desiring to participate in the research study were required to have completed a doctoral degree in counseling or counselor education. In addition, prospective participants were required to be currently employed in a CACREP-accredited program, having a full-time (nine-month minimum) position as a counselor educator.

Selection of Participants

Purposive sampling procedures were used to target counselor educators who met the inclusion criteria in efforts to best reflect the above-described population. Random sampling allows a researcher to obtain a representative sample from a population whose results can then be generalized to said population; as such, it is been identified by Creswell (2014) as an optimal sampling method. However, no database or listing of all counselor educators currently employed in CACREP-accredited programs in the United States exists, making it impossible to have employed random sampling for this study. Some structure of access to participants exists since CACREP maintains an active listing of accredited counseling programs. In order for participants to be recruited using purposive sampling, intentionality and some level of access to participants

are necessary. Using the CACREP program listing, it was realistic to contact currently accredited counseling programs using their respective websites, thereby obtaining access to information about counselor educators currently employed in their programs.

Participants were recruited by contacting faculty listed in the CACREP program directory via individual counselor education program websites and making direct contact via email. This direct method involved sending individual emails with a recruitment letter to faculty members whose programs were included in the CACREP directory. Although the recruitment method ensured participants would meet the eligibility requirement of working in a CACREP-accredited counseling program, it could not guarantee they met the eligibility requirement of possessing a terminal degree in counselor education.

Research Instruments

Demographic information. Participants were asked their age, gender, race, ethnicity, relationship status, sexual orientation, perceived social support, type of higher education institution where they were employed, employment status, faculty rank, salary for a nine-month (minimum) contract, if they were a CACREP doctoral program graduate, years of experience in current position, years of experience as a counselor educator, specialty area, Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) region, and membership in professional organizations (see Appendix E).

Leadership. The PPLES (Wahesh & Myers, 2012) was used to measure participant self-reported perceived competence, experience, and importance of the PPLE (CSI Academy of Leaders, 1999). Wahesh and Myers (2012) developed the survey through a process that included a thorough review of the research literature, reviews by content experts, and field-testing using a sample representative of the population for whom the instrument was created. All of the steps

employed were consistent with accepted survey-development procedures found in the literature (Crocker & Algina, 1986; DeVellis, 2003). Elected leaders serving on the CSI Executive Council functioned in the capacity of content experts and provided input on content validity. Following instrument revisions based on expert feedback, a pilot testing of the PPLES occurred using five of nine CSI Leadership Fellows (2012–2013 academic year) as participants. The pilot study participants were tasked with the responsibility of completing the PPLES and providing feedback on the clarity of the items and the instructions. From this pilot testing process, survey items, response options, and instructions were updated accordingly (Wahesh & Myers, 2014). A recent study conducted by McKibben et al. (2017) only examined the PPLES using CSI Chapter student leaders and found their behaviors to be consistent with the PPLE. However, no other research has examined the PPLES assessment (McKibben et al., 2017), except for Wahesh and Myers (2014) study; therefore, this study was meaningful in helping to better understand the PPLES for research and practice purposes.

The final PPLES contains items that assess demographic variables (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity), and CSI leadership involvement (e.g., leadership positions held, years as a member, type of chapter). The PPLES provides assessments of leadership experience and perceived competencies. It uses Likert-type scaling items that were created to provide a range of variability in scores across two main scales. The 10-item experience scale uses a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (not something I have ever done) to 6 (I do this all the time) where participants indicate their experience with the PPLE. Higher scores indicate more experience using the particular principle. The 10 items are summed to create a global measure of PPLE experience. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale ($\alpha = .87$) is acceptable (Wahesh & Myers, 2014). The 10-item competence scale uses a five-point Likert scale that allows participants to

rate the PPLE by choosing response options ranging from 0 (not applicable) or 1 (low competence) to 4 (highly competent). Higher ratings represent greater competence using the specific principle. For participants who did not have experience using a particular principle, the option of not applicable was provided. Participants' responses to the 10 competence items are summed to create a global measure of PPLE perceived competence. The Cronbach's alpha for the competence scale ($\alpha = .89$) is acceptable (Wahesh & Myers, 2014). After participants reported their experience and perceived competence, they were asked to rank the ten principles in order of importance and provide comments explaining the reason for rating their highest- and lowest-ranked principle the way they did. A final question asked participants to describe a situation when they employed their highest- and lowest-ranked principle and explain how this principle influenced the outcome of the situation (see Appendix G).

Burnout. The CBI (Kristensen et al., 2005) is a 19-item scale measuring three subdimensions of burnout: personal (six items), work-related (seven items), and student-related (six items). A five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (always or to a very high degree) to 5 (never/almost never or to a very low degree) is used to identify participant responses in the CBI. The responses are rescaled from 0 to 100, with higher values representing higher levels of burnout. Symptoms of exhaustion are examined by the personal burnout subscale (e.g., "How often do you feel tired?"). Symptoms of exhaustion related to work are examined by the work-related burnout subscale (e.g., "Do you feel burnt out because of your work?"). Symptoms of exhaustion related to working with students are examined by the student-related burnout subscale (e.g., "Does it drain your energy to work with students?"). The CBI produced strong reliability estimates with Cronbach's alphas ranging between .85 and .87 for scores across all three subscales (Borritz et al., 2006; Kristensen et al., 2005). Recently, Moate and colleagues (2016)

found reliability estimates for scores from the CBI subscales to be: .89 for the personal burnout subscale, .87 for the student-related burnout subscale, and .88 for the work-related burnout subscale. The factor structure of the CBI has been demonstrated in previous studies (e.g., Milfont, Denny, Ameratunga, Robinson, & Merry, 2008). Measures of general health ($r = -.34$ to $-.49$) and well-being ($r = -.49$ to $-.66$) have been used to demonstrate concurrent validity; likewise, significant differences between high and low burnout groups were found in number of sick days and job satisfaction levels (Borritz et al., 2006; Kristensen et al., 2005) (see Appendix H).

Research Procedures

Approval from the Liberty University's Institutional Review Board was obtained to conduct this study. After approval was granted (Appendix A), recruitment of participants began on April 5, 2018, via emails (Appendix B) to faculty at CACREP-accredited programs identified on the CACREP website. Data were collected using the online platform SurveyMonkey. The informed consent process began with participants reading the informed consent document provided online (Appendix C). Participants were asked to check a box indicating they consented to completing the study. They were then asked to complete some screening questions (Appendix D) to determine if they met the inclusion criteria before gaining access to the survey.

Confidentiality was maintained since participants were not asked to identify themselves by name. Furthermore, confidentiality was maintained for the duration of the research process and throughout analysis as well as for any future publications that may emerge from this study.

Additionally, data collected were stored online using the SurveyMonkey platform, which is password protected, and data collected and stored on the researcher's computer were also password protected. Once consent and screening for eligible participants occurred, participants

completed several measures, which included demographic items (Appendix E), the PPLES (Wahesh & Myers, 2012), items measuring leadership experience and leadership competence (Appendixes F and G), and the CBI (Kristensen et al., 2005), and items measuring personal, work-related, and student-related burnout (Appendix H). After participants completed the survey, the data were downloaded into IBM SPSS Statistics Version 24 and analyzed. Data analysis procedures are described in more detail below.

Data Processing and Analysis

The data were downloaded into IBM SPSS Statistics Version 24 (Hayes, 2013) where they were screened, and missing data were excluded from the analysis. Participants' incomplete survey responses were excluded from the data before preliminary data screening was performed to determine if scores on the measures were normally distributed and if any outliers existed. Pearson's correlation coefficients were used to test the hypotheses in research question one. Simultaneous multiple regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses in research question two.

Ethical Considerations

This research study was designed to ensure participants' anonymity by following the ACA's (2014) ethical guidelines for research and the regulations and guidelines from the institutional review board. Due to the study's collection of sensitive and personal information (e.g., demographics, self-perceived leadership competence), participants' anonymity was considered throughout. Since participants were not paid by the researcher to complete the survey, there was no concern of having participants' identity revealed to the researcher. Identifying information was not solicited from the demographic items used in the online survey, nor did the data contain any identifying information from participants. Participants completing

the online survey were anticipated to experience or encounter no more than minimal risk, with possible discovery of burnout from one's current employment situation.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has reviewed the methodology that was used to investigate how leadership experiences and competencies and certain demographic features of counselor educators relate to burnout. A national sample of full-time counselor educators working in CACREP-accredited programs was taken. Recruitment efforts included identifying participants through the CACREP program directory and counseling program websites. Study participants completed a demographic questionnaire as well as the PPLES (Wahesh & Myers, 2012), and the CBI (Kristensen et al., 2005). The results of the data analysis will be presented in Chapter Four, while the discussion of these results and implications for practice and further research are presented in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine how counselor educators' leadership experience and competence related to burnout. Burnout subscales included personal, work-related, and student-related. The study also examined reasons counselor educators experience burnout using leadership experience and competence, gender, teaching load, current rank as predictor variables. Participants were asked to provide information related to demographic items as well as answer questions related to working in the role as a counselor educator. Measures assessing the leadership experience and competence and burnout of participants were completed.

A total of 129 participants agreed to the informed consent and completed screening questions to determine eligibility to complete the survey. Six participants did not meet inclusion criteria, resulting in a sample of 123 eligible participants who met inclusion criteria to participate in the research. Only 55 participants completed the entire survey. Although snowball recruitment procedures were utilized to recruit participants, a response rate can be indicated. Individual, personalized recruitment letters were emailed to 1,300 recipients between April 5 and April 11, 2018. A total of 15 recruitment letters were undeliverable or rejected by the recipients' email account, leaving a total of 1,285 individuals in the sampling frame. The response rate was 10.03% based on the number of recruitment letters sent and the total number of survey responses, while the completion rate was 4.28%. This chapter describes the data analyses used to examine whether the hypotheses were supported by this data. A summary of the findings is presented here.

Data Screening

A sample of 123 participants was obtained during data collection in April 2018. Several methods were employed to screen data. First, attempts were made to remove cases in which

participants failed to complete the entire survey (i.e., answer all of the questions). There were 68 participants who failed to complete the survey in its entirety. These cases were deleted, which resulted in a total of 55 cases that were retained.

To detect careless responding from participants, the variance on some of the measures was examined. First, variance of the leadership experience and competence subscales (Wahesh & Myers, 2012) were calculated. After sorting the cases in ascending order on the new variables, the data were visually inspected to remove the cases in which participants selected the same response for 12 or more consecutive items on the PPLES. No cases were deleted, which resulted in all 55 cases being retained. Next, variance on the three CBI subscales (Kristensen et al., 2005) was calculated for each participant. After sorting the cases in ascending order on the new variables, the individual CBI items were visually screened to remove the cases in which participants selected the same response for 10 or more consecutive items. No cases were deleted, which resulted in all 55 cases being retained for the final analysis.

Before the main statistical analyses were performed, all the variables of interest were examined through SPSS Version 24 for accuracy of data entry and to identify any missing values, the normality of distributions, and multivariate outliers. Additionally, means, standard deviations, skewness, and kurtosis were computed for each of the study variables and for the descriptive variables in the sample. Pearson product correlation coefficients were calculated to address the first six study hypotheses (1a–1f). Finally, three separate simultaneous multiple regression analysis were conducted to examine how much of the variance in each of the three burnout subscales (personal, work-related, and student-related) reported by counselor educators was explained by each of the predictor variables. Each CBI subscale score was used as the

criterion variable. The PPLES subscales scores were used as predictor variables along with the variables of gender, faculty rank, and teaching load.

The PPLES subscales and CBI subscales demonstrated relatively normal distribution with little skew or kurtosis. Items requiring participants to type in a response (i.e., string variables) were examined to ensure that responses were correctly entered. Responses that were not in the proper format were corrected. For example, a response to the question regarding the participant's years in current position of "thirteen" was entered as 13. On the item that asked participants to indicate their institution's Carnegie classification, some participants were unable to select from the given list and instead wrote in the name of their institution. For these responses, the institution name entered into the Carnegie classification website and the correct designation was entered into the participant's data set.

Participant Demographics

Age

Participants were asked to indicate their age by selecting the appropriate age category. There was a wide variability of ages. Participants' age ranges were divided into 10-year spans from 20–29 to 70–79 years old. Results are summarized in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1

Participants' Age Range

Age	<i>n</i>	%
20–29	3	5.5
30–39	11	20.0
40–49	22	40.0
50–59	12	21.8
60–69	6	10.9
70–79	1	1.8

Gender

Participants were asked to indicate their gender as male, female, transgendered, or other and to specify. From the sample of 55 participants, there were 22 males (38.2%), 32 females (58.2%), one transgender (1.8%), and one participant identified as other: gender queer (1.8%).

Ethnicity/Racial Background

Participants were asked to indicate their ethnicity/racial background. Approximately 89.1% of the sample reported Caucasian/European American ($n = 49$), 5.5% African American ($n = 3$), 1.8% Asian American ($n = 1$), 1.8% Hispanic or Latino ($n = 1$), 0.0% American Indian/Native Alaskan ($n = 0$), and 0.0% Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander ($n = 0$). Additionally, 1.8% of participants ($n = 1$) selected 'Other' and reported the following background: mixed. Results are summarized in Table 4-2.

Table 4-2

Participants' Ethnicity/Racial Background

Race/ethnicity	<i>n</i>	%
American Indian/Native American	0	0.0
Hispanic or Latino	1	1.8
African American	3	5.5
Asian American	1	1.8
Caucasian/European American	49	89.1
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0.0
Other	1	1.8

Relationship Status

Participants were asked to indicate their relationship status. Results are summarized in Table 4-3.

Table 4-3

Participants' Relationship Status

Relationship Status	<i>n</i>	%
Single	6	10.9
In a relationship	1	1.8
In a committed relationship	5	9.1
Married	39	70.0
Divorced	2	3.6
Widowed	2	3.6

Sexual Orientation

Participants were asked to indicate their sexual orientation. Results are summarized in

Table 4-4.

Table 4-4

Participants' Sexual Orientation

Sexual Orientation	<i>n</i>	%
Heterosexual/straight	45	81.8
Gay/lesbian	7	12.7
Bi-sexual	2	3.6
Other	1	1.8

Perceived Social Support

Participants were asked to indicate their perceived social support from partners, family, friends, and peers. Results are summarized in Table 4-5.

Table 4-5

Participants' Perceived Social Support

Perceived Social Support	<i>n</i>	%
Strongly disagree	7	12.7
Disagree	2	3.6
Neutral	3	5.5
Agree	20	36.4
Strongly agree	23	41.8

Teaching Load

Participants were asked to indicate their teaching load per semester. Results are summarized in Table 4-6.

Table 4-6

Participants' Teaching Load

Courses per Semester	<i>n</i>	%
1	2	3.6
2	11	20.0
3	31	56.4
4	11	20.0

Labor Union Employee

Participants were asked to indicate if they were employed as a faculty member under a labor union at a university or college. Approximately 31% of the sample (30.9%, $n = 17$) reported yes, while 69.1% reported no ($n = 38$).

Type of Higher Education Institution

Participants were asked to identify the type of higher education institution at which they were employed, according to the 2015 Carnegie classification. Five participants selected “uncertain” and reported their university name. The researcher manually looked up the correct Carnegie classification for the respective universities and included them appropriately in the analysis. Results are summarized in Table 4-7.

Table 4-7

Participants' Carnegie Classification Work Setting

Carnegie Classification	<i>n</i>	%
Master's/M1 (larger programs)	5	9.1
Master's/M2 (medium programs)	10	18.2
Master's/M3 (smaller programs)	8	14.5
Doctoral/R1 (very high research)	9	16.4

Doctoral/R2 (higher research activity)	8	14.5
Doctoral/R3 (limited research activity)	15	27.3

Employment Status

Participants reported their current employment status. Approximately 44% for participants (43.6%, $n = 24$) indicated they were employed on a tenure-track/tenure earning line, 16.4% of participants ($n = 9$) were employed on a non-tenured line, 3.6% of participants ($n = 2$) were employed on a clinical line, and 36.4% of participants ($n = 20$) were employed as tenured faculty.

Current Rank

Participants reported their current academic rank. Approximately 7.3% of participants selected “Assistant Clinical Professor (Clinical Track)” ($n = 4$), 1.8% selected “Associate Clinical Professor (Clinical Track)” ($n = 1$), and 0% reported “Clinical Professor (Clinical Track)” ($n = 0$). Additionally, 40.0% of participants reported “Assistant Professor (Tenure Track)” ($n = 22$), 16.4% reported “Associate Professor (Tenure Track)” ($n = 9$), and 20.0% reported “Professor” (Tenure Track)’ ($n = 11$). Finally, 7.3% of participants reported “Assistant Professor (Non-Tenured Track)” ($n = 4$), 5.5% reported “Associate Professor (Non-Tenured Track)” ($n = 3$), and 1.8% reported “Professor (Non-Tenured Track)” ($n = 1$).

Current Salary for Nine-Month (Minimum) Contract

Participants were asked to indicate their current salary for a nine-month (minimum) contract within \$10,000 increments. Results are summarized in Table 4-8.

Table 4-8

Participants' Current Nine-Month (Minimum) Contract Salary

Salary	<i>n</i>	%
\$40,001 to \$50,000	3	5.5
\$50,001 to \$60,000	13	23.6
\$60,001 to \$70,000	16	29.1
\$70,001 to \$80,000	10	18.2
\$80,001 to \$90,000	4	7.3
\$90,001 to \$100,000	5	9.1
\$100,001 to \$110,000	3	5.5
\$130,001 to \$140,000	1	1.8

Graduation from a CACREP-Accredited Doctoral Program

Participants were asked to indicate whether or not they graduated from a CACREP-accredited doctoral counseling program. Forty-seven (85.5%) indicated they did graduate from a CACREP-accredited program, while eight participants (14.5%) indicated they did not graduate from a CACREP-accredited program.

Number of Years in Current Academic Position

Participants were asked to indicate the number of years they have been employed in their current academic position. Responses ranged from half of a year to 35 years. Participants reported an average of 6.89 years in their current academic position.

Number of Years as a Counselor Educator

Participants were asked to indicate how many years they have worked as a counselor educator. Responses ranged from half of a year to 38 years. Participants reported an average of 9.92 years as a counselor educator.

Counseling Specialization

Participants were asked to indicate which counseling specialization they most strongly identify. Results are summarized in Table 4-9.

Table 4-9

Participants' Counseling Specialization

Specialization	<i>n</i>	%
Addictions Counseling	6	10.9
Career Counseling	6	10.9
Clinical Mental Health Counseling	32	58.2
Marriage, Couple, & Family Counseling	5	9.1
Rehabilitation Counseling	2	3.6
School Counseling	4	7.3
Student Affairs & College Counseling	0	0.0

ACES Regional Affiliation

Participants were asked to indicate the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) region in which they work. Results are summarized in Table 4-10.

Table 4-10

Participants' ACES Region Affiliation

ACES Region	<i>n</i>	%
Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (SACES)	29	52.7
North Atlantic Region Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (NARACES)	15	27.3
North Central Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (NCACES)	8	14.5
Rocky Mountain Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (RMACES)	2	3.6
Western Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (WACES)	1	1.8

Membership in Professional Organizations

Participants were asked to select any applicable professional organizations for which they currently hold membership(s). Additionally, they could select “other” and provide the name of a professional organization not listed on the survey. Nearly 76% of participants (76.4%, $n = 42$) identified membership with Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES).

Results are summarized in Table 4-11.

Table 4-11

Participants’ Professional Organization Memberships

Professional Organization	<i>n</i>	%
American Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (AAMFT)	2	3.6
American Mental Health Counselors Association (AMHCA)	5	9.1
American Rehabilitation Counseling Association (ARCA)	3	5.5
American School Counselor Association (ASCA)	7	12.7
Association for Adult Development and Aging (AADA)	5	9.1
Association for Assessment and Research in Counseling (AARC)	6	10.9
Association for Child and Adolescent Counseling (ACAC)	1	1.8
Association for Creativity in Counseling (ACC)	7	12.7
American College Counseling Association (ACCA)	2	3.6
Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES)	42	76.4
Association for Humanistic Counseling (AHC)	2	3.6
Association for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Issues in Counseling (ALGBTIC)	6	10.9
Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD)	6	10.9
Association for Spiritual, Ethical, and Religious Values in Counseling (ASERVIC)	13	23.6
Association for Specialists in Group Work (ASGW)	8	14.5
Counselors for Social Justice (CSJ)	3	5.5
International Association for Addictions and Offender Counselors (IAAOC)	4	7.3
International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors (IAMFC)	4	7.3

Military and Government Counseling Association (MGCA)	1	1.8
National Career Development Association (NCDA)	7	12.7
National Employment Counseling Association (NECA)	1	1.8
Other	9	16.4

Sample Means

The minimum score, maximum score, mean, and standard deviation were calculated for all of the subscale measures used. These results are displayed in Table 4-12.

Table 4-12

Descriptive Statistics of All Subscale Measures Used in This Study

Subscale Measure	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
PPLES experience	1	6	4.73	0.70
PPLES competence	0	4	3.11	0.53
CBI personal	0	100	40.61	18.38
CBI work-related	0	100	27.66	20.30
CBI student-related	0	100	10.08	17.42

Data Analysis

Data analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 24. Participants who did not complete all the items for any measure were excluded from the analysis. Bivariate correlations were completed between the PPLES subscales and the CBI subscales. Simultaneous multiple regression analyses were completed to examine how much of the variance in the personal, work-related, and student-related subscales of burnout as reported by counselor educators was explained by five predictor variables: PPLES experience, PPLES competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load. In the remainder of this chapter, results from these analyses are presented.

Correlations

Pearson correlations were performed to examine the relationship between PPLES experience and PPLES competence, and CBI personal, CBI work-related, and CBI student-related scores. See Table 4-13 for Pearson correlations and significance levels. The analysis indicated weak negative correlations between PPLES experience and CBI personal ($r = -.211, p < .05$); CBI work-related ($r = -.258, p < .05$); and CBI student-related ($r = -.191, p < .05$) subscales. This suggests participants who identified as having greater leadership experience tended to have lower levels of burnout; however, the correlations were not significant to support Hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c.

The analysis also indicated significant but weak correlations between PPLES competence and CBI personal ($r = -.279^*, p < .05$) and CBI work-related ($r = -.296^*, p < .05$) subscales. This suggests participants who identified as having higher perceived competence in their leadership tended to have lower levels of personal and work-related burnout, while participants who identified as having lower perceived competence in their leadership tended to have higher levels of personal and work-related burnout, which provides support for Hypotheses 1d and 1e. Although Hypotheses 1d and 1e were supported, these correlations were weak, indicating that other variables are important to consider in understanding counselor educator burnout in relation to leadership competence.

Examining the correlation between the PPLES competence and the CBI student-related subscale, the analysis indicated a weak negative correlation ($r = -.191, p < .05$) that was not statistically significant. This suggests participants who indicated higher perceived competence in their leadership tended to have lower levels of student-related burnout; however, the correlations were not significant to support Hypothesis 1f.

Table 4-13

Correlations Among Study Variables

	CBI personal	CBI work-related	CBI student-related
PPLE experience	-.211	-.258	-.191
PPLE competence	-.279*	-.296*	-.231

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed, $p \leq .05$, $N = 55$).

Simultaneous Multiple Regressions

Hypothesis 2 was tested using simultaneous multiple regression analysis to determine how much of the variance in burnout for each of the three subscales, personal, work-related, and student-related, reported by counselor educators was explained by five predictor variables: PPLES experience, PPLES competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load. Prior to conducting the regression analysis, the study data were reviewed to ensure that the assumptions of regression were satisfied. Linearity was tested by creating scatterplots of the residuals and the assumption of linearity appeared to be met. Testing the assumption of independence of observations was unnecessary since all data were collected at one point in time and were independently sampled from the population of counselor educators currently employed in CACREP-accredited programs. The assumption of homoscedasticity of errors was tested and appeared to have been met. Testing for normal distribution of errors was also completed, and the residuals appeared to be normally distributed. Finally, aspects of noncollinearity were tested and the eigenvalues, tolerance values, and variance inflation values indicated that the assumption was met.

The final hypotheses under Research Questions 2 a, b, and c were examined using simultaneous multiple regression analysis. The regression equations used five predictor variables, PPLES experience, PPLES competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load, to

predict the outcome variable of counselor educators' burnout for each of the three subscales.

The regression model summary predicting personal burnout can be seen in Table 4-14 and the regression coefficients in Table 4-15. Results showed that the linear combination of predictor variables accounted for 12% of the variance in personal burnout, $R^2 = .118$, adjusted $R^2 = .028$, $F(5, 49) = 1.314$, $p > .01$. Standardized multiple regression coefficients for the five predictor variables were as follows: (a) PPLES experience, $\beta = .034$, $t = .173$, $p = .864$; (b) PPLES competence, $\beta = -.357$, $t = -1.764$, $p = .084$; (c) Gender, $\beta = .082$, $t = .583$, $p = .562$; (d) faculty rank, $\beta = .073$, $t = .494$, $p = .624$; and (e) teaching load, $\beta = .207$, $t = 1.418$, $p = .163$. Hypothesis 2a was not supported. Therefore, it is important to consider other predictor variables to better understand what accounts for personal burnout in counselor educators.

Table 4-14

Counselor Educators' Personal Burnout Regression Model Summary

Model 1	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Regression	2155.895	5	431.179	1.314	.274
Residual	16080.847	49	328.181		
Total	18236.742	54			

Table 4-15

Counselor Educators' Personal Burnout Regression Model Coefficients

Variable	b	Std. error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	61.030	20.002		3.051	.004
Gender	2.378	4.078	.082	.583	.562
Rank	.767	1.553	.073	.494	.624
Load	5.125	3.615	.207	1.418	.163
PPLES_Exp	.894	5.174	.034	.173	.864
PPLES_Com	-12.428	7.044	-.357	-1.764	.084

The regression model summary predicting work-related burnout can be seen in Table 4-16 and the regression coefficients in Table 4-17. Results showed that the linear combination of predictor variables accounted for 18% of the variance in work-related burnout, $R^2 = .178$, adjusted $R^2 = .095$, $F(5, 49) = 2.129$, $p > .01$. Standardized multiple regression coefficients for the five predictor variables were as follows: (a) PPLES experience, $\beta = -.870$, $t = -.158$, $p = .875$; (b) PPLES competence, $\beta = -12.775$, $t = -1.701$, $p = .095$; (c) gender, $\beta = -2.562$, $t = -.589$, $p = .558$; (d) faculty rank, $\beta = 1.584$, $t = .957$, $p = .343$; and (e) teaching load, $\beta = 7.953$, $t = 2.063$, $p = .044$. Hypothesis 2b was not supported. Therefore, it is important to consider other predictor variables to better understand what accounts for work-related burnout in counselor educators.

Table 4-16

Counselor Educators' Work-Related Burnout Regression Model Summary

Model 1	Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	3970.914	5	794.183	2.129	.078
Residual	18279.550	49	373.052		
Total	22250.464	54			

Table 4-17

Counselor Educators' Work-Related Burnout Regression Model Coefficients

Variable	b	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	51.257	21.325		2.404	.020
Gender	-2.562	4.348	-.080	-.589	.558
Rank	1.584	1.656	.136	.957	.343
Load	7.953	3.854	.291	2.063	.044
PPLES_Exp	-.870	5.517	-.030	-.158	.875
PPLES_Com	-12.775	7.510	-.332	-1.701	.095

The regression model summary predicting student-related burnout can be seen in Table 4-18 and the regression coefficients in Table 4-19. Results showed that the linear combination of

predictor variables accounted for 17% of the variance in student-related burnout, $R^2 = .167$, adjusted $R^2 = .082$, $F(5, 49) = 1.965$, $p > .01$. Standardized multiple regression coefficients for the five predictor variables were as follows: (a) PPLES experience, $\beta = .325$, $t = .068$, $p = .946$; (b) PPLES competence, $\beta = -.9207$, $t = -1.419$, $p = .162$; (c) gender, $\beta = -.3447$, $t = -.918$, $p = .363$; (d) faculty rank, $\beta = 2.601$, $t = 1.818$, $p = .075$; and (e) teaching load, $\beta = 5.232$, $t = 1.571$, $p = .123$. Hypothesis 2c was not supported. Therefore, it is important to consider other predictor variables to better understand what accounts for student-related burnout in counselor educators.

Table 4-18

Counselor Educators' Student-Related Burnout Regression Model Summary

Model 1	Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	2735.894	5	547.1792	1.965	.100
Residual	13642.262	49	278.414		
Total	16378.157	54			

Table 4-19

Counselor Educators' Student-Related Burnout Regression Model Coefficients

Variable	b	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	18.699	18.423		1.015	.315
Gender	-3.447	3.756	-.125	-.918	.363
Rank	2.601	1.430	.260	1.818	.075
Load	5.232	3.329	.223	1.571	.123
PPLES_Exp	.325	4.766	.013	.068	.946
PPLES_Com	-9.207	6.488	-.279	-1.419	.162

A complete summary of hypothesis testing results is found in Table 4-20.

Table 4-20

Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis	Supported?
1a: There will be a significant correlation between the principles and practices of leadership excellence experience (Wahesh & Myers, 2012) reported by counselor educators and personal burnout (Kristensen et al., 2005).	No
1b: There will be a significant correlation between the principles and practices of leadership excellence experience (Wahesh & Myers, 2012) reported by counselor educators and work-related burnout (Kristensen et al., 2005).	No
1c: There will be a significant correlation between the principles and practices of leadership excellence experience (Wahesh & Myers, 2012) reported by counselor educators and student-related burnout (Kristensen et al., 2005).	No
1d: There will be a significant correlation between the principles and practices of leadership excellence competence (Wahesh & Myers, 2012) reported by counselor educators and personal burnout (Kristensen et al., 2005).	Yes
1e: There will be a significant correlation between the principles and practices of leadership excellence competence (Wahesh & Myers, 2012) reported by counselor educators and work-related burnout (Kristensen et al., 2005).	Yes
1f: There will be a significant correlation between the principles and practices of leadership excellence competence (Wahesh & Myers, 2012) reported by counselor educators and student-related burnout (Kristensen et al., 2005).	No
2a: There will be significant contributions of counselor educator leadership experience and competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load to the prediction of counselor educator burnout, as measured by the CBI Personal subscale (Kristensen et al., 2005).	No
2b: There will be significant contributions of counselor educator leadership experience and competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load to the prediction of counselor educator burnout, as measured by the CBI Work-related subscale (Kristensen et al., 2005).	No
2c: There will be significant contributions of counselor educator leadership experience and competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load to the prediction of counselor educator burnout, as measured by the CBI Student-related subscale (Kristensen et al., 2005).	No

Chapter Summary

A sample of 55 adults who were identified as counselor educators in CACREP-accredited programs in the United States participated in this study. Hypothesis 1a, which stated that there is a significant correlation between leadership experience and personal burnout, was not supported. Hypothesis 1b, which stated that there is a significant correlation between leadership experience and work-related burnout, was not supported. Hypothesis 1c, which stated that there is a significant correlation between leadership experience and student-related burnout, was not supported. Hypothesis 1d, which stated that there is a significant correlation between leadership competence and personal burnout, was supported. Hypothesis 1e, which stated that there is a significant correlation between leadership competence and work-related burnout, was supported. Hypothesis 1f, which stated that there is a significant correlation between leadership competence and student-related burnout, was not supported. Hypothesis 2a, which stated that there is a significant contribution of counselor educators' leadership experience, competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load to the prediction of personal burnout, was not supported. Hypothesis 2b, which stated that there is a significant contribution of counselor educators' leadership experience, competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load to the prediction of work-related burnout, was not supported. Hypothesis 2a, which stated that there is a significant contribution of counselor educators' leadership experience, competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load to the prediction of student-related burnout, was not supported. These results will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was grounded within servant leadership theory, which is associated with excellence in leadership, mentorship, and professional service. The purposes of this research were (a) to examine the relationship between a counselor educator's leadership experience and competence and burnout and (b) to determine if the leadership experience and competence, reported by counselor educators, as well as their gender, rank, and teaching load influence their burnout. Chapter Five builds on the data analysis and results presented in Chapter Four, exploring the significance of the research findings. Explanations of both research questions are presented and implications for counselor educators, administrators, and counselor education programs, research limitations, and future research suggestions are outlined.

Summary of Findings and Implications

Summary of Demographics

Counselor educators employed as full-time faculty members in programs accredited by the CACREP across the United States were recruited as participants for this study. The final research sample consisted of 123 full-time counselor educators after data cleaning. The female-to-male ratio of the sample was 2:1. Accounting for age, approximately 5% of the participants were in their 20s, 20% in their 30s, 40% in their 40s, 22% in their 50s, 11% in their 60s, and 2% in their 70s. In relation to relationship status, most participants reported being married (70.0%), 10.9% reported being single, 1.8% in a relationship, and 9.1% in a committed relationship, with 3.6% reported being divorced and 3.6% widowed. The large majority of participants reported their sexual orientation as heterosexual/straight (81.8%), with about 12.7% reporting as gay/lesbian, 3.6% reporting as bisexual, and the remaining 1.8% reporting as other, indicating sexual orientation as gender queer. Regarding the construct race/ethnicity, the vast majority of

participants (89.1%) reported their racial background as Caucasian/European American, with 5.5% identifying themselves as African American, 1.8% as Hispanic or Latino, 1.8% as Asian American; 0.0% American Indian/Native American, 0.0% as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and the remaining 1.8% as other.

In regard to participants' current academic rank, assistant clinical professors (clinical track) accounted for 7.3% of the sample, associate clinical professors (clinical track) accounted for 1.8%, assistant professors (tenure track) accounted for 40.0%, associate professors (tenure track) accounted for 16.4%, full professors (tenure track) accounted for 20.0%, assistant professors (non-tenure track) accounted for 7.3%, associate professors (non-tenure track) accounted for 5.5%, and 1.8% of the sample were accounted as full professors (non-tenure track). In terms of employment status, 44% reported being in a tenure-track/tenure-earning position and 16.4% reported being in a non-tenured position, while 3.6% reported being in a clinical position and 36.4% reported being in tenured faculty positions.

According to the Carnegie classification system of academic institutions, 14.5% of participants were employed in smaller master's (M3) programs, 18.2% in medium-sized master's (M2) programs, and 9.1% in larger master's (M1) programs. In addition, 27.3% of participants were employed in limited research activity doctoral (R3) programs, 14.5% in higher research activity doctoral (R2) programs, and 16.4% in very high research activity doctoral (R1) programs.

The mean number of years participants were working in their current academic institutions was 6.89, while the mean number of years they reported working as counselor educators was 9.92. The majority of participants (58.2%) identified clinical mental health counseling as their specialty, followed by addictions and career counseling at 10.9% each,

marriage and family counseling (9.1%), school counseling (7.3%), and rehabilitation counseling (3.6%). To examine participants by Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) regions, 52.7% affiliated with Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (SACES), 27.3% affiliated with North Atlantic Region Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (NARACES), 14.5% affiliated with North Central Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (NCACES), 3.6% affiliated with Rocky Mountain Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (RMACES), and 1.8% with Western Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (WACES). Most participants reported membership in at least two ACA divisions, with the majority (76.4%) indicating membership in ACES.

Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables

For each of the variables of interest, descriptive statistics were computed and the following results were found.

Leadership: PPLES Experience Subscale

The PPLES (Wahesh & Myers, 2012) measure was not designed to calculate a total score; however, total subscale scores are calculated for each participant. The total score on the experience subscale was calculated by summing the total score across each of the 10 principles and dividing it by the total number of questions ($n = 25$). Total scores could range from 1 (participant having minimal or no leadership experience in relation to the 10 principles) to 6 (participant having high leadership experience in relation to the 10 principles). Of the 55 participants in the current study, the mean score was 4.73 with a standard deviation of 0.70. This suggests that the participants in this study reported on average using the 10 principles fairly often to very often when serving in a leadership role and/or deciding to take on a leadership role.

These findings are consistent with previous literature where master's and doctoral graduate students and professional counselors reported having high scores on the leadership experience subscale (Wahesh & Myers, 2014).

Leadership: PPLES Competence Subscale

As stated earlier, the PPLES (Wahesh & Myers, 2012) measure was not designed to calculate a total score; however, total subscale scores are calculated for each participant. The total score on the competence subscale was calculated by summing the total score across each of the 10 principles and dividing it by the total number of questions ($n = 25$). Total scores could range from 0 (not applicable, participant perceived no ability in relation to leadership on the 10 principles) to 4 (highly competent). Of the 55 participants in the current study, the mean score was 3.11 with a standard deviation of 0.53. This suggests that the participants in this study reported on average to be competent in their perceived ability to use the 10 principles when serving in a leadership role and/or deciding to take on a leadership role. These findings are consistent with previous literature in which master's and doctoral graduate students and professional counselors reported having high scores on the leadership competence subscale (Wahesh & Myers, 2014).

Personal Burnout Subscale

The CBI (Kristensen et al., 2005) measure was not designed to calculate a total score; however, total subscale scores are calculated for each participant. The total score on the personal burnout subscale was calculated by summing the scores from the questions comprising this scale and dividing it by the total number of questions ($n = 6$). Total subscale scores range from 0, indicating never/not at all endorsing burnout in personal life, to 100, indicating always endorsing burnout in personal life. Of the 55 participants in the current study, the mean score was 40.61

with a standard deviation of 18.38. This suggests that the participants in this study reported a state of prolonged physical and psychological exhaustion between seldom and sometimes in relation to personal burnout. These findings are consistent with previous literature in which counselor educators reported low to moderate states of prolonged physical and psychological exhaustion in their personal life (Moate et al., 2016).

Work-Related Burnout Subscale

The CBI (Kristensen et al., 2005) measure was not designed to calculate a total score; however, total subscale scores are calculated for each participant. The total score on the work-related burnout subscale was calculated by summing the score from the questions comprising this scale and dividing it by the total number of questions ($n = 7$). Total subscale scores range from 0, indicating never/almost never/to a very low degree endorsing work-related burnout, to 100, indicating always/to a very high degree endorsing work-related burnout. Of the 55 participants in the current study, the mean score was 27.66 with a standard deviation of 20.30. This suggests that the participants in this study reported a state of prolonged physical and psychological exhaustion, perceived as related to their work between seldom/to a low degree and sometimes/somewhat. These findings, although approximately 10 points lower, were within the same range as reported in a previous study on counselor educators by Moate et al. (2016).

Student-Related Burnout Subscale

The CBI (Kristensen et al., 2005) measure was not designed to calculate a total score; however, only total subscale scores are calculated for each participant. The total score on the student-related burnout subscale was calculated by summing the score from the questions comprising this scale and dividing it by the total number of questions ($n = 6$). Total subscale scores range from 0, indicating never/almost never/to a very low degree endorsing student-

related burnout, to 100, indicating always/to a very high degree endorsing student-related burnout. Of the 55 participants in the current study, the mean score was 10.08 with a standard deviation of 17.42. This suggests that the participants in this study reported a state of prolonged physical and psychological exhaustion perceived as related to their work with students between seldom/to a low degree and sometimes/somewhat. These findings, although approximately 10 points lower, were within the same range as reported in a previous study on counselor educators by Moate et al. (2016).

Discussion

The following section begins by addressing both research questions in relation to the larger literature. This is followed by an examination of the limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, and implications for counselor educators, administrators, and counselor education programs.

Research Question 1

Question one investigated if a relationship existed between the principles and practices of leadership excellence (experiences, competencies) and burnout among counselor educators. The six hypotheses associated with this question addressed each of the PPLES and CBI subscales. Because leadership is associated with constructs related to burnout like occupational satisfaction (Hill, 2009; Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013), work-life fit and turnover intention (Coaston, 2013), and personality characteristics (Moate et al., 2016), it was hypothesized that significant correlations would exist between each PPLES subscale, experience and competence, and the CBI subscales of personal, work-related, and student-related.

The majority of the hypotheses associated with the first research question were not supported, although correlational analyses established the existence of weak negative

relationships between each of the PPLES and CBI subscales. The correlations between the PPLES experience subscale and all three CBI subscales were not statistically significant, nor was the correlation between the PPLES competence subscale and the CBI student-related subscale statistically significant. However, it appears that those counselor educators who have more leadership experience have a lower probability of experiencing burnout. Statistically significant but weak negative correlations were observed between the PPLES competence subscale and CBI personal burnout as well as between PPLES competence subscale and CBI work-related burnout. This suggests that counselor educators who feel more competent in their perceived leadership abilities have a lower probability of experiencing burnout in their personal and work lives compared to counselor educators who feel less competent in their perceived leadership abilities. Similarly to findings here on the influence of personal and work-related burnout on a counselor educator's leadership competence, research conducted by Leinbaugh and colleagues (2003) suggested that the personal and professional dimensions of counselor educators' identity impacted their quality of life. Burnout appears to be a likely reality for counselor educators with low levels of leadership competence, which might result in them experiencing negative health consequences (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998) while negatively influencing co-workers and students (Bakker, Schaufeli, Sixma, & Bosveld, 2001) and adversely impacting their place of employment (Hill, 2004). For counselor educators, it is necessary to model self-care and wellness practices since the counseling profession is built on a wellness orientation (Yager & Tovar-Blank, 2007). Counselor educators are responsible for mentoring new counseling professionals in the field (Coaston, 2013), and if they lack the leadership competence to fulfill their professional responsibilities and experience burnout, their students will likely suffer (Yager & Tovar-Blank, 2007). It seems a counselor educator's competence spans multiple life domains

and can have both positive and negative effects. Therefore, additional research might be useful to better understand how a counselor educator's leadership competence relates to wellness both personally and professionally.

Further support of the relationship between leadership competence and personal and work-related burnout is seen in Coaston's (2013) work; counselor educators who practice healthy leadership (caring for, mentoring, and empowering others) are less likely to experience burnout. It seems the more comfortable counselor educators are in their leadership competence, the better they are able to thrive in a given leadership role without experiencing burnout. Leadership competence for counselor educators appears to be similar to the concept of counselor self-efficacy (Larson, 1998). When counselors utilize self-efficacy, they reflect on their perceptions based on experiential and educational knowledge with the aim of improving their abilities to perform counseling tasks. These tasks include the ability to accept and succeed under pressure, have positive thoughts, and set achievable goals (Brogan, Saurez, Reh fuss, & Shope, 2013). To apply counselor self-efficacy to leadership competence in counselor educators, is it likely that counselor educators with high competence in leadership will be more capable of engaging in self-reflection with the aim of improving their leadership abilities while having the capacity to persist and succeed under pressure, thereby having lower susceptibility to burnout. It might be helpful for researchers to examine the relationship between leadership competence and counselor self-efficacy to determine how these constructs interact and how they might help create a buffer against burnout for counselor educators.

An important distinction to note is that correlation does not imply causation. Data for each participant were collected at one point in time using a non-experimental research design. The correlations between leadership and burnout in counselor educators described above do not

indicate that one of these constructs caused changes in the other construct; instead, these values indicate the strength of the linear relationship. Researchers (Radey & Figley, 2007; Stamm 2002, 2005) have theorized that compassion satisfaction, which involves feeling fulfilled as a result of an individual's role as a helper, acts as a buffer against burnout due to the inverse relationship between the two constructs (Star, 2013). Counselor educators who have low levels of leadership competence can incorporate compassion satisfaction to help increase their self-efficacy and thereby increase their levels of leadership competence. Therefore, it is possible for counselor educators who have the capacity to develop higher levels of compassion satisfaction in relation to their leadership roles to minimize the likelihood of experiencing burnout.

Research Question 2

The second research question asked whether counselor educators' leadership experience and competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load predicted burnout. Simultaneous multiple regression analysis indicated that the variables were not significant predictors for any of the CBI subscales: personal, work related, and student related. More specifically, the predictor variables accounted for 12% of the variance in personal burnout, 18% of the variance in work-related burnout, and 18% of the variance in student-related burnout for counselor educators. It is very possible that gender was not a significant predictor of burnout because the sample lacked representativeness, with majority (two thirds) of the participants being female. Similarly, faculty rank and teaching load were also not significant predictors of burnout, which might also be due to the lack of representativeness in the sample. Therefore, 88%, 82%, and 83% of the variance in personal, work-related, and student-related burnout, respectively, is still unaccounted for, indicating the need for further exploration into the CBI burnout subscales in order to better understand what other variables, like occupational satisfaction (Hill, 2009; Sangganjanavanich &

Balkin, 2013), work-life fit and turnover intention (Coaston, 2013), and personality characteristics (Moate et al., 2016) might better account for burnout in counselor educators. In so doing, the hope is counselor educators will be more equipped to address those issues with the intention of minimizing the probability that counselor educators experience burnout.

Although the predictor variables were not significant predictors of burnout in counselor educators, it is still important for researchers to continue examining the impact that faculty rank has on burnout. Research indicates assistant professors identify feeling lonely, dissatisfied, and stressed; as such, academic institutions need to be proactive in attending to and supporting the needs of assistant professors (Hill, 2004; Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson, Black, & Lahman, 2006; Magnuson, Norem, & Haberstroh, 2001). Furthermore, higher education institutions may need to take the assistant professors' circumstances into consideration when evaluating the work of counselor educators seeking tenure and promotion.

Limitations of the Study

A number of limitations related to the instrumentation, generalizability, the self-reporting survey research design, and the administration of the survey were identified during this research study. Even though the instruments employed in this study were carefully selected, they still contained certain limitations. For example, the instrument used to measure leadership behaviors, the PPLES, was not normed using a population of counselor educators. Instead, it was normed using masters and doctoral counseling students and counseling professionals (Wahesh & Myers, 2012, 2014). As a result, the PPLES was utilized with a different population than what was originally intended. Similarly, the CBI was normed using participants employed in the human service sector but not in faculty positions (Kristensen et al., 2005); however, it has been used in previous research with counselor educators (Moate et al., 2016).

Another major limitation of the study is related to participant completion. Counselor educators self-selected and voluntarily participated in this study. There is a possibility that counselor educators who are burned out as a result of their leadership experience and competence chose not to participate in this study. Consequently, caution should be used interpreting findings, and attention should be given to encouraging all qualified counselor educators to contribute in future studies like this one. Therefore, the resulting sample may not accurately reflect the true status of leadership and burnout among counselor educators, limiting the generalizability of the findings. Although the intention of the study was to obtain results that could be generalized to all counselor educators, the researcher acknowledges certain limitations based on the study design.

Another limitation was seen in the response rate of those invited to participate. This response rate was very low (4.28%). The researcher attempted to recruit participants through individualized emails. Although efforts were made to include all qualified counselor educators currently employed in CACREP-accredited programs in the United States, this was not possible since such a database does not exist. There was only one option for recruiting eligible participants, and it was using the CACREP directory website, which lists accredited programs and schools. In addition, the researcher employed personal contacts to aid with recruitment of participants. Personal contacts were formed as a result of attending professional conferences. Therefore, data obtained from personal contacts may not accurately reflect all counselor educators, especially when one considers counselor educators who do not attend professional conferences (Logan, 2016). Furthermore, including only counselor educators employed at CACREP-accredited institutions limited the generalizability of the findings to all counselor educators. Although this may limit generalizability, it was important to identify those who are

employed in CACREP-accredited programs to establish a benchmark for counselor educators' faculty responsibilities across the United States (Logan, 2016).

Another noteworthy limitation inherent to this study is the use of self-report instruments. According to Heppner and colleagues (2008), participant bias may stem from the following participant characteristics or behaviors: (a) self-presentation style, (b) motivation level, (c) psychological defenses, and (d) worldview. Participants often feel the desire to present themselves in a positive or favorable manner to researchers. In this study, the population of interest may have been motivated by the topic, which could have contributed to participation. However, due to the multiple roles counselor educators fulfill, it is likely that participants ignored the requests for participation, possibly because they were too exhausted or overwhelmed to participate. Another possibility is that participants may not have wanted to accurately and honestly acknowledge their current levels of leadership and/or burnout. Therefore, defensiveness or apprehension could have played a role in non-participation or incomplete responses. Finally, a participant's worldview, or their beliefs, values, and assumptions (e.g., on a research topic or statistical analysis) are worthy of being considered (Logan, 2016).

Apart from the methodological issues, conceptual limitations were also present. For instance, it is likely the variables selected for this study did not encompass all relevant aspects predicting counselor educator burnout. For example, it is possible that burnout in a counselor educator is influenced by life variables such as physical health, intimate relationships, and parenting duties. Likewise, university and department climates may also influence burnout in counselor educators. Nonetheless, the present study did not address these variables. Another conceptual limitation worthy of consideration is the definition of leadership. There is a

possibility this definition is context specific and therefore the leadership behaviors addressed in the PPLES may not be applicable for the target population.

Some limitations also arose regarding survey administration. The timing of data collection was less than optimal since recruitment occurred toward the end of the spring semester, when many faculty members were working on preparing and grading final projects, exams, and end-of-school-year reports. In addition, administration closely preceded the annual ACA conference, which could have negatively impacted participation rates.

In relation to survey completion, it is possible that some participants were unable to accurately complete the survey. A few participants contacted the researcher to inform that the survey platform crashed, preventing them from completing the survey, which could have contributed to low response and completion rates. Finally, it is important to note that data collection occurred for only a one-week duration, which could have also contributed to low response and completion rates.

Suggestions for Future Research

The present study addressed gaps in the literature regarding leadership and burnout in counselor educators. In light of this, there are a number of directions for future research. For example, while leadership experience was not significantly correlated with burnout, it is still beneficial to better understand the leadership experiences and competencies counselor educators participate in and self-report. This study was the first of its kind to employ the PPLES instrument to measure leadership in counselor educators. Therefore, future research should investigate the differences in leadership experiences and competencies among counselor educators at different institutions based on Carnegie classifications, different ranks (assistant, associate, full professor), or employment status (clinical, tenure-track, and non-tenured). This

research could allow for greater insight into leadership development within the profession of counseling and counselor education.

The sample that was retained in the present study contained a high percentage of White/Caucasian female participants; yet, it is essential for the counseling profession to attend to the unique needs of ethnic minority faculty members. Future research should examine the unique needs of ethnic minority faculty, their leadership experience and competence, and their levels of burnout. Since there exists a small percentage of ethnic minority counselor educators, it might be useful to engage in qualitative research methodologies to better obtain rich and meaningful data on their leadership experience and competence and the presence or absence of burnout.

Faculty rank consistently appears in the literature as an important variable in burnout (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Hill, 2009; Sabharwal & Corley, 2009). Previous research (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2001, 2006; Magnuson, Shaw, Tubin, & Norem, 2004) has utilized qualitative methods to longitudinally examine pre-tenured counselor educators' occupational satisfaction, a construct associated with burnout. It might be helpful to employ qualitative and quantitative methodologies to further explore leadership and burnout in faculty at different ranks (assistant, associate, and full professor levels). Another area for future investigation is the influence of a counselor educator's institutional Carnegie classification upon leadership and burnout. Although research has examined faculty occupational satisfaction in Carnegie Research Extensive (R2) universities (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011), the differences in leadership and burnout in counselor educators by institutional classification have yet to be documented.

This quantitative study produced a cross-sectional understanding of leadership and burnout among counselor educators. However, it might benefit the profession to perform a longitudinal study, which could measure leadership and burnout among counselor educators starting with participants' roles as doctoral students and continuing throughout their career. Engaging in this form of investigative analysis would provide further understanding of the dimensions and changes in leadership and burnout across a counselor educator's career.

Since leadership experience and competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load were not found to be significant predictors of burnout, future research could explore differences in burnout across social support, physical health, and Carnegie classification. If differences were found to exist across these variables, this information could aid administrators in creating programs aimed at retention and wellness in counselor educators, specifically in new assistant professors (Logan, 2016). It might also be helpful to replicate the study but provide for a larger window for data collection, which could allow greater effect sizes to be observed.

The profession of counseling continues to grow and change in response to the needs of clients, communities, and society. As leaders, counselor educators directly impact counseling professionals and indirectly influence the clients who interact with counseling professionals. Therefore, it would be beneficial for future research to continue examining the factors influencing and inhibiting leadership and burnout in counselor educators.

Counselor Education Implications

This research study indicated counselor educators who report lower levels of perceived competence in leadership have a greater likelihood of experiencing burnout in personal and work-related areas of life. Cumulatively, implications for counselor educators, higher education administrators, and counseling programs can be deduced from the research findings.

Counselor Educators

Given that burnout has been reported among counselor educators, it would benefit counselor educators and administrators to continue to examine factors such as leadership competence in order to understand what may influence burnout. By examining factors that influence burnout in counselor educators, educators themselves can focus on maintaining employment while avoiding or minimizing burnout, which, if not addressed, can result in increased spending by administrators and institutions of higher learning.

Relatedly, the findings of this study suggest that counselor educators' leadership competence is associated with one's level of personal and work-related burnout. The higher one's leadership competence, the less they reported feeling burned out in areas of personal and work-related life. Wellness and appropriate coping are part of leadership competence, and therefore counselor educators are expected to model these behaviors competently (Wester et al., 2009). Counselor educators who do not believe they are competent in their leadership roles are likely to experience stress, which can negatively impact their ability to engage in and maintain personal wellness (Moate et al., 2016), which can then lead to burnout. Therefore, counselor educators could benefit from understanding how to develop and enhance their leadership competence through leadership experiences and mentoring relationships. The current research findings provide counselor educators with pertinent information worthy of attention that may impact career decision-making and the trajectory of a counselor educator.

Higher Education Administrators

The development of competence in leadership does not only fall on the counselor educator. Higher education administrators also contribute to the development of this construct, and as a result, administrators should be knowledgeable of how leadership style can contribute to

empowerment (social justice advocacy) and professional service (Greenleaf, 2003; Sweeney, 2012), with the possibility of minimizing personal and work-related burnout in faculty. Researchers (Coaston, 2013; Hill, 2009; Moate et al., 2016; Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013) believe examining the relationship between burnout and leadership in counselor educators can offer greater understanding of how leadership is modeled through mentorship, and consequently, the wellness practices counselor educators engage in that might provide protection against burnout. To enhance leadership competence in counselor educators, it would benefit administrators to dedicate time to activities that promote leadership (Logan, 2016). For example, administrators could provide training during department or college faculty meetings focused on the development of three main skills: (a) recognizing stress symptoms, thereby becoming mindful of one's sources of stress; (b) reflecting on encounters that are stressful and examining how outcomes might have ended for better or for worse, with the intention of making realistic assessments regarding the experience of stressors; and (c) challenging oneself by accepting opportunities focused on building self-confidence and the recognition of the ability to manage stressful situations (Logan, 2016). Such leadership trainings could also be executed during new faculty orientations or through peer faculty mentoring programs. In addition, mentoring programs could seek to pair faculty members of the same rank since there are disparities in role expectations and occupational satisfaction by rank (Logan, 2016).

Furthermore, since leadership competence was significantly correlated with burnout, it could be advantageous for administrators to encourage leadership development (Logan, 2016). Similar to providing opportunities for leadership training, administrators could offer professional development seminars or workshops to allow counselor educators to identify their own leadership behaviors and understand how those behaviors may influence or impact their levels of

burnout personally and professionally. For example, it could be helpful for a counselor educator to recognize they strongly demonstrate the leadership principle of preservation of history (CSI Academy of Leaders, 1999). This awareness could help the counselor educator better mentor students in this leadership principle and also contribute to their institution's history in meaningful ways, thereby minimizing burnout. The suggestions outlined above seem to align with Magnuson, Wilcoxon, and Norem's (2002) recommendation that being committed to learning, growth, personal and professional development, and improvement may be powerful contributors to minimizing professional burnout.

Implications for Counselor Education Preparation Programs

It is expected that counselor education programs provide students with the knowledge, skills, and experience to function ethically and competently as professional counselors and counselor educators (ACA, 2014). Furthermore, a main component of the profession is wellness (CACREP, 2015). Although this study found that a majority of participants were on the low end of the burnout measure, it is important that doctoral counselor education students be adequately prepared to step into the role of faculty member and that doctoral programs inform them of the multiple responsibilities and roles counselor educators fulfill (Coaston, 2013; Moate et al., 2016; Niles et al., 2001; Sangganjanavanich & Balkin, 2013).

Research also asserts the need for counselor educators to be intentional in offering support to doctoral students through the supervisory relationship so they adequately understand the unique roles of both pre-tenured and tenured faculty (Hill, 2004, 2009; Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004, 2006). By educating doctoral students on faculty roles, they are more likely to develop realistic work expectations when entering the workforce and hopefully be more resilient against burnout. Specifically, doctoral counselor education programs should provide

students with information on role expectations of counselor educators in different institutions (M1–M3 and R1–R3) and at different levels of employment (clinical or tenure-track faculty and assistant, associate, or full professor) (Logan, 2016). Programs can accomplish this task by requiring doctoral students to interview counselor educators at different career levels (assistant, associate, or full professor) and complete a reflection paper on their experience, documenting the differences observed between interviewees. An assignment like this might help students learn from experienced counselor education faculty while also allowing faculty members to reflect on their role expectations. The supervisory relationship can also be used to address and resolve issues like compassion fatigue and failures. Having faculty supervisors develop trusted relationships with doctoral students; supervisors can model healthy self-care practices and make counseling referrals when appropriate (Merriman, 2015).

In addition, Levitt and Hermon (2009) suggested counselor education doctoral programs offer a one-hour course on wellness and self-care to students that could examine factors inhibiting and influencing burnout and wellness. Furthermore, these factors could also be incorporated into an existing course(s) throughout the counseling preparation program (Blount, Taylor, Lambie, & Anwell, 2016). The current CACREP standards include aspects of leadership development and training and current and topical issues relevant to the work of counselors and the counseling profession, specifically in relation to doctoral professional identity (CACREP, 2015). A doctoral course addressing CACREP standards in the leadership and advocacy domain might be an acceptable setting to address the role of leadership for counselor educators and relevant issues regarding counselor educator work expectations.

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented a summary of the findings, counselor educator implications, limitations to the study, and recommendations for future research. There were three main findings. First, when examining leadership and burnout in counselor educators, significant relationships were not identified between the PPLES experience subscale and the CBI personal, work-related, and student-related subscales, and between the PPLES competence subscale and the CBI student-related subscale. However, statistical analysis did find weak negative relationships to exist between the variables of interest. Increasing the sample size might result in significant relationships. Second, significant negative weak correlations were found between the PPLES competence subscale and the CBI personal and work-related subscales. It appears that counselor educators who identify as having greater perceived competence in leadership, using the PPLE criteria, have lower probabilities of experiencing burnout (personal and work-related), while counselor educators who identify as having lower perceived competence in leadership seem to have higher probabilities of experiencing burnout. Having a larger sample size might emphasize the strength of the relationship between the variables of interest. Third, the PPLES experience and competence subscales, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load were not found to be significant predictors of the three CBI subscales. Increasing the sample size could allow for more accurate analyses of the predictors of interest. However, it might also be informative to experiment with the removal of predictors from the analyses and observing the effect. Regarding future research, replicating this study with a larger sample size would be beneficial to account for greater effect size in the analyses. This study did not address mediation or moderation effects between the leadership and burnout; future research should include measures related to social support and physical health, which may provide information about these models. Future

research might also consider different predictor variables including demographic characteristics, occupational satisfaction, work-life fit, turnover intention, and personality characteristics to determine if they are significant in explaining the variance in burnout for counselor educators. It would also be meaningful to engage in qualitative or mixed-method analyses to better understand the reasons some counselor educators appear more resilient to burnout than others. The findings from this study inform current and future counselor educators and administrators who will and currently engage in leadership roles at the national, regional, state, local, institutional, and classroom levels.

Summary of the Study

Extant research indicates that leadership is an important construct to examine since it appears to influence burnout for counselor educators (Coaston, 2013; Hill, 2009; Moate et al., 2016; Sangganjanavanich and Balkin, 2013). The servant leadership model adopted and endorsed by CSI (Herr, 2010) seeks to guide members toward the pursuit of excellence using the 10 PPLE (CSI Academy of Leaders, 1999). Therefore, it was proposed that leadership would be significantly related to burnout in counselor educators, and that leadership in addition to gender, faculty rank, and teaching load would be significant predictors of burnout.

This study recruited 129 participants through SurveyMonkey, 123 of whom met the criteria to complete the survey. Of the eligible participants, 55 completed the survey in its entirety. Analysis of the research findings indicated weak negative but not significant relationships between the PPLES experience subscale and the CBI personal, work-related, and student-related subscales. This was also the case for the relationship between the PPLES competence subscale and the CBI student-related subscale. Significant negative weak correlations were found between the PPLES competence subscale and the CBI personal and

work-related subscales. Based on these relationships, it appears that counselor educators who identify as having greater perceived competence in leadership using the PPLE criteria have lower probabilities of experiencing burnout (personal and work-related). On the other hand, it appears that counselor educators who identify as having lower perceived competence in leadership using the PPLE criteria have higher probabilities of experiencing burnout (personal and work-related). The PPLES experience and competence subscales, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load were not found to be significant predictors of the results of the three CBI subscales. Further research is needed to better understand what other variables account for burnout in counselor educators so that current and future counselor educators, administrators, and counselor education preparation programs become aware of and work collaboratively toward minimizing faculty burnout.

REFERENCES

- Alexander-Albritton, C. (2008). *Women counselor educators: Contributors to levels of job satisfaction* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3311517)
- Alexander-Albritton, C., & Hill, N. R. (2015). Familial and institutional factors: Job satisfaction for female counselor educators. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 54*(2), 109–121. doi:10.1002/ceas.12008
- American Counseling Association. (1995). *ACA code of ethics & standards of practice*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- American Counseling Association. (2002). *American counseling association task force on counselor-wellness and impairment*. Retrieved from <http://www.creating-joy.com/taskforce/index.htm>
- American Counseling Association. (2005, 2014). *ACA code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- American School Counselor Association. (2012). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Sixma, H. J., & Bosveld, W. (2001). Burnout contagion among general practitioners. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 20*(1), 82–89. doi:10.1521/jscp.20.1.82.22251
- Bardhoshi, G., Schweinle, A., & Duncan, K. (2014). Understanding the impact of school factors on school counselor burnout: A mixed-methods study. *Professional Counselor, 4*(5), 426–443. doi:10.15241/gb.4.5.426
- Barkhuizen, N., Rothmann, S., & van de Vijver, F. J. (2014). Burnout and work engagement of academics in higher education institutions: Effects of dispositional optimism. *Stress and Health, 30*(4), 322–332. doi:10.1002/smi.2520
- Barnes, L. B., Agago, M. O., & Coombs, W. T. (1998). Effects of job-related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(4), 457–469. doi:0361-0365/98/0800-0457\$15.00/0
- Barnett, K., & McCormick, J. (2004). Leadership and individual principal-teacher relationships in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(3), 406–434. doi:10.1177/0013161X03261742
- Bartley, A. E. (2005). *Correlates of burnout in counselor educators* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3190888)
- Bass, B. M. (2003). Face to face – Power to change: A conversation with Bernard M. Bass. *Leadership in Action, 23*(2), 9–11. doi:10.1002/lia.1013

- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2014). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Bhindi, N., & Duignan, P. (1997). Leadership for a new century: Authenticity, intentionality, spirituality and sensibility. *Educational Management & Administration*, 25(2), 117–132. doi:10.1177/0263211X97252002
- Blankertz, L., & Robinson, S. (1997). Turnover intentions of community mental health workers in psychosocial rehabilitation services. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 33(6), 517–529. doi:10.1023/A:1025000703487
- Blount, A. J., Taylor, D. D., Lambie, G. W., & Anwell, A. N. (2016). Clinical supervisors' perceptions of wellness: A phenomenological view on supervisee wellness. *The Professional Counselor*, 6(4), 360-374. doi:10.15241/ab.6.4.360
- Borritz, M., Rugulies, R., Bjorner, J. B., Villadsen, E., Mikkelsen, O. A., & Kristensen, T. S. (2006). Burnout among employees in human service work: Design and baseline findings of the PUMA study. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 34, 49–58. doi:10.1080/14034940510032275
- Bozeman, B., & Gaughan, M. (2011). Job satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 82(2), 154–186. doi:10.1353/jhe.2011.0011
- Brogan, J., Suarez, E., Rehfuess, M., & Shope, R. (2013). Increasing student self-efficacy through counselor education teaching methods. *VISTAS*, 39, 1–11. Retrieved from https://www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/vistas/increasing-student-self-efficacy-through-counselor-education-teaching-methods.pdf?sfvrsn=ed627a16_12
- Byrne, B. M. (1991). The Maslach Burnout Inventory: Validating factorial invariance across intermediate, secondary, and university educators. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 26(4), 583–605. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr2604_2
- Chang, C. Y., Minton, C. A. B., Dixon, A. L., Myers, J. E., & Sweeney, T. J. (Eds.). (2012). *Professional counseling excellence through leadership and advocacy*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Cherry, A. (2000). *A research primer for the helping professions*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Chi Sigma Iota. (2018). *Strategic plan*. Retrieved from https://www.csi-net.org/?page=Strategic_Plan
- Chi Sigma Iota Academy of Leaders. (1999). *Principles and practices of leadership excellence*. Retrieved from http://www.csi-net.org/?Leadership_Practices
- Coaston, S. C. (2013). *The experience of burnout in counselor education: Considering perceived worklife fit and turnover intention* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest

Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3596019)

- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2015). *2016 CACREP standards*. Retrieved from <https://www.cacrep.org/for-programs/2016-cacrep-standards/>
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2018). *Welcome to CACREP*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cacrep.org>
- Crabtree, S. (2004). Getting personal in the workplace: Are negative relationships squelching productivity in your company? *Gallup Management Journal*. Retrieved October 2, 2017, from <http://gmj.gallup.com/content/default.aspx?ci=11956>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory*. Philadelphia, PA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Davis, T. E., Heller Levitt, D., McGlothlin, J. M., & Hill, N. R. (2006). Perceived expectations related to promotion and tenure: A national survey of CACREP program liaisons. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 46, 146–156. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00019.x
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Vardakou, I., & Kantas, A. (2003). The convergent validity of two burnout instruments: A multitrait-multimethod analysis. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 19(1), 12–23. doi:10.1027//1015-5759.19.1.12
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dewa, C. S., Loong, D., Bonato, S., Thanh, N. X., & Jacobs, P. (2014). How does burnout affect physician productivity? A systematic literature review. *BioMed Central Health Services Research*, 14(1), 325. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-14-325
- Dillman, D. A. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Doyle, C., & Hind, P. (1998). Occupation stress, burnout and job status in female academics. *Gender, Work, and Organization*, 5(2), 67–82. doi:10.1111/1468-0432.00047
- Du Plooy, J., & Roodt, G. (2010). Work engagement, burnout and related constructs as predictors of turnover intentions. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology/SA Tydskrif vir Bedryfsielkunde*, 36(1), 1–13. doi:10.4102/sajip.v36i1.910
- Eatough, V., & Smith, J. (2006). 'I was like a wild person': Understanding feelings of anger using interpretative phenomenological analysis. *British Journal of Psychology*, 97, 483–498. doi:10.1348/000712606X97831

- Eberly, M. B., Johnson, M. D., Hernandez, M., & Avolio, B. J. (2013). An integrative process model of leadership: Examining loci, mechanisms, and event cycles. *American Psychologist*, 68, 427–443. doi:10.1037/a0032244
- Edward, K. (2005). The phenomenon of resilience in crisis care mental health clinicians. *International Journal of Medical Health Nursing*, 14, 142–148. doi:10.1111/j.1440-0979.2005.00371.x
- Emery, S., Wade, T. D., & McLean, S. (2009). Associations among therapist beliefs, personal resources and burnout in clinical psychologists. *Behaviour Change*, 26(2), 83–96. doi:10.1375/bech.26.2.83
- Farber, B. A. (2000). Treatment strategies for different types of teacher burnout. *In Session: Psychotherapy in Practice*, 56(5), 675–689. doi:10.1002/(ISSN)1520-6572
- Feeney, S. C. (1998). Humanistic leadership in the 1990s: Heart, soul, and head. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 8(4), 413–420. doi:10.1002/nml.8408
- Fowler, F. (2002). *Survey research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burnout. *Journal of Social Issues*, 30, 159–165. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1974.tb00706.x
- Fujiwara, K., Tsukishima, E., Tsutsumi, A., Kawakami, N., & Kishi, R. (2003). Interpersonal conflict, social support, and burnout among home care workers in Japan. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 45(5), 313–320. doi:10.1539/joh.45.313
- Fulton, C. L., & Shannonhouse, L. (2014). Developing servant leadership through counselor community engagement: A case example. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, 1(1), 98–111. doi:10.1080/2326716X.2014.886978
- Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Giampetro-Meyer, A., Brown, T., Browne, M. N., & Kubasek, N. (1998). Do we really want more leaders in business? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(15), 1727–1736. doi:10.1023/A:100609210
- Gladding, S. (2009). *Counseling: A comprehensive profession*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Gmelch, W. H., Lovrich, N. P., & Wilke, P. K. (1984). Sources of stress in academe: A national perspective. *Research in Higher Education*, 20(4), 477–490. doi:10.1007/BF00974924
- Golembiewski, R. T., Boudreau, R. A., Sun, B. C., & Luo, H. (1998). Estimates of burnout in public agencies: Worldwide, how many employees have which degrees of burnout, and what consequences? *Public Administration Review*, 58(1), 59–65. doi:10.1111/(ISSN)1540-6210

- Gomel, D. (2015). *Retaining behavioral healthcare employees of the millennial generation* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2995&context=dissertations>
- Granello, D. H., & Wheaton, J. E. (2004). Online data collection: Strategies for research. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 82, 387–393. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2004.tb00325.x
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Retrieved from https://www.essr.net/~jafundo/mestrado_material_itgikhnd/IV/Lideranas/The%20Servant%20as%20Leader.pdf
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness* (25th anniv. ed.). New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (2003). *The servant leader within: A transformative path*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. (2008). *The servant as leader*. Westfield, IN: The Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership.
- Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2000(105), 5-20. doi:10.1002/ir.10501
- Harrison, B. J. (1999). Are you destined to burn out? *Fund Raising Management*, 30(3), 25–27.
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Heavey, A. L., Holwerda, J. A., & Hausknecht, J. P. (2013). Causes and consequences of collective turnover: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(3), 412–453. doi:10.1037/a0032380
- Heppner, P. P., Wampold, B. E., & Kivlighan, D. M. (2008). *Research design in counseling* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- Herr, E. L. (2010). *Leadership: A CSI position paper*. Retrieved from http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.csi-net.org/resource/resmgr/research,_essay,_papers,_articles/leadership_herr_position_pap.pdf
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1979). *Management of organization behavior: Utilizing human resources*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hill, N. R. (2004). The challenges experienced by pretenured faculty members in counselor

- education: A wellness perspective. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 44, 135–146. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2004.tb01866.x
- Hill, N. R. (2009). An empirical exploration of the occupational satisfaction of counselor educators: The influences of gender, tenure status, and minority status. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 87, 55–61. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2009.tb00549.x
- Hogan, J. M., Carlson, J. G., & Dua, J. (2002). Stressors and stress reactions among university personnel. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 9(4), 289–310. doi:10.1023/A:1019982316327
- Hogan, R. L., & McKnight, M. A. (2007). Exploring burnout among university online instructors: An initial investigation. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 10(2), 117–124. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2007.03.001
- Hughes, F. R., & Kleist, D. M. (2005). First-semester experiences of counselor education doctoral students. *Journal of Counselor Education and Supervision*, 45(2), 97–115. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2005.tb00133.x
- Hutchens, N., Block, J., & Young, M. (2013). Counselor educators' gatekeeping responsibilities and students' First Amendment rights. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 52(2), 82–95. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2013.00030.x
- Jackson, S. E., Schwab, R. L., & Schuler, R. S. (1986). Towards an understanding of the burnout phenomenon. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(4), 630–640. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/apl/index.aspx>
- Jeffries, E. N. (1993). *The heart of leadership*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Johns, H. E., & Moser, H. R. (2001). From trait to transformation: The evolution of leadership theories. *Education*, 110(1), 115–122. Retrieved from <http://www.educationpublishing.com/ej.shtml>
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Faculty worklife: Establishing benchmarks across groups. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(5), 539–555. Retrieved from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/101599/>
- Kalliath, T. J., O'Driscoll, M. P., Gillespie D. F., & Bluedorn, A. C. (2000). A test of the Maslach Burnout Inventory in three samples of healthcare professionals. *Work & Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health & Organisations*, 14(1), 35–50. doi:10.1080/026783700417212
- Kirby, P. C., Paradise, L. V., & King, M. I. (1992). Extraordinary leaders in education: Understanding transformational leadership. *Journal of Educational Research*, 85(5), 303–311. doi:10.1080/00220671.1992.9941130
- Kok, S. K., Douglas, A., McClelland, B., & Bryde, D. (2010). The move towards managerialism: Perceptions of staff in “traditional” and “new” UK universities. *Tertiary Education and*

- Management*, 16(2), 99–113. doi:10.1080/13583881003756740
- Kottler, J. A. (2003). *On being a therapist* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K. B. (2005). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work & Stress*, 19(3), 192–207. doi:10.1080/02678370500297720
- Lackritz, J. R. (2004). Exploring burnout among university faculty: Incidence, performance, and demographic issues. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(7), 713–729. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2004.07.002
- Larson, L. (1998). The social cognitive model of counselor training. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 26(2), 219–273. doi:10.1177/0011000098262002
- Lawson, G. (2007). Counselor wellness and impairment: A national survey. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development*, 46(1), 20–34. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1939.2007.tb00023.x
- Lazarus, R. S. (1999). *Stress and emotion: A new synthesis*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Lease, S. H. (1999). Occupational role stressors, coping, support, and hardiness as predictors of strain in academic faculty: An emphasis on new and female faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, 40(3), 285–307. doi:10.1023/A:1018747000082
- Lechuga, V. M. (2006). *The changing landscape of the academic profession: The culture of faculty at for-profit colleges and universities*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lee, C. C., & Rodgers, R. A. (2009). Counselor advocacy: Affecting systemic change in the public arena. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 87(3), 284–287. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2009.tb00108.x
- Lee, R. V. (2008). *Burnout among professional school counselors* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3373608)
- Lee, S. M., Baker, C. R., Cho, S. H., Heckathorn, D. E., Holland, M. W., Newgent, R. A., . . . Yu, K. (2007). Development and initial psychometrics of the counselor burnout inventory. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 40(3), 142–154.
- Leinbaugh, T., Hazler, R. J., Bradley, C., & Hill, N. R. (2003). Factors influencing counselor educators' subjective sense of well-being. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 43, 52–64. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2003.tb01829.x
- Leiter, M. P. (1993). Burnout as a development process. In W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Marek (Eds), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 237–249). Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis.

- Lent, J., & Schwartz, R. C. (2012). The impact of work setting, demographic characteristics, and personality factors related to burnout among professional counselors. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 34*(4), 355–372.
- Levitt, D. H., & Hermon, D. A. (2009). Career experiences of counselor educators: Early and near-tenure experiences. *Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision, 1*(1), 10–22. doi:10.7729/11.0105
- Lewis, T. F. (2012). Foundations of leadership: Theory, philosophy, and research. In C. Y. Chang, C. A. Barrio Minton, A. L. Dixon, J. E. Myers, & T. J. Sweeney (Eds.), *Professional counseling excellence through leadership and advocacy* (pp. 21–40). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lim, N., Kim, E., Kim, H., Yang, E., & Lee, S. (2010). Individual and work-related factors influencing burnout of mental health professionals: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 47*(2), 86–96. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1920.2010.tb00093.x
- Lindholm, J. A. (2003). Perceived organizational fit: Nurturing the minds, hearts, and personal ambitions of university faculty. *The Review of Higher Education, 27*(1), 125–149. doi:10.1353/rhe.2003.0040
- Logan, S. M. (2016). *Examining psychological hardiness and leadership practices and their relation to occupational satisfaction among counselor educators* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Florida, FL.
- Lucas, C. J. (2006). *American higher education: A history* (2nd ed.). New York City, NY: Palgrave MacMillion.
- Magnuson, S. (2002). New assistant professors of counselor education: Their 1st year. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*(4), 306–320. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2002.tb01293.x
- Magnuson, S., Black, L. L., & Lahman, M. K. (2006). The 2000 cohort of new assistant professors of counselor education: Year 3. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45*(3), 162–179. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00140.x
- Magnuson, S., Norem, K., & Haberstroh, S. (2001). New assistant professors of counselor education: Their preparation and their induction. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40*(3), 220–229. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2001.tb01254.x
- Magnuson, S., Shaw, H., Tubin, B., & Norem, K. (2004). Assistant professors of counselor education: First and second year experiences. *Journal of Professional Counseling, Practice, Theory, & Research, 32*(1), 3–18. Retrieved from https://www.txca.org/Login.asp?MODE=LOGIN&Login_Redirect=True&Login_RedirectURL=%2Ftca%2FTCA%5FJOURNAL%2Easp
- Magnuson, S., Wilcoxon, S. A., & Norem, K. (2003). Career paths of professional leaders in counseling: Plans, opportunities, and happenstance. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education, & Development, 42*(1), 42–52. doi:10.1002/j.2164-490X.2003.tb00167.x

- Maslach, C. (1993). Burnout: A multidimensional perspective. In W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Marek (Eds), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 19–32). Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis.
- Maslach, C. (2003). *Burnout: The cost of caring*. Cambridge, MA: Malor Books.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2(2), 99-113. doi:10.1002/job.4030020205
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1984). Burnout in organizational settings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Applied social psychology annual: Vol. 5*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996). *Maslach burnout inventory manual* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Maslach, C., & Gomes, M. E. (2006). Overcoming burnout. In R. MacNair (Ed.), *Working for peace: A handbook of practical psychology and other tools* (43-49). Atascadero, CA: Impact Publishers.
- Maslach, C., & Schaufeli, W. B. (1993). Historical and conceptual development of burnout. In W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach, & T. Marek (Eds), *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research* (pp. 1–16). Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 387–422. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397
- McAdams, C. R., Foster, V. A., & Ward, T. J. (2007). Remediation and dismissal policies in counselor education: Lessons learned from a challenge in federal court. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 46(3), 212–229. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2007.tb00026.x
- McDougle, L. R. (2009). *Servant leadership in higher education: An analysis of the perceptions of higher education employees regarding servant leadership practices at varying types of institutions* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3387783)
- McKibben, W. B. (2015). *Development and validation of the Dynamic Leadership in Counseling Scale-Self Report* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3708150)
- McKibben, W. B, Webber, W. B., & Wahesh, E. (2017). Exploring CSI chapter leaders' development toward leadership excellence. *Journal of Counselor Leadership and Advocacy*, 4(1), 52–65. doi:10.1080/2326716X.2017.1282
- Mellin, E. A., Hunt, B., & Nichols, L. M. (2011). Counselor professional identity: Findings and implications for counseling and interprofessional collaboration. *Journal of Counseling &*

- Development*, 89(2), 140–147. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00071.x
- Merriman, J. (2015). Enhancing counselor supervision through compassion fatigue education. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 93(3), 370–378. doi:10.1002/jcad.12035
- Milfont, T. L., Denny, S., Ameratunga, S., Robinson, E., & Merry, S. (2008). Burnout and wellbeing: Testing the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory in New Zealand teachers. *Social Indicators Research*, 89, 169–177. doi:10.1007/s11205-007-9229-9
- Millis, B. J. (1994). Faculty development in the 1990s: What it is and why we can't wait. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 72, 454–464. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1994.tb00974.x
- Mintz, J. A. (1999). Faculty development and teaching: A holistic approach. *Liberal Education*, 85(2), 32–37. Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation>
- Moate, R. M., Gnilka, P. B., West, E. M., & Bruns, K. L. (2016). Stress and burnout among counselor educators: Differences between adaptive perfectionists, maladaptive perfectionists, and nonperfectionists. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 94(2), 161–171. doi:10.1002/jcad.12073
- Mor Barak, M. E., Nissly, J. A., & Levin, A. (2001). Antecedents to retention and turnover among child welfare, social work, and other human service employees: What can we learn from past research? A review and metanalysis. *Social Service Review*, 75(4), 625–661. doi:10.1086/323166
- Mullen, P. R., & Gutierrez, D. (2016). Burnout, stress and direct student services among school counselors. *The Professional Counselor*, 6(4), 344–359. doi:10.15241/pm.6.4.344
- Niles, S. G., Akos, P., & Cutler, H. (2001). Counselor educators' strategies for success. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 40(4), 276–291. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2001.tb01260.x
- O'Meara, K., Terosky, A. L., & Neumann, A. (2008) Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 34(3), 1–221. doi:10.1002/(ISSN)1554-6306
- Oser, C. B., Biebel, E. P., Pullen, E., & Harp, K. L. (2013). Causes, consequences, and prevention of burnout among substance abuse treatment counselors: A rural versus urban comparison. *Journal of psychoactive drugs*, 45(1), 17–27. doi:10.1016/j.jsat.2010.11.015
- Paradise, L. V., Ceballos, P. T., & Hall, S. (2010). Leadership and leader behavior in counseling: Neglected skills. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 32(1), 46–55. doi:10.1007/s10447-009-9088-y
- Paris Jr., M., & Hoge, M. A. (2010). Burnout in the mental health workforce: A review. *The Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, 37(4), 519–528. doi:10.1007/s11414-009-9202-2

- Parry, K. W., & Proctor-Thomson, S. B. (2002). Perceived integrity of transformational leaders in organisational settings. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 35(2), 75–96. doi:10.1023/A:101307710
- Pines, A. M., & Aronson, E. (1988). *Career burnout*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Radey, M., & Figley, C. R. (2007). The social psychology of compassion. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 35(3), 207–214. doi:10.1007/s10615-007-0087-3
- Rath, T., & Clifton, D. O. (2004, July 8). The power of praise and recognition. *The Gallup Management Journal*. Retrieved from: <http://news.gallup.com/businessjournal/12157/power-praise-recognition.aspx>
- Rice, E. M., Rady, M. Y., Hamrick, A., Verheijde, J. L., & Pendergast, D. K. (2008). Determinants of moral distress in medical and surgical nurses at an adult acute tertiary care hospital. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 16, 360–373. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2834.2007.00798.x
- Romero, D., & Pinkey, J. (1980). Role swapping: An antidote to professional burnout. *Journal of Counselor Education and Supervision*, 20(1), 6–14. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.1980.tb02026.x
- Rössler, W. (2012). Stress, burnout, and job dissatisfaction in mental health workers. *European Archives of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience*, 262(2), 65–69. doi:10.1007/s00406-012-0353-4
- Rude, W. J. (2004). *The connection between servant leadership and burnout* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. MR15212)
- Rush, R. R. (2003). *The influence of selected factors on burnout among faculty in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3112713)
- Sabharwal, M., & Corley, E. A. (2009). Faculty job satisfaction across gender and discipline. *The Social Science Journal*, 46(3), 539–556. doi:10.1016/j.soscij.2009.04.015
- Sánchez-Moreno, E., de La Fuente Roldán, I., Gallardo-Peralta, L. P., & Barrón López deRoda, A. (2015). Burnout, informal social support and psychological distress among social workers. *British Journal of Social Work*, 45(8), 2368–2386. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcu084
- Sangganjanavanich, V. F., & Balkin, R. S. (2013). Burnout and job satisfaction among counselor educators. *The Journal of Humanistic Counseling*, 52(1), 67–79. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1939.2013.00033.x
- Sax, L. J., Gilmartin, S. K., & Bryant, A. N. (2003). Assessing response rates and nonresponse bias in web and paper surveys. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(4), 409–432. doi:10.1023/A:1024232915870

- Schaufeli, W. B., & Enzmann, D. (1998). *The burnout companion to study and practice: A critical analysis*. Philadelphia, PA: Taylor and Francis.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Greenglass, E. R. (2001). Introduction to special issue on burnout and health. *Psychology & Health, 16*(5), 501–510. doi:10.1080/08870440108405523
- Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2009). Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. *Career Development International, 14*(3), 204–220. doi:10.1108/13620430910966406
- Schutte, N., Toppinen, S., Kalimo, R., & Schaufeli, W. (2000). The factorial validity of the Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey (MBI-GS) across occupational groups and nations. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*, 53–66. doi:10.1348/096317900166877
- Schuyler, K. G., & Branagan, L. (2003). The power line: A model for generating a systematic focus on organizational health. *Journal of Applied Sociology, 20*(2), 77–88. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43736069>
- Sendjaya, S., & Sarros J. C. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origins, development, and application in organizations. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 9*(2), 57–64. doi:10.1177/107179190200900205
- Shallcross, L. (2009, December). Counseling profession reaches the big 5-0. *Counseling Today, 52*(6), 39.
- Shirom, A. (1989). Burnout in work organizations. In C. L. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organization psychology* (pp. 25–48). Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Siegall, M., & McDonald, T. (2004). Person-organization value congruence, burnout, and diversion of resources. *Personnel Review, 33*(3) 291–301. doi:10.1108/00483480410528832
- Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and servant leadership: Content and contextual comparisons. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 10*(4), 80–91. doi:10.1177/107179190401000406
- Spears, L. C. (Ed.). (1998). *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, spirit, and servant leadership*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Spears, L. C. (2004). Practicing servant leadership. *Leader to Leader, 34*, 7–11. Retrieved from <https://apscomunicacionpublic.files.wordpress.com/2012/12/larry-spears-practicing-servant-leadership.pdf>
- Spears, L. C. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *Journal of Virtues & Leadership, 7*(1), 25–30. Retrieved from https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/jvl/vol1_iss1/Spears_Final.pdf

- Stamm, B. H. (2002). Measuring compassion satisfaction as well as fatigue: Developmental history of the compassion satisfaction and fatigue test. In C. R. Figley (Ed.), *Treating compassion fatigue* (pp. 107–122). New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.
- Stamm, B. H. (2005). *The ProQOL manual: The professional quality of life scale: Compassion satisfaction, burnout & compassion fatigue/secondary trauma scales*. Lutherville, MD: Sidran Press.
- Star, K. L. (2013). *The relationship between self-care practices, burnout, compassion fatigue, and compassion satisfaction among professional counselors and counselors-in-training* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3618924)
- Steele, K. M. (2014). *Degree of implementation of the American school counselor association national model and school counselor burnout* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3580525)
- Stone, A. G., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(4), 349–361. doi:10.1108/01437730410538671
- SurveyMonkey. (2017, July 19). *Security statement*. Retrieved from: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/policy/security/>
- Sweeney, T. J. (2012). Leadership for the counseling profession. In C. Y. Chang, C. A. Barrio Minton, A. L. Dixon, J. E. Myers, & T. J. Sweeney (Eds.), *Professional counseling excellence through leadership and advocacy* (pp. 3–20). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Talbot, L. A. (2000). Burnout and humor usage among community college nursing faculty. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 24(5), 359–374. doi:10.1080/106689200263962
- Taris, T. W., Le Blanc, P. M., Schaufeli, W. B., Schreurs, P. J. G. (2005). Are there causal relationships between the dimensions of the Maslach Burnout Inventory? A review and two longitudinal tests. *Work and Stress*, 19(3), 238–255. doi:10.1080/02678370500270453
- Tead, O. (1935). *The art of leadership*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Thelin, J. R. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Thompson, E. H., Frick, M. H., & Trice-Black, S. (2011). Counselor-in-training perceptions of supervision practices related to self-care and burnout. *Professional Counselor*, 1(3), 152–162. doi:10.15241/eh.1.3.152
- Tümekaya, S. (2006). Faculty burnout in relation to work environment and humor as a coping strategy. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 6(3), 911–921.

- Valente, F. (2015). *Empathy and servant leadership in education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3662876)
- van Emmerik, I. H. (2002). Gender differences in the effects of coping assistance on the reduction of burnout in academic staff. *Work & Stress, 16*(3), 251–263. doi:10.1080/0267837021000034593
- Wahesh, E., & Myers, J. E. (2012). *Principles and practices of leadership excellence survey (PPLES)*. Greensboro, NC: Chi Sigma Iota Counseling Academic & Professional Honor Society International. Retrieved from https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.csi-net.org/resource/resmgr/Research,_Essay,_Papers,_Articles/PPLE_Study.pdf
- Wahesh, E., & Myers, J. E. (2014). Principles and practices of leadership excellence: CSI chapter presidents' experience, perceived competence, and rankings of importance. *Journal of Counselor Leadership & Advocacy, 1*(1), 83–97. doi:10.1080/2326716X.2014.886977
- Wardle, E. A., & Mayorga, M. G. (2016). Burnout among the counseling profession: A survey of future professional counselors. *I-Manager's Journal on Educational Psychology, 10*(1), 9–15. Retrieved from <http://www.imanagerpublications.com/journalsfulldetails/7/JournalonEducationalPsychology>
- Wester, K. L., Trepal, H. C., & Myers, J. E. (2009). Wellness of counselor educators: An initial look. *The Journal of Humanistic Counseling, 48*(1), 91–109. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1939.2009.tb00070.x
- Whitelaw, G. (2012). *The Zen leader: 10 ways to go from barely managing to leading fearlessly*. Pompton Plains, NJ: Career Press.
- Wilkerson, K. (2009). An examination of burnout among school counselors guided by stress-strain-coping theory. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 87*(4), 428–437. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2009.tb00127.x
- Wilkerson, K., & Bellini, J. (2006). Intrapersonal and organizational factors associated with burnout among school counselors. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 84*(4), 440–450. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2006.tb00428.x
- Wong, P. T. P., & Page, D. (2003, October). *Servant leadership: An opponent-process model and the revised servant leadership profile*. Paper presented at the Servant Leadership Roundtable. Retrieved from [http://www.drpaulwong.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Wong-Servant leadership-An-Opponent-Process-Model.pdf](http://www.drpaulwong.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Wong-Servant%20leadership-An-Opponent-Process-Model.pdf)
- Yager, G. G., & Tovar-Blank, Z. G. (2007). Wellness and Counselor Education. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 46*(2), 142–153. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1939.2007.tb00032.x
- Zusman, A. (1999). Issues facing higher education in the twenty-first century. In P. G. Altbach,

R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century* (pp. 109–150). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

APPENDIX A: IRB Approval

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

April 5, 2018

John J. S. Harrichand

IRB Exemption 3196.040518: The Relationship Between Counselor Educators' Leadership Experience and Competence and Burnout

Dear John J. S. Harrichand,

The Liberty University Institutional Review Board has reviewed your application in accordance with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) and Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations and finds your study to be exempt from further IRB review. This means you may begin your research with the data safeguarding methods mentioned in your approved application, and no further IRB oversight is required.

Your study falls under exemption category 46.101(b)(2), which identifies specific situations in which human participants research is exempt from the policy set forth in 45 CFR 46:101(b):

- (2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
 - (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Please note that this exemption only applies to your current research application, and any changes to your protocol must be reported to the Liberty IRB for verification of continued exemption status. You may report these changes by submitting a change in protocol form or a new application to the IRB and referencing the above IRB Exemption number.

If you have any questions about this exemption or need assistance in determining whether possible changes to your protocol would change your exemption status, please email us at irb@liberty.edu.

Sincerely,



Administrative Chair of Institutional Research
The Graduate School

LIBERTY

UNIVERSITY

Liberty University | Training Champions for Christ since 1971

APPENDIX B: Recruitment Email/Post to Counselor Educators

Dear Counselor Educator,

My name is John Harrichand, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Counselor Education and Supervision Program at Liberty University. I would like to invite you to participate in my dissertation research study examining the **relationship between counselor educators' leadership experience and competence and burnout**. I am conducting this study to fulfill degree requirements for the Ph.D. in Counselor Education and Supervision at Liberty University. This study has been approved by the Liberty University Institutional Review Board (Approval #: 3196.040518).

About the Study:

If you choose to participate, you will be asked to complete a survey. **The survey is anonymous and takes approximately 25 minutes to complete.** Participation in this survey is completely voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw at any time during the survey. You may withdraw by exiting the survey and closing the browser window.

Eligibility:

You may participate in this study if you meet the following criteria:

1. You are 18 years of age or older
2. You have earned a Ph.D./Ed.D. in Counseling or Counselor Education
3. You are currently employed as a full-time faculty member in a CACREP-accredited counseling program in the United States

Contacting the Researcher:

If you have any questions regarding this study you may contact me by phone [REDACTED] or email at [REDACTED]. My dissertation chair is Dr. John Thomas, and he may be reached at [REDACTED].

How to participate:

If you choose to participate in this research study, the link below will direct you to consent information. The consent information will explain the study and any potential benefits/risks involved. If you agree to the consent document and qualify for the study based on the screening questions, you will then be directed to the survey.

[REDACTED]

Thank you so much in advance for your time and consideration!

Sincerely,
John J. S. Harrichand, Ph.D. Candidate

APPENDIX C: Informed Consent Document

CONSENT FORM

The relationship between counselor educators' leadership experience and competence and burnout

John Harrichand
Liberty University

Department of Counselor Education and Family Studies, School of Behavioral Sciences

You are invited to be in a research study examining the relationship between counselor educators' leadership experience and competence and burnout. You were selected as a possible participant because you are: 18 years of age or older, earned a Ph.D./Ed.D. in Counseling or Counselor Education, and are currently employed as a full-time faculty member in a CACREP-accredited counseling program in the United States. Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

John Harrichand, a doctoral candidate in the Department of Counselor Education and Family Studies, School of Behavioral Sciences at Liberty University, is conducting this study.

Background Information: The purpose of this study is to: (a) examine the leadership behaviors of counselor educators and (b) to determine if burnout is associated with a counselor educators' leadership behaviors (experience and competence). The following research questions will guide this investigation: Do significant correlations exist between the principles and practices of leadership excellence (experiences, competencies) as measured by the Principles and Practices of Leadership Excellence Survey (PPLES; Wahesh & Myers, 2012) and burnout (personal, work related, student related) as measured by the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI; Kristensen, Borritz, Villadsen, & Christensen, 2005) among counselor educators?; To what extent do counselor educators' leadership experience and competence, gender, faculty rank, and teaching load predict burnout?

Procedures: If you agree to be in this study, I would ask you to do the following things:

1. Complete the screening questions to determine eligibility (approximately 1 minute)
2. Complete a demographic questionnaire (approximately 5 minutes)
3. Complete the Principles and Practices of Leadership Excellence Survey (approximately 11 minutes)
4. Complete the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (approximately 5 minutes)

Risks: The risks involved in this study are minimal, which means they are equal to the risks you would encounter in everyday life.

Benefits: The direct benefits participants should expect to receive from taking part in this study include an opportunity to engage in reflections and critical thinking about one's leadership behaviors and level of burnout. This will hopefully lead to better self-care and wellness practices.

Benefits to society include improvements in leadership training, practices, and expectations by administrators and current and future counselor educators at institutions of higher education. In so doing, we will hopefully develop counseling leaders who model and mentor current and future counselor educators, counselors, and clients involved in leadership responsibilities, showing them how to engage in healthy wellness practices in the hopes of minimize the risk of burnout.

Compensation: Participants will not be compensated for participating in this study.

Confidentiality: The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report I might publish, I will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely on a password-protect computer, and only the researcher and doctoral committee members will have access to the records. Your IP address will not be collected to ensure anonymity.

Voluntary Nature of the Study: Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Liberty University. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time prior to submitting the survey without affecting those relationships.

How to Withdraw from the Study: If you choose to withdraw from the study, please exit the survey and close your internet browser.

Contacts and Questions: The researcher conducting this study is John Harrichand. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, **you are encouraged** to contact him at [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED]. You may also contact the researcher's faculty chair, Dr. John Thomas at [REDACTED].

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher, **you are encouraged** to contact the Institutional Review Board, 1971 University Blvd., Green Hall Ste. 1887, Lynchburg, VA 24515 or email at irb@liberty.edu.

A copy of this information can be downloaded for your records.

Statement of Consent: I have read and understood the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

NOTE: The Liberty University Institutional Review Board has approved this document for use from 4/5/2018 to --. **Protocol # 3196.040518**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

APPENDIX D: Screening Questions

- 1) Are you 18 years of age and/or older?
 - Yes
 - No
- 2) Do you hold a doctoral degree (Ph.D./Ed.D.) in Counseling /Counselor Education
 - Yes
 - No
- 3) Are you employed as a full-time faculty member in a CACREP-accredited counseling program in the United States?
 - Yes
 - No

Note:

- Participants who answer “Yes” to all three screening questions will be given access to the full survey.
- Participants who answer “No” to any of the screening questions will be denied access to the full survey and taken to an exit message that reads:

“Unfortunately, you do not meet the participant criteria for this study. Thank you for your time.”

APPENDIX E: Demographic Questionnaire

What age category best describes you?

- 20–29
- 30–39
- 40–49
- 50–59
- 60–69
- 70–79
- 80–89
- 90–99

How do you identify your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Transgender (Male-to-Female or Female-to-Male)
- Other (Please specify:_____)

How would you describe your ethnicity/racial background? *(please check all that apply)*

- American Indian/Native Alaskan
- African American
- Asian American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Caucasian/European-American
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Other (Please specify:_____)

Please indicate which option best describes your relationship status:

- Single
- In a relationship
- In a committed relationship
- Married
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Other (Please specify:_____)
-

Please identify which option best describes your sexual orientation:

- Heterosexual/straight
- Gay/lesbian
- Bi-sexual
- Other (Please specify: _____)

Please identify which option best describes the following statement on your level of perceived social support (partner, family, friends, peers):

“I received social support (partner, family, friends, peers) as a Counselor Educator.”

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Please specify your current teaching load (number of courses) per semester:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- Other (please specify: *number* _____)

Are you employed as a faculty member under a labor union within your university/college?

- Yes
- No

Which of the following identifies the type of higher education institution you are employed at, according to 2015 Carnegie Classifications?

- Master's/M1 (larger programs)
- Master's/M2 (medium programs)
- Master's/M3 (smaller programs)

- Doctoral University/R1 (Very high research activity)
- Doctoral University R2 (Higher research activity)
- Doctoral University R3 (Limited research activity)
- Uncertain (please list name of institution: _____)

Which of the following identifies your employment status?

- Non-tenured
- Tenure track/tenure earning
- Clinical
- Tenured

Which of the following identifies your current rank?

- Assistant Clinical Professor (Clinical track)
- Associate Clinical Professor (Clinical track)
- Clinical Professor (Clinical track)
- Assistant Professor (Tenure track)
- Associate Professor (Tenure track)
- Professor (Tenure track)
- Assistant Professor (Non-Tenure track)
- Associate Professor (Non-Tenure track)
- Professor (Non-Tenure track)

What is your current salary for a 9-month contract?

- under \$35,000
- \$40,001 to \$50,000
- \$50,001 to \$60,000
- \$60,001 to \$70,000
- \$70,001 to \$80,000
- \$80,001 to \$90,000
- \$90,001 to \$100,000
- \$100,001 to \$110,000
- \$110,001 to \$120,000
- \$120,001 to \$130,000
- \$130,001 to \$140,000
- \$140,001 to \$150,000
- \$150,001 to \$160,000
- \$160,001 to \$170,000
- \$170,001 to \$180,000
- \$180,001 to \$190,000

- \$190,001 to \$200,000
- over \$200,000

Did you graduate from a CACREP-accredited doctoral counseling program?

- Yes
- No

How many years have you worked in your current academic position? _____

How many years have you worked as a counselor educator? _____

Which of the following counseling backgrounds do you most strongly identify with?

- Addictions Counseling
- Career Counseling
- Clinical Mental Health Counseling
- Marriage, Couple, and Family Counseling
- Rehabilitation Counseling
- School Counseling
- Student Affairs and College Counseling
- Other (Please specify: _____)

In which ACES (Association for Counselor Education and Supervision) region do you work?

- SACES (Southern; Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia)
- NARACES (North Atlantic; District of Columbia, Europe, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont)
- NCACES (North Central; Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wisconsin)
- RMACES (Rocky Mountain; Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming)
- WACES (Western; Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, as well as Pacific Rim countries)

Select any of the following professional organizations that you are currently a member of:

- American Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (AAMFT)
- American Mental Health Counselors Association (AMHCA)
- American Rehabilitation Counseling Association (ARCA)
- American School Counselor Association (ASCA)
- Association for Adult Development and Aging (AADA)
- Association for Assessment and Research in Counseling (AARC)
- Association for Child and Adolescent Counseling (ACAC)
- Association for Creativity in Counseling (ACC)
- American College Counseling Association (ACCA)
- Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES)
- Association for Humanistic Counseling (AHC)
- Association for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Issues in Counseling (ALGBTIC)
- Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD)
- Association for Spiritual, Ethical, and Religious Values in Counseling (ASERVIC)
- Association for Specialists in Group Work (ASGW)
- Counselors for Social Justice (CSJ)
- International Association for Addictions and Offender Counselors (IAAOC)
- International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors (IAMFC)
- Military and Government Counseling Association (MGCA)
- National Career Development Association (NCDA)
- National Employment Counseling Association (NECA)
- Other (Please specify: _____)

APPENDIX F: Permission to Use the PPLES Assessment

From: Holly Hartwig Moorhead <[REDACTED]>
Date: Friday, June 9, 2017 at 10:39 AM
To: John Harrichand <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, Edward Wahesh <[REDACTED]>
Subject: PPLES Permission

Dear John,

Dr. Stephen Kennedy forwarded to me your request to use the Principles and Practices of Leadership Excellence Survey (PPLES). I'm pleased to provide to you CSI's permission for you to use the [*Principles and Practices of Leadership Excellence Survey*](#) in your research. Please use the following citation when referencing the PPLES:

Wahesh, E., & Myers, J. E. (2012). *Principles and practices of leadership excellence survey (PPLES)*. Greensboro, NC: Chi Sigma Iota Counseling Academic & Professional Honor Society International. Retrieved from: [https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.csi-net.org/resource/resmgr/Research, Essay, Papers, Articles/PPLE_Study.pdf](https://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.csi-net.org/resource/resmgr/Research,_Essay,_Papers,_Articles/PPLE_Study.pdf)

Also, you will note that Dr. Edward Wahesh is cc'd on this email and he, of course, authored the PPLES with Dr. Jane Myers. He has graciously agreed to connect with scholars who are conducting research with the PPLES. We encourage you to follow-up with him for the purposes of expanding the practical application of the PPLES.

We wish you well in your research and hope you will share with CSI the findings of your study so that the Society can benefit from what you learn.

Kind regards,

Holly J. Hartwig Moorhead, Ph.D., LPC, NCC, ACS



Holly J. Hartwig Moorhead, Ph.D., LPC, NCC, ACS

Chief Executive Officer

Chi Sigma Iota Counseling Academic & Professional Honor Society International

P.O. Box 1829

Thomasville, NC 27360

www.csi-net.org

Member, Association of College Honor Societies

APPENDIX G: Principles and Practice of Leadership Excellence Survey (PPLES)

(Wahesh & Myers, 2012; Copyright © Chi Sigma Iota, International, 2013; all rights reserved).

The PPLES can be found here:

https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.csinet.org/resource/resmgr/Research,_Essay,_Papers,_Articles/PPLE_Study.pdf

APPENDIX H: Copenhagen Burnout Inventory

(CBI; Kristensen, Borritz, Villadsen, & Christensen, 2005; all rights reserved)

The CBI can be found here:

<http://www.arbejdsmiljoforskning.dk/~media/Spoergeskemaer/CBI/cbi-data-uk.pdf>

NB: The questions of the CBI were *not* displayed in the questionnaire in the same order as shown here. In fact, the questions were mixed with questions from each part: one, two, and three. This is recommended in order to avoid stereotyped response patterns.