

JOB FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE BURNOUT IN CAMPUS CRISIS RESPONDERS

A Dissertation Submitted to the Temple University Graduate Board

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

By

Melissa DePretto Behan

May 2019

Examining Committee Members:

Joseph Ducette, Ph.D., Advisory Committee Chair, Educational Psychology

James Earl Davis, Ph.D., Higher Education

Jennifer M. Johnson, Ph.D., Higher Education

Subir Sahu, Ph.D., Drexel University

ABSTRACT

Campus crisis responders are critical to ensuring the safety of students on a college campus. However, attrition in student affairs and specifically in the field of residence life (the department that most professionals that serve in an on-call rotation would fall under), continues to be a concern (Marshall et al., 2016). I assert that burnout of staff members in these roles is a large part of the problem and that managers can ameliorate some of that burnout by controlling specific job factors for those who serve as campus crisis responders.

I conducted a quantitative study using an anonymous survey on the Qualtrics platform that was distributed to staff members who serve as campus crisis responders at institutions of higher education. I primarily utilized professional Facebook groups related to Housing and residence life or student affairs in addition to professional email listserves to elicit participants. The effective sample size was 233 and participants were all individuals who serve in an on-call rotation on a college campus. The survey instrument was comprised of demographic questions, as well as questions from the Live-In/Live-On Report (Horowitz 1997) and the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Kristensen et al., 2005).

Findings suggest that while participants who identified as female had a significantly higher rate of burnout than those who identified as male, there were no job

factors that significantly affected the burnout rate of these staff members. The overall burnout rate of campus crisis responders, however, is significantly higher than that of other populations measured by the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory. With that in mind, hiring managers for campus crisis responders should look at the overall issue of burnout in their staff to address issues of attrition. Future research should include looking at staff and supervisor support, and organizational culture.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my dad, who made me who I am. No matter the circumstances or obstacles, my dad believed in me no matter what. He listened, and encouraged, and never faltered in telling me I could do anything because he really believed I could. He insisted that I live my own life on my terms and taught me to be independent and driven. I know that he would be so proud of the life I've built, my beautiful family, and especially this degree I've completed.

This dissertation, and in fact this whole doctoral journey is also dedicated to my girls, Madeline and Eleanor. The hardest part of the past few years was knowing that the time I've spent pursuing this degree meant less time with each of you. I was hesitant to start the degree for that reason, knowing how quickly you were growing, Madeline. I didn't want to miss anything. Eleanor, I got through pregnancy and the bulk of my classes at the same time, and went back to work and class when you were only three months old. During that time I wasn't sure I'd really make it through, that I'd really survive to see the finish line of graduation while not screwing up the two most precious things in my life in the process. However, as much as I missed you while I was in classes, or reading, or staying late at work to write, and as much as I wanted to quit over and over, you both were also my greatest motivation for finishing.

I hope that when you look back on this time (Eleanor-thankfully you won't remember, and Madeline maybe only a little), that instead of the chaos, you will remember how hard I worked to show you both that it really is possible to have it all. And the best part is, while as a grown-up you may still not have figured anything out,

you can define exactly what “all” is for YOU. You can pursue your dreams and ambitions, nurture your family, and have a warm and laughter-filled life. Don’t ever let anyone tell you that you can’t, or shouldn’t. Persist through the days you want to quit, and ignore the people who say you might not succeed. Have dance parties in the dining room, eat too much chocolate, and shake off your grumpies. Live your life and strive for it all. I love you, my two sunshines. Now, get after it.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my faculty committee: Dr. Joseph Ducette, Dr. James Earl Davis, and Dr. Jennifer Johnson for their time and consideration of this dissertation. Dr. Ducette as my chair provided me with endless revisions and feedback, and helped to guide me in the right direction. I truly appreciate the committee's hard questions, and tough feedback that forced me to think harder and dig deeper. You helped me learn to push through the process, be self-driven, and be resilient until the finish line.

A big thanks to Gabrielle Rebillard, IRB Program Coordinator at Temple. You helped walk me through a critical juncture of this process and I am so grateful that you took the time to assist me. You took the time to listen and went above and beyond in helping me move forward in pursuing my research. Temple is lucky to have caring staff like you, and the students you interact with are fortunate to have such a warm, funny, and caring person in their corner!

An important thank you to (future Dr.) Katie Zamulinsky and Dr. Subir Sahu who have given me the gift of a wonderful place to work and the flexibility to get my job done, take care of my family, and finish writing this thing. I truly would not have been able to take on what I have in the time that I did without your endless support.

Thank you to my mother who never understood anything I said about this crazy journey but listened and encouraged me anyway. Thank you for being my biggest cheerleader! You knew I would go back to school even when I was convinced I wouldn't and you always pushed me to chase the dream. Your encouraging words when I just

wasn't sure I could balance it all, and the support you've given always given, have steadied me when I felt uncertain and helped me keep moving forward. Thank you for always being there.

Thank you to my mother-in-law Linda who was there to help soothe crying little ones when I had a pre-schooler, newborn and also evening classes. Thank you for bringing over dinner many nights and never let me clean a dish, and for always being prepared whether it be with some soup or a hug. I felt confident pursuing this degree knowing that you were there to help lift us up and encourage me along the way.

To my husband, Sean: I could write an entire dissertation on just how grateful I am for you. You are the embodiment of unconditional love, and I am thankful every day you chose me. You have always supported every crazy idea I've ever had, and while we don't yet own a cupcake shop, I sure am going to finish this degree (which will probably pay out more in the end anyway). It's not just your support though that has gotten me through this process, but your unwavering belief in me, that has propelled me forward. You have taken on so much and complained so little in the past few years. This is truly a celebration for our family. We did this together. Always Always.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study	2
Residence Life	4
Research Questions.....	6
Significance of the Study	8
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Theoretical Framework.....	9
Burnout	10
The Multi-Dimensional Theory of Burnout.....	11
Burnout and Demographics	14
Impact of Major Campus Crises	15
The Role of the Campus Crisis Responder.....	21
The Measurement of Burnout	22
Summary	24
CHAPTER 3: METHODS	26
Research Methods.....	26
Data Collection	29
Data Analysis	31
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	33
Descriptive Data on the Respondents	33
Descriptive Statistics.....	34
Additional Analyses.....	42
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION	45
Limitations	47
Recommendations for Future Research	48
Recommendations for Future Practice.....	49
Conclusion	50
REFERENCES	51

APPENDIX A	56
Research Survey.....	56
APPENDIX B	75
Live-In/On Report.....	75
APPENDIX C	78
Copenhagen Burnout Inventory	78
APPENDIX D	87
RECRUITMENT EMAIL LANGUAGE	87
APPENDIX E	88
IRB APPROVAL.....	88

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 4.1	GENDER OF RESPONDENTS	34
TABLE 4.2	RACE OF RESPONDENTS	34
TABLE 4.3	MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS.....	34
TABLE 4.4	YEARS WORKING OF RESPONDENTS	34
TABLE 4.5	EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS	35
TABLE 4.6	ANNUAL SALARY OF RESPONDENTS.....	37
TABLE 4.7	ALLOWED TO LIVE WITH ANOTHER PERSON IN ON-CAMPUS RESIDENCE	37
TABLE 4.8	EXISTENCE OF A MEAN PLAN	37
TABLE 4.9	PETS	37
TABLE 4.10	MONEY FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	38
TABLE 4.11	FULL OR PART TIME	39
TABLE 4.12	NUMBER OF RESIDENTS.....	40
TABLE 4.13	STUDENTS	40
TABLE 4.14	HOURS WORKED PER WEEK	40
TABLE 4.15	MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR GENDER	41

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Crisis management on a college campus is something typically undertaken as a collaborative effort between the residence life staff and campus safety personnel (Zdziarski et al., 2007). This collaboration is utilized to manage issues on college campuses such as mental health concerns, interpersonal violence, and even housing relocations because of infrastructure issues. As Eugene Zdziarski, Norbert Dunkel, and J. Michael Rollo explain in their book, *Campus Crisis Management, A Comprehensive Guide to Planning, Prevention, Response, and Recovery*, comprehensive crisis management is critical to ensuring the safety of individuals and the campus community, providing resources to students, and assisting students in navigating difficult situations as they navigate their college experience. While Zdziarski et al. (2007) discuss the variety of structures available for campus crisis management, they consistently reiterate the crucial nature of a well-functioning and collaborative system to prepare for and address crises as they occur.

On a campus it is crucial for crisis responders to be retained in the field for their knowledge and experience in handling crises. Senior student affairs officers (SSAOs) are part of a shifting higher education landscape that requires them to be crisis managers as a primary job function (Zdziarski 2006). This shift in higher education and the role of

SSAOs means that cultivating competent professionals from entry level through senior administration is critical with regards to crisis management.

Currently, the Association for College and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I) has over 950 member institutions globally. With turnover in these positions hovering around 42% (Marshall et al., 2016) attrition is a large problem that may be remedied by ameliorating some of the burnout these professionals experience. Zdziarski et al. (2007) illustrate that having a team comprised of senior officials that have skills and competencies such as knowledge of resources, trainability, and have a job function that keeps them knowledgeable about crisis procedures will lead to more successful crisis response. Higher Education, like many work environments, requires that considerations be taken for staff in these settings to avoid burnout and maintain professional satisfaction and growth. However, research has shown that persistence in the field of student affairs is a challenge with nearly 42% of student affairs staff members leaving the field after only five years (Marshall et al., 2016). It is concerning to think that the staff members with the most experience with crisis management may elect to leave the field early in their careers when the field needs those with strong experience to best respond to challenging situations on campus.

Purpose of the Study

For many campuses across the country, the first-responders for any kind of crisis are graduate students or entry-level professional staff members who work in residence

life (Rankin & Gulley, 2018). These staff members live on campus and respond to crises immediately, often before police, paramedics, or fire departments are able to arrive on scene. These staff ensure on-call coverage every hour of every day across campus so that the students in that community are well served and protected. These staff members then help inform senior leadership of actions taken and remaining needs. This then informs practice and policy decisions made in the moment and in the long-term.

In an ideal scenario, the senior leadership on a college campus has the crisis experience to help guide these entry-level professionals in decision making and in serving the students while action needs to be taken, and to then use their experience to guide the campus community in understanding the issue and recovering. However, many entry-level crisis responders never make it to those critical senior leadership positions due to the high turnover rates (Collins & Hirt, 2016; Marshall et al., 2016; Wilson, 2008). Staff members often move to other areas of higher education or outside the field altogether after working in crisis management largely due to the demands of the position and the physical and emotional toll it takes. In the study conducted by Marshall et al. (2016), burnout and stress of the position were the most frequently cited explanation for people leaving the field of student affairs. Burnout is a condition identified in many contexts, and studied extensively in work settings. The literature on burnout identifies many factors that correlate with this phenomenon including job amenities like salary, and workload and demographic information including age, and

marital status (Maslach et al., 2001; Maslach & Leiter, 1997). However, burning out experienced crisis responders can lead to a dangerous and disheartening situation when the senior campus leadership has no crisis management experience during a major campus trauma.

Residence Life

Residence life departments (sometimes called university housing, or some combination of the two) are typically situated within a division of student affairs at institutions of higher education. Student affairs is typically led by a Dean of Students (or equivalent) who oversees multiple areas that might include housing and residence life, campus activities, Greek life, and even units like counseling or campus dining. A Housing and Residence Life Office is typically overseen by a Director (who reports up through the Dean of Students), a mid-tier level of leadership, and then entry-level staff who serve as the crisis responders. These entry-level staff have supervision responsibilities for student and possibly professional staff. The crisis response teams in these offices are typically made up of a combination of professional and graduate staff members. Depending on the needs of the institution, the staff members at the entry or mid-level may live on campus in order to be available for students and to serve in an on-call duty rotation (Rankin & Gulley, 2018; Zdiarski et al., 2007). Campus crisis responders typically live in the buildings they oversee near the students they work with. Many of their apartments share a wall with their office offering little separation

between professional and personal life. The position also requires a great deal of interpersonal interaction with the students these staff oversee, often resulting in late night roommate mediations or many career-guiding conversations. The staff often supervise others and work on teams that require a great deal of collaboration. The compensation and amenities offered for these positions vary widely and may include allowing for a partner or pet to reside with the staff member, and offering professional development funds (Horowitz, 2018).

Residence life departments may be an auxiliary, making them a more financially independent arm of the institution than their other student affairs counterparts. Due to the live- on component, most staff members work many nights and weekends to best accommodate student schedules. Guthrie et al. (2005) discussed student affairs professionals as reporting high levels of exhaustion and fatigue as a result of being in a stressful, helping profession.

Residence life hires the most entry-level student affairs professionals (Collins & Hirt, 2006) and so it stands to reason that this population, in particular, is susceptible to burnout. Staff members in these roles deal with major campus crises such as mental health concerns, assault on campus, or significant facilities issues in addition to the daily factors of working closely with other people (students in particular). In the 2016 Marshall et al. study, burnout related to putting students' needs ahead of their own was the most frequently cited reason for student affairs professionals leaving the field.

In research done by Belch et al. (2008), a number of best practices for retention were discovered for live-in/on professionals in housing and residence life. They included: allowing pets and partners, a meal plan, flexible scheduling, and access to professional development opportunities. These factors were found to increase job satisfaction and lead to stronger retention in these professionals.

Job factors and amenities, in particular, are largely controlled by the individual institutions and so can be used as mitigating factors rather than exacerbating factors regarding burnout in campus crisis responders. Because of the variation in job amenities, and the research regarding demographic information's impact on burnout, it is critical to consider these factors when assessing burnout in specific populations.

Research Questions

This research was designed to discover:

- 1. To what extent is burnout, as measured by the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory, related to job amenities for crisis responders on college campuses?*
- 2. To what extent is burnout, as measured by the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory, related to demographics of crisis responders on college campuses?*

Key Terms

Burnout: The definition used by the authors of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory is “a state of physical, emotional and mental exhaustion that results from long-term involvement in work situations that are emotionally demanding” (Schaufeli & Greenglass, 2001, p.501).

Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A tool for the measurement of burnout that includes three scales measuring personal, work-related, and client-related burnout (Kristensen et al., 2005).

Crisis: A crisis is an event, which is often sudden or unexpected, that disrupts the normal operations of the institution or its educational mission and threatens the well-being of personnel, property, financial resources, and/or reputation of the institution (Zdziarski, 2006, p.5).

Campus Crisis Responders: Staff members on a college campus who serve in an on-call duty rotation with an expectation of crisis response. These staff members may be graduate students or master’s level staff who work in residence life/housing departments at institutions of higher education.

Crisis Management: The processes or procedures used to respond to a significant event on campus.

Job Amenities: Amenities related to the campus crisis responders' position that may include an apartment, compensation for meals, permission to have a partner or pet reside with the staff member on campus, etc. For the purposes of this proposal the amenities are specifically inquired about in the survey instrument.

Significance of the Study

I argue that discovering which job factors or demographics of crisis responders contribute to burnout in the field could help shape job descriptions, compensation, and amenities provided to this level of staff. In addition, by mediating burnout in these professionals we have the opportunity to increase the staff that constitute campus leadership that have significant crisis management experience while maintaining a student centered approach. While much research on burnout has been conducted regarding employees generally and in person-centered or helping fields (Maslach & Jackson, 1981) there is little to no quantitative research to be found specifically focusing on campus crisis responders. It was the purpose of this research to address that gap.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Sound, holistic decision making during a campus crisis is critical to a successful response and follow-up. When senior leadership at an institution has experience in dealing with crises on the ground level, these decisions are more informed and can be more student centered. Therefore, there is a need to have experienced leaders in decision-making positions. However, the attrition rate for all student affairs administrators (which is the overarching category campus crisis responders would fall under) is high with 42% turnover within five years (Marshall et al., 2016). This means that most entry-level professionals (which is the category that most campus crisis responders fall into), do not persist for long enough in the field to hold senior leadership positions. A large amount of this turnover can be attributed to burnout (Lorden, 1998; Marshall et al., 2016; Vaughn, 2016). Burnout as a factor contributing to attrition in student affairs is the motivation for this research. If recommendations for alleviating burnout can be made it will lead to less attrition, and more experienced leadership on campus long-term.

Theoretical Framework

Burnout is the framework that will be used in this research to better understand how campus crisis responders are responding to work that is very people-oriented, and quite stressful. Job burnout is defined as a response to prolonged interpersonal stressors at work (Maslach et al., 2001). The most common theory of burnout is the

multi-dimensional theory which indicates that burnout has three distinct factors: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). This foundational theory of burnout has led to the development of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory which is the publicly available inventory used in the survey instrument for this research (See Appendix A).

Burnout

Burnout is a phenomenon studied in many contexts, and is applicable to crisis managers on college campuses as well. Burnout research began in healthcare and human services where employees are interacting with people as a main component of their jobs. The term “burnout” was first used to identify the symptoms of severe stress in work places in 1974 by Herbert Freudenberger. Freudenberger identified burnout as a psychological construct and a relatively common issue with individuals who work closely with others. In the mid-1970s, post-World War II, the human services fields were more in demand and as a result, staff in those areas were better trained and viewed as professionals. Therefore, the issue of burnout was heightened in the psychological sciences at this time (Schaufeli et al., 1993). However, it was not until the 1980s that academic researchers, rather than practitioners, truly became involved in framing theories of burnout. At that time burnout had not been studied outside the United States, and so in the mid 1980s when burnout became a globally researched construct, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) was the only measurement instrument

available. As a result, the components of the MBI have become nearly synonymous with burnout.

Burnout is a response to prolonged interpersonal job stress (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Burnout manifests as emotional exhaustion, physical exhaustion, and generally negative feelings about oneself and others particularly as it pertains to one's work. It influences job turnover in addition to morale, quality of work, and absenteeism (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach, 1976; Maslach, 1978).

The Multi-Dimensional Theory of Burnout

Christina Maslach is widely known as the pioneering researcher of this construct and has done an exceptional amount of work defining burnout in addition to developing the 1981 Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). Exhaustion, depersonalization, and low personal accomplishment are the three dimensions widely regarded as the standard for measuring burnout across occupations and are used in defining the MBI as well (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Exhaustion is the feeling of depletion or overextension in one's work. Depersonalization is the interpersonal component of burnout and is categorized as the negative feelings or cynical attitude that develop because of high touch work. Finally, the feeling of low personal accomplishment is the self-described component that manifests as a feeling of ineffectiveness (Maslach et al., 2001).

Arronson et al. (2017) completed a meta-analysis of burnout literature looking at symptoms and work environment to summarize research on burnout in a work setting.

The researchers analyzed 25 different articles. That research team found that most burnout research has historically focused on exhaustion as the main factor; however, depersonalization and low personal accomplishment have significant relations to other factors in people's work. Burnout is highly influenced by factors of work including job demands, support, and the possibility of exerting control (Arronson et al., 2017). The authors looked at 25 different studies, which used a variety of burnout inventories. Their analyses showed significant interaction between high job demands and high emotional exhaustion. Emotional demands and emotional exhaustion were significantly positively correlated, as were patient demands. While this study does not look into job demands, this may be an area for future research. Burnout symptoms were also moderately associated with job control and workplace support. Of note, their analysis also showed that most studies on burnout focus on emotional exhaustion and recommend expanding research efforts to include the other two factors of burnout as well. The authors recommend a serious look at structural job factors as those are highly related to burnout symptoms. A case study looking at a particular institution might be appropriate to get into the nuances of structural factors as related to burnout. Because structural factors can be changed and controlled, they may be able to ameliorate burnout.

The PUMA study was a five-year longitudinal study looking at burnout in Danish workers in the human service sector (Borritz et al., 2006). PUMA is a Danish acronym

for the Project on Burnout, Motivation and Job Satisfaction. The study was a prospective intervention study that included a baseline with three-year and five-year follow-up. It is quasi-experimental because at each phase results were shared with the organization and resulted in interventions as a result. The study worked with seven organizations in the human services sector and included: 10 social security offices, a state psychiatric prison, 16 county institutions for disabled people, three medical wards from two county hospitals, one psychiatric ward from a psychiatric hospital, one rural homecare service, and one urban homecare service. There was a baseline participation of 1,914, which was a response rate of 80.1%.

The baseline data collection occurred between 1999-2000 and then from 2002-2003. Finally, the five-year follow up occurred in 2005. The data were collected using the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Kristensen et al., 2005) and comparing burnout scores to lifestyle factors, job satisfaction, social connections, personality, and other workplace factors. The average age of the participants was 42, and 83% were women. Cronbach's alpha for the scales were 0.87 for personal and work-related burnout and 0.85 for client-related burnout. The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory showed high internal consistency. The scales on demands at work and role conflicts correlated positively with burnout, while scales looking at resources correlated negatively. The authors suggest further research on work environment's impact on burnout, and also

using a random selection of participants as one of the limitations of the study is that the organizations self-selected into the study.

Burnout and Demographics

Since Freudenberger coined the term burnout in the 1970s, the work force in the United States has undergone massive shifts in demographics, most notably with more women and non-white participants over time. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the participation of women in the labor force has increased from approximately 50% in 1970 to around 74% in 2017. Non-white participation in the labor force in that time has also increased approximately 5% (Hipple, 2016). As a result, more research has focused on the intersection of demographics such as race and gender on burnout.

Noting the inconsistencies in research results looking at gender and burnout, Purvanova and Muros (2010) completed a meta-analysis of research that looked at that relationship. The researchers compared 409 effect sizes from 183 studies. The results dug into the three constructs of burnout to reveal significant differences between males and females that go beyond the common belief that women are just generally higher in burnout than men. The researchers looked at 6,806 peer-reviewed articles and unpublished dissertations. They determined the inclusion criteria to be that the articles were written in English and dealt with work-related burnout. Any research results only included the pre-intervention gender-burnout relationship. Finally, only studies for

which data for both male and female participants were included. The results indicated that there were significant differences between women and men in emotional exhaustion as a component of burnout, with women scoring somewhat higher than men ($t=6.56$, $p<.01$) with a mean effect size of .10. For the criteria of depersonalization, the mean effect size is $-.19$ ($t=10.83$, $p<.01$) with men scoring higher than women. The researchers also compared overall burnout scores which showed that women scored higher overall on burnout than men with a mean effect size of .18 ($t=4.37$, $p<.01$). The researchers argue that while the effect sizes are small, practically the differences between men and women in two components of burnout may be important. Because the emotional exhaustion component is widely viewed as the most salient component of burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2008), women may be viewed as more likely to burn out than men when this is not necessarily the case. This can lead to discrimination in the workplace, and to men receiving less care for burnout than women. This study in particular led me to look specifically at the differences between genders in this study.

Impact of Major Campus Crises

To understand why it is critical for experienced administrators to be making decisions in a major campus crisis, one must examine the literature regarding the impact of crises in educational settings. In Asmussen (1995), the authors wanted to develop a better understanding of the psychological and organizational issues of stakeholders involved in a campus crisis, which was a gunman on campus. The authors use a

psychological and organizational approach to look at the data. The authors were doing something unique as no study had ever been done this close to a major crisis on a campus in the past. The researchers wanted to understand what happened on campus immediately and in the short-term to the individuals involved but also overall campus climate and policies.

The researchers interviewed campus administrators and student newspaper reporters in addition to collecting documents regarding campus planning that occurred because of the incident. Several themes emerged from the interviews and observations. The reaction of denial was reported shortly after the incident observed by campus culture essentially going back to normal with class schedules and setup. The severity of the incident was lost on most participants until much later. Fear was another theme exhibited in the class where the shooting took place specifically, but also around the specific assailant and then later on to more general fears. Desire for safety is the third theme where reports say that students were shocked that something could happen at that university. New safety systems were installed on campus as a result. Retriggering was another finding that could be expected based on previous psychological research. Campus planning and preparedness now had renewed support and vigor behind prioritizing. This study takes an extreme case of campus crisis and examines the impact on individuals who were part of that. These findings apply to this research in that campus crisis responders may be the first on the scene of a major incident and will serve

in a support role for others who were impacted. This research emphasizes the importance of comprehensive campus planning, and the stress responses that could lead to burnout.

Fein and Isaacson's study (2009) is designed to look at two forms of emotion work in school teachers at school shooting sites, both surface and deep acting. The researchers interviewed 36 individuals, between 1998-2008, who served in a leadership role at one of seven institutions where high profile violence occurred. The authors use a sociological lens by utilizing emotion work as the frame for which to collect and analyze the data. Data from three qualitative studies over a three-year period were examined to dive deep into the toll that crisis work takes on leaders in the education environment. The authors drew on organizational research around this concept, in addition to frameworks of leadership.

The researchers were looking to discover personal definitions of leadership that may have guided response to the school shootings, the extent to which the leaders' work was changed as a result of the crisis, the toll the crisis work took on the individuals, and the change in the sense of what is possible. The study looked through the lens of emotional work in the field of organizational leadership to analyze the answers to these questions.

Four major findings emerged from the interviews of leaders at school shooting sites. The first is the personal definition of leadership as a compass. Leaders shared the

belief that they were ultimately responsible for the organizations they led which was shaped by a definition of leadership as one who sets and follows a vision. The second theme was that the “job description” of leaders changes because of crises. The crises forced them to act in ways they had not been trained and they all wanted to do the right thing. The third theme was the high personal toll paid by leaders in these situations that sometimes led to negative personal impact. The fourth lesson was that the sense of what is possible had changed-no longer subscribing to an “It will never happen to me” mentality. The third theme is the most applicable to the research regarding campus crisis responders. The physical and emotional stress cited by participants is similar to that described in the definition of burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Having a leadership role during a crisis leads to this stress and burnout. Campus crisis responders deal with crises both small and large on a continuous basis.

Stein’s 2006 study is a case study examining the communications around crisis following a school shooting in Oregon at Thurston High School. The aim was to look at the impact an incident like this can have on responders by looking at communication and information dissemination during and after the crisis. By looking at crisis response in this way through an organizational communication lens, systematic issues can be identified and addressed. The authors specifically identify the theoretical framework as the concept of gatekeeping of how organizations keep and release information. Gatekeeping, or strategically withholding information, and information dissemination

are the main concepts examined in this qualitative study. Research on gatekeeping focuses on influencing social change as cited by the authors (Shoemaker, 1991). The authors were looking at how gatekeeping influenced information dissemination to the public during the Thurston High School shootings, and what best practices might be developed in similar instances concerning information sharing.

This case study focused on the staff of Thurston High School who were employed at the time of the Thurston High School Shootings in May 1998. The authors used interviews with 11 individuals involved in the communication of information in the aftermath of the shootings. The authors uncovered several themes. The first was that all of the interviewees, while having dealt with some level of crisis in the past, were shocked to be part of such a large- scale and public crisis. They also chose to provide the media with information as quickly as possible citing that getting information out was the easiest way to reassure the public. Finally, the large emotional toll on the interviewees was apparent as a theme as well. It was through the proactive planning and experience of the public information officers (PIOs) who made up the participant pool that allowed for swift and accurate information flow, increasing a sense of community and increasing support overall. It also helped assure the public that the school was well prepared and able to respond in the most appropriate way to crises of this magnitude.

Reason and Saunder's article (2003) is grounded in a phenomenological approach using a social constructivist framework. They held to the tenants of these frames by seeking understanding of the experience of an event by a common group of people. The researchers asked whether 16 senior student affairs officers compartmentalized their reactions to a major crisis event (September 11th attacks) into personal and professional themes, and if so what were the consequences of that compartmentalization on each person's performance in both the professional and personal realm. Questions on both personal and professional themes were asked and analyzed, and the focus was on whether these administrators compartmentalized those feelings and reactions and what the consequences of that might be. The researchers used inductive coding to identify themes across the interviews. The researchers formed consensus on these themes and presented these to a group of senior student affairs officers at a national conference as a method of member checking.

The researchers made a point to say that the results should be viewed as tentative, with variables regarding the administrators' institution affecting their professional responses and personal closeness to the events of September 11th also varied greatly. The personal responses included helplessness, heightened emotional state, numb, and stress. Many downplayed their personal responses for the sake of their professional responses. The professional responses included the emergence of three roles: Doer (taking action immediately); Leader (highly visible, bringing together a

team of staff members); and, Connector (collaborating across offices and connecting parents and students with campus stakeholders). The participants focused on the needs of others (students, staff, etc.). However, the compartmentalization of personal and professional reactions may have hindered their performance professionally.

The Role of the Campus Crisis Responder

In 2015 the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) updated their joint competency areas for student affairs professionals to include proficiency in leading a campus crisis (NASPA & ACPA, 2015). These competency areas are a guide to drive education and practice in the field of student affairs. This spotlight on crisis management implies an importance in this skill area for all student affairs practitioners (Shaw, 2018). A campus crisis responder is typically in the role of a Resident Director, Hall Director, Area Coordinator, or a graduate version of these positions. All are essentially synonymous and indicate a position that requires the staff member to live in the residence halls or on campus in order to fulfill the crisis response aspects of the job. In addition, they likely oversee a residence hall, supervise student and/or professional staff, and are responsible for programming and potentially collateral assignment in the department or within the student affairs Division at the institution. What makes these positions so unique is that the staff members literally live where they work and so are interacting with their students around the clock. This situation has the potential for developing high

levels of burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). What differs greatly between institutions is the compensation and amenities provided to those filling these roles.

In an attempt to collect broad information regarding compensation and amenities in live-on crisis responder roles, to better aid individuals searching for jobs, the Live-In/Live-On Report was created in 1997 by Rich Horowitz who currently serves as the Interim Director of Residential Life at Vassar College. Currently a “Google Doc”, there are 650 institutions from across the United States that have submitted compensation and amenity information. Because one of the goals of this research was to provide guidance into how hiring managers and department heads can structure compensation and amenities for campus crisis responders, the nine survey questions from the Live In/Live On Report were used in the data collection of this research study (See Appendix A).

The Measurement of Burnout

The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) is widely considered the standard inventory used to measure the construct of burnout. It was created in 1981 by Christina Maslach and Susan E. Jackson as a way to assess what had only been qualitative research in the area of burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). It was also the first burnout measure to look at multiple dimensions of burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). The general MBI is a survey of 25 items designed to measure the three components of burnout: depersonalization, emotional exhaustion, and personal accomplishment. The

original MBI was designed with human services occupations in mind, and since then four additional versions of the instrument have been developed beyond the general survey to focus on those in human services, medical personnel, educators, and students. In addition, the MBI is used all over the world and demonstrates high validity in all forms and languages (Maslach, Shaufeli & Leiter, 2001).

While the MBI is often considered the gold standard for the measurement of burnout, there are criticisms of the instrument that have led to the development of other, publicly available surveys to measure this construct. Even in the general MBI, critics assert that the survey is too focused on “people-work” to be applicable across job categories. In addition, the MBI is not public domain and so not easily accessible to researchers looking to assess burnout (Kristensen et al., 2005). Kristensen and colleagues go on to argue that while emotional exhaustion is a burnout symptom, depersonalization is actually a coping mechanism to deal with burnout while low accomplishment is a consequence of burnout and so the MBI is mischaracterizing these components. A final argument against using the MBI is that while the MBI does break burnout into three components, it is really looking at it as one overall measure while the three components are distinct and should be looked at as such.

Due to these criticisms of the MBI a new inventory was created to account for those concerns. The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) was developed specifically for the PUMA study (Borritz et al., 2006) to improve upon the MBI. The CBI focuses on

fatigue and exhaustion as the core of burnout (Kristensen et al., 2005). It is used around the globe and has been translated into eight languages. A study conducted by Milmont et al. in 2007 showed acceptable reliability, construct and criterion validity when used with teachers in New Zealand.

The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory is comprised of twenty questions, and for the researcher, is broken into three parts to assess personal, work, and client-related burnout where clients are the receiver of services. The section on personal burnout is comprised of six questions and can be applicable to anyone, as it is not directly tied to work. The section on work-related burnout is comprised of seven questions and is applicable to anyone who is working. The third section on client-related burnout is comprised of six questions and is specifically applicable to those who work with clients. All questions in the instrument have five response categories that are then scaled to be 0-25-50-75-100. The score for each component is calculated based on the mean of the scores for each question within the component (Borritz et al., 2006; Kristensen et al., 2005).

Summary

Residence life staff members are often the first responders during a campus crisis (Zdiadarski et al., 2008). Due to this major job function, crisis response is a critical competency for Student Affairs professionals broadly, and particularly for those who serve as campus crisis responders (ACPA & NASPA, 2015). Residence Life staff not

only deal with a wide variety of crises and emergencies, but also have a high rate of interpersonal connection in their roles as student serving staff members (Vaughn, 2016). However, there is a high rate of job turnover from these positions, due in part to the burnout experienced in these roles (Belch et al., 2008). If as a field we cannot combat this attrition, executive leadership will not have the experience necessary to guide a campus during a major crisis.

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

Research Methods

This research was designed to discover:

1. *To what extent is burnout, as measured by the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory, related to job amenities for crisis responders on college campuses?*
2. *To what extent is burnout, as measured by the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory, related to demographics of crisis responders on college campuses?*

These research questions are intended to uncover factors that contribute to burnout in campus crisis responders. These factors could inform best practices for hiring and supervising managers to alleviate burnout thereby decreasing the attrition of these staff members.

A survey was developed in the form of a questionnaire as the primary method of obtaining data from crisis managers on college campuses (Appendix A). Given the narrow focus of the research questions and the validated instrument to assess burnout that was readily available, a questionnaire was methodologically appropriate.

Questionnaires are used to gather information from a large number of participants and are particularly useful when the scope of the phenomenon being studied is specific (Wilkinson & Birmingham, 2003). This approach allowed me to reach a large number of

participants in a short amount of time. The survey is comprised of demographic questions and all nine questions from the Live-In/On Report (1997) (Appendix B) which were modified to be written in the first person. The original survey is written with the institution as the subject. Finally, the complete Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (2005) (Appendix C) was used, which is publicly available. The survey was developed and I then tested it with 10 campus crisis responders employed at a large private university in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania whose roles were the same as the prospective participants for this survey. The feedback they provided related to survey flow by having the job factor related questions first rather than in the middle, and as a result of the feedback, the survey questions were changed into the first person rather than the third person in the original metrics to aid in understanding. The dissertation committee also suggested that having the demographic questions at the end of the survey rather than the beginning would help with survey completion and allow me to have the data that were most important in the burnout scale. Qualtrics was the platform that was used to develop and distribute the survey. Qualtrics is a survey platform that was free and available to me through a professional affiliation. Qualtrics is a software that allows a researcher to write and analyze survey data in a format that is accessible online via computer or mobile device. The survey for this paper was created using Qualtrics software, Version XM. Copyright © 2019 Qualtrics. Qualtrics and all other Qualtrics product or service names are registered trademarks or trademarks of Qualtrics, Provo, UT, USA.

<https://www.qualtrics.com>. Qualtrics utilized an anonymous link for responses. As the researcher, I was the only person with access to the information to maintain confidentiality. The data were shared only with the Primary Investigator and research committee and published without identifying participant information.

The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory was the main component of the survey instrument and was used to measure burnout in the participants. It is comprised of twenty questions, and assesses personal, work, and client-related burnout where clients are the receiver of services (Kristensen et al., 2005). Because it is more general, and the fact that it is publicly available, I used all 20 questions from the CBI where “clients” were students for campus crisis responders.

In an attempt to collect job factor information to better aid individuals searching for jobs the Live-In/Live-On Report was created in 1997 by Rich Horowitz who currently serves as the Interim Director of Residential Life at Vassar College. Currently a “Google Doc,” there are 650 institutions from across the United States that have submitted information regarding the “Resident Director” position or equivalent. The information can be reported by anyone at the institution, and includes questions that inquire about salary, ability to have pets and partners living in the on-campus accommodations, professional development funds, and the type of institution (public, private, etc.). It is updated multiple times each year as institutions self-report. Because it is a Google Doc, institutions must be proactive in their participation and submit information regarding

their live-in/on Resident Director position (or equivalent). The survey is well-known in the field and is used as a job searching tool, and it is mainly used as a way to get details about a position that might not be readily available in a job description or appropriate to ask about in initial interviews. Because this research is intended to provide guidance into how hiring managers and department heads can structure compensation and amenities for campus crisis responders, the full nine survey questions from the Live In/Live On Report have been used in the data collection of this research study.

The survey was distributed via email and professional Facebook groups in fall 2018 and was available from October 23, 2018 through November 24, 2018. The timing was intentional as most institutions at that time were several weeks into the fall semester and most professional staff would have been transitioned into their daily job responsibilities of the academic year. The specific criteria for participants in this study was that the respondent had to serve as a crisis responder on a college campus with a live-in or live-on position. The IRB approved this research on September 21, 2018 (Appendix E).

Data Collection

Using an anonymous link generated by Qualtrics, I distributed the survey and the recruitment language (Appendix D) through the professional Facebook groups below. Facebook is an online social network and social media site. I have been a residence life and student affairs professional for nearly 12 years and so have built a vast professional

network. I am active in several professional Facebook groups, which are frequently utilized to solicit research participation. Facebook groups were targeted to increase the number of participants, and to increase the diversity of institutions participating rather than reaching out to institutions directly.

- Association for Colleges and University Housing Officers-International (ACUHO-I)
- Association of Intermountain Housing Officers (AIMHO)
- Great Lakes Association of Colleges and University Housing Officers (GLACUHO)
- Mid-Atlantic Association of College and University Housing Officers (MACUHO)
- Northeast Association of College and University Housing Officers (NEACUHO)
- Northwest Association of College and University Housing Officers (NWACUHO)
- Southeastern Association of Housing Officers (SEAHO)
- Southwest Association of College and University Housing Officers (SWACUHO)
- Upper Midwest Region-Association of College and University Housing Officers (UMR-ACUHO)
- Student Affairs Moms (S.A.M.S.)
- Residence Life Professionals
- Student Affairs Professionals
- National Housing Training Institute Class of 2011

The survey was posted on these sites on October 25, 2018 and again on November 12, 2018. The only region that was not included was Western Association of College and University Housing Officers (WACUHO) due to it being a closed group that I was unable to access. In addition, on October 25, 2018, I emailed the list-serve that contacts all Chief Housing Officers in the MACUHO region with the recruitment language

and anonymous link asking that they forward to any colleagues who might serve as campus crisis responders. Finally, the President of the Mid-Atlantic Association of College and University Housing Officers (MACUHO), after seeing the posting, reached out to inquire about the organization officially sponsoring the research and sending the recruitment language and anonymous link to its membership on my behalf in exchange for a presentation of the results at the next regional conference. I agreed, and so an email utilizing the recruitment language and anonymous link was sent out to the MACUHO membership on November 7, 2018 and November 14, 2018. Based on the membership of these various social media channels, approximately 52,446 student affairs professionals had access to view the survey.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using correlations and ANOVAs to determine the relationship between burnout and demographics, and burnout and job factors with burnout being the dependent variable, and demographics and job factors serving as independent variables.

An initial analysis was conducted by computing a Cronbach's Alpha on the data to determine whether the internal consistency of the items with this sample is consistent with the data presented in previous research. One-way ANOVAs were then conducted to determine the relationship between burnout and the various job factors including professional development dollars, and salary. Pearson correlations were

computed between the total burnout score and number of residents supervised, hours worked per week, years as a professional and students. Several additional analyses were conducted to extend and elaborate the results. A one-sample t-test was computed comparing the sample mean to the population mean. Finally, a principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation was conducted to determine variation between the components of the CBI.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Descriptive Data on the Respondents

A total of 233 surveys were returned; however, not all subjects answered all questions and the sample sizes for each question reflect that. The specific criteria for participants in this study was that the respondent had to serve as a crisis responder on a college campus with a live-in or live-on position. The participants ranged from graduate students through Master's level professionals. The typical job title for these positions included: Graduate Resident Director, Resident Director, Hall Director, or Area Coordinator. The position title responses were coded into four categories (1-4) with "1" indicating graduate student level, "2" indicating entry level, "3" indicating mid-level, and "4" indicating senior level. For level 1 there were 16 participants, for level 2 there were 133 participants, for level 3 there were 44 participants, and for level 4 there were 14 participants. The participants all served in an on-call duty rotation on a college campus with the expectation of responding to crises. Descriptive data on the respondents are presented in the Tables 4.1 through 4.5.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.1 *Gender of Respondents*

Gender	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample
Male	55	25.8
Female	151	70.9
Prefer not to say	3	1.4
Non-Conforming	4	1.9

Table 4.2 *Race of Respondents*

Race	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample
African American	20	9.3
Asian	8	3.8
Hispanic	5	2.3
White	161	75.6
Other	19	8.2

Table 4.3 *Marital Status of Respondents*

Status	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample
Married	58	27.2
Never Married	154	72.3
Divorced	1	0.46

Table 4.4 *Years Working of Respondents*

Years Working	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample
Less than 1 year	20	9.3
1 – 3 Years	68	31.8
3 – 5 Years	56	26.2
5 – 7 Years	28	13.1
More than 7 Years	42	19.6

Table 4.5 *Education of Respondents*

Level of Education	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample
Bachelors	31	14.9
Masters	177	85.1

Table 4.1 shows the gender identity of the participants with 70.9% identifying as female, 25.8% identifying as male, 1.9% identifying as non-conforming, and 1.4% choosing not to respond. As shown in Table 4.2, over 75% of participants were white, followed by 9.3% African American, 3.8% Asian, 2.3% Hispanic, and 8.2% were identified as other which also included participants who selected multiple options for Race. In Table 4.3, 72.7% of the respondents were unmarried while only 27.2% were married at the time they completed the questionnaire. The years that the participants were working is shown in Table 4.4 with 31.8% being in their role for between 1-3 years, 26.2% for 3-5 years, 13.1% for 5-7 years and 19.6% for more than 7 years. Table 4.5 shows the education level of the participants of which 85.1% held master’s degrees. The area where there is more diversity is in the number of years the respondent had been working. Participants in this study spend an average of 31 structured hours in the office every week overseeing an average of 607 residents in their direct area.

Research Questions

There were two major research questions in this study. The research questions are:

1. *To what extent is burnout, as measured by the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory, related to job amenities for crisis responders on college campuses?*
2. *To what extent is burnout, as measured by the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory, related to demographics of crisis responders on college campuses?*

Since both of these research questions refer to the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory an initial analyses was conducted by computing a Cronbach's Alpha on the data to ascertain if the internal consistency of the items with this sample is consistent with the data presented in previous research. The alpha computed on the data equaled .901, which is considered well beyond the minimally acceptable level. The mean burnout score for the sample was 54.78 with a standard deviation of 11.44. The range was 26 – 84. The creators of the CBI do not specify a particular range that is “high” or “low”, but rather compare the scores relative to samples. Additional analyses on the scale will be presented at the end of this chapter.

There were several amenities considered in answering the first research question. These are:

1. Salary
2. Permission to have another person live with them in their on-campus residence
3. Permission to have a pet in the on-campus residence

4. Existence of a meal plan
5. Money for professional development

Descriptive data on each of these are presented in Table 4.6 to 4.10.

Table 4.6 *Annual Salary of Respondents*

Salary Range	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample
Less than 10,000	14	6.0
10,000 – 20,000	12	5.2
21,000 – 30,000	15	6.4
31,000 – 40,000	82	35.2
41,000 – 50,000	76	32.6
51,000 – 60,000	22	9.4
61,000 – 70,000	4	1.7
Over 71,000	8	3.4
Mean Salary	39,250	
Range	896 – 140,000	

Table 4.7 *Allowed to Live with another Person in On-Campus Residence*

Allowed	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample
No	56	24
Yes	177	76

Table 4.8 *Existence of a Meal Plan*

Meal Plan	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample
No	71	30.3
Partial	66	28.2
Yes	97	41.5

Table 4.9 *Pets*

Pets	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample
None	37	16.2
Fish Only	44	19.2
More than Fish	148	64.6

Table 4.10 *Money for Professional Development*

Professional Development	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample
None	31	17.6
Less than 1000	64	36.4
1001 – 2000	59	33.5
2001 – 3000	17	9.7
3001 – 4000	5	2.8

As shown in the above tables, the vast majority of respondents (83%) indicated that they are allowed to have another person live with them in their on-campus residence (typically a partner or dependent). However, only 58 participants indicated that they were currently married. Having a pet on campus is seen as a perk, and so luckily only 37 participants indicated that they would not be allowed to have any type of pet. Most of the respondents have at least a partial meal plan, and most get at least some money for professional development with an average of \$943.40 allocated per person. Approximately 67% of participants had a salary between \$31,000-50,000.

To answer research question number one, the total burnout score was correlated with salary and professional development money. Neither of these correlations was significant: r with salary = $-.071$; r with professional development = $-.074$. Differences in burnout as a function of meal plan were tested by a one-way ANOVA. The result was not significant: $F_{2, 222} = .711$, $p = .995$. A similar analysis was conducted with the existence of pets. As before, the result was not significant: $F_{2, 218} = .864$, $p = .463$. Finally, a comparison of the burnout score for those who were allowed to

live with another person as contrasted to those who were not allowed was conducted. This also produced a non-significant result: $F(1, 220) = 2.008, p = .158$. Thus, the answer to the first research question is that amenities are not related to the level of burnout of the respondents.

To answer the second research question, the following variables were included in the analysis:

- Whether the respondent worked full-time or part-time
- Education
- Number of residents supervised
- Hours worked per week
- Years as a professional
- Institution type
- Students
- Gender
- Race
- Marital status

Descriptive data on each of the variables that have not already been reported are presented in Table 4.11 to 4.14.

Table 4.11 *Full or Part Time*

Working	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample
12 Months	178	87.7
Less than 12 Months	25	12.3

Table 4.12 *Number of Residents*

Number of Residents	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample
0 – 100	8	4.3
101 – 200	21	11.2
201 – 300	19	10.2
301 – 400	33	17.6
401 – 500	29	15.5
501 – 600	25	13.4
601 – 700	16	8.6
710 – 800	8	4.3
801 – 900	5	2.7
Over 900	23	12.3
Mean	612.46	
Range	0 – 6,500	

Table 4.13 *Students*

Students	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample
Less than 1000	34	16.5
1000 - 3000	89	43.2
3001 – 5000	42	20.4
5001 – 7000	25	12.1
More than 7000	16	7.8

Table 4.14 *Hours worked per week*

Hours	Number of Respondents	Percent of Sample
10 or less	18	8.7
11 – 20	20	9.7
21 – 30	28	13.6
31 – 40	139	67.5
41 or more	1	.49
Mean	30.67	
Range	4 – 41	

As seen in tables 4.11-4.14, 87.7% of participants work full time which is defined as 12 months out of the year; 31.5% oversaw between 300-500 residents in their halls, while 43.2% had responsibility for between 1000-3000 on the entire campus. Finally, most participants (67.5%) work full-time at 31-40 hours each week.

Pearson correlations were computed between the total burnout score and number of residents supervised, hours worked per week, years as a professional and students. None of these correlations was significant. One-way ANOVAs were conducted on all of the remaining variables. The only significant result was for gender. The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15 *Means and Standard Deviations for Gender*

Gender	Mean	Standard Deviation
Male (n = 55)	50.71	10.91
Female (n = 151)	56.69	11.16
Prefer not to Say (n = 3)	46.67	18.04
Non-Conforming (n = 4)	54.75	11.15

Since the sample sizes for “prefer not to say” and “non-conforming” are too small for an accurate estimate, they were removed and the comparison was only between males and females. The result was: $F_{1, 204} = 11.716, p = .001$, partial eta squared = .054. Thus, the difference is statistically significant with a medium effect size. As shown in Table 4.14, females report a higher level of burnout than males.

Additional Analyses

Several additional analyses were conducted to extend and elaborate the results.

Each of these is presented as a research question.

Additional question # 1: What is the level of burnout in the sample?

As mentioned above, the mean for this sample was 54.78 with a standard deviation of 11.44. The authors of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory report that the mean for their norming sample was 30.9 with a standard deviation of 17.6. A one-sample t-test was computed comparing the sample mean to the population mean. The result was highly significant ($t = 31.98$, $p = .000$).

Additional question # 2: Is the factor structure of CBI in this sample the same as reported by the authors?

According to the authors, the CBI is intended to have three components:

Personal Burnout, Work-related burnout, and Client-related burnout. To ascertain if this structure exists in the current sample, a principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation was conducted. This produced three factors with eigenvalues over one.

The rotated matrix is presented in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16 *Factor Analysis of the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory*

Factor I: Personal and Work-Related Burnout

Burnout Question	Factor Loading
How often are you emotionally exhausted?	.793
How often do you feel worn out?	.785
How often are you physically exhausted?	.776
How often do you feel tired?	.771
Is your work emotionally exhausting?	.759
How often do you feel weak and susceptible to illness?	.715
Do you feel burnt out because of your work?	.714
Does your work frustrate you?	.667
How often do you think? "I can't take it anymore"?	.660
Do you feel that every working hour is tiring for you?	.638
Are you exhausted in the morning at the thought of another day at work?	.587
Does your work frustrate you?	.503

Factor II: Client-Related Burnout

Burnout Question:	Factor Loading
Do you find it frustrating to work with clients?	.865
Do you find it hard to work with clients?	.823
Are you tired of working with clients?	.775
Does it drain your energy to work with clients?	.751
Do you feel that you give more than you get back when you work with clients?	.623
Do you sometimes wonder how long you will be able to continue working with clients?	.589

Factor III: Social Support

Burnout Question:	Factor Loading
Do you feel supported by your supervisor?	-.788
Do you have enough energy for family and friends during leisure time?	-.538

Factor scores were computed on the three factors and converted to T scores.

These were then used to compare males and females. The results indicated that the only difference was for Factor I with females having a higher mean than males. The effect was medium to large. (Mean for males = 45.65; Females = 51.71; $F = 5.604$, $p = .001$, partial eta squared = .074).

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

As presented in Chapter 4, the research questions were answered by showing that there is no significant relationship between job factors and burnout, nor, with the exception of gender, demographic variables and burnout in campus crisis responders. This is quite concerning. This indicates that despite generally accepted best practices in the field of student affairs regarding job amenities of this type of staff, those factors seem to be ineffective at ameliorating burnout, and so have no impact on the attrition that occurs as a result. The job factors that are part of the Live-In/On Report (Horowitz, 2018) are generally factors that are controlled to some extent by hiring managers or department heads. Factors such as whether a staff member is allowed to have a pet in their apartment, or a partner or dependent live with them, stem from an attempt at promoting work-life balance and so for the data to say that these controllable factors do not significantly impact burnout is disheartening.

An argument can be made that burnout is in fact, a good thing. The reason that this argument can be made is that, as in any organization, there are fewer senior level positions as compared to entry level positions. Burned out employees drop out of the field paving the way for stronger, more resilient staff members to take on senior leadership. While some attrition is objectively positive for organizational stability and momentum, turnover that does not feel like a choice can have dire consequences. Staff members leaving the field as a result of burnout leave because they feel they must for

their own physical and mental well-being. They are not necessarily leaving because they are not passionate about the work, or are not talented as staff in their roles. If we are weeding staff members out by putting their mental and physical health at risk, then we are doing a disservice to those individuals as well as the field of Higher Education.

The data did show that female-identified participants had a significantly higher overall burnout score than male-identified participants. This is consistent with the literature (Puranova & Muros, 2010). To further support the literature, additional analyses were completed on the three factors within the CBI. The results showed a significant difference between females and males with females having significantly higher burnout than males on Factor I of the CBI which is similar to what would be considered “emotional exhaustion”. This supports Puranova and Muros’ 2010 meta-analysis that saying females are more burned out than males is oversimplifying the data. Female campus crisis responders may be more emotionally exhausted than their male counterparts, but both genders are overworked and generally burned out in their role. Supervisors and hiring managers need to be cognizant that for their male employees, more support and resources might be needed since the symptoms of burnout in males may not be as easily identifiable. In addition, it is important to keep in mind that just because a female employee is exhibiting more symptoms of burnout does not mean she is more burned out than her male counterparts are and so her job trajectory should not be stunted as a result.

The additional analysis that was done to determine the overall burnout of the sample in this study showed that the participants overall had a significantly high level of burnout with a mean of 54.78 when compared to the CBI's mean for the norming sample at 30.9. This high burnout score paired with the data showing that job factors and demographics are not significantly related to this burnout should raise the alarm for the field of student affairs. Having a population of staff that are so significantly burned out is concerning. Further understanding that factors such as salary, living arrangements, or workload cannot be manipulated to help lessen burnout should be reason for the field to really stop and assess what is happening in these positions. Further research into the work environment itself looking at factors of connectedness, purpose, etc. should be conducted. In order to combat the attrition of these staff members, as well as care for them as people, it is critical that the field look at what can be done to lessen the burnout that is experienced by the folks in these roles including the role of solid supervision and a supportive work environment.

Limitations

A survey method alone, while efficient, does not capture much of the nuanced information or personal details that might be beneficial in a study looking at job factors and burnout. While the survey was comprised of known instruments, further adaptation might have been appropriate to find additional information. For example, specifically referencing "students" rather than "clients" in the burnout scale might have

better framed the survey context for participants. In addition, asking more questions regarding the type, scope, and frequency of crises participants were dealing with could have also illuminated interesting information regarding that aspect of their positions. Collecting data via email and social media may have limited responses to participants who are active or easily sought out in those arenas.

Recommendations for Future Research

A mixed methods study using follow-up interviews would be beneficial to dig deeper into some of the nuanced responses. Mixed-methods are useful when there is a need for a more holistic perspective of a phenomenon as there is in this case (Cresswell, 2013). This issue is also quite complex and the current research is only either qualitative or quantitative and so a mixed-methods approach could illuminate the nuances of a particular experience. Of particular interest, due to the high overall burnout score of this population, it is recommended to ask participants about the impact that burnout has on their current job satisfaction and intent to remain in the field of Higher Education. It could be beneficial to utilize a known instrument to measure job satisfaction and compare it to the results of this current study. To understand more about job factors' influence on campus crisis responders, comparing those factors to overall job satisfaction or resilience in individuals may give a more holistic understanding of why these staff members have such high attrition. Looking at the impact of the job factors in the Live-In/On Report (Horowitz 2018) may also be

beneficial. While this study shows that those factors do not significantly impact burnout, they may significantly impact job satisfaction which would be useful information in determining which factors should be focused on when hiring staff. Arronson et al. (2016) suggested examining the structural job factors as a way to lessen burnout. I recommend further research in this area by looking at the support staff receive, and their supervisory relationships in particular. Finally, I suggest further studies looking into trauma or vicarious trauma experienced by campus crisis responders. Looking more deeply into the types of crises that these staff members deal with daily, or those incidents that are most impactful, could help in developing a greater understanding of the burnout they experience. This research has begun (Hodge 2016) but to really get the full scope of the issue all of these potential burnout factors should be looked at collectively.

Recommendations for Future Practice

While job factors including salary, allowing for a partner or pet, and professional development funds do not seem to have any significant impact on burnout of staff members, there are still widely regarded best practices regarding these factors. They include allowing pets and domestic partners to live in, providing support for professional development, flexible schedules, and providing a meal plan (Wilson, 2008). In addition, looking at how much autonomy and support employees feel in their job and working to train supervisors and colleagues on how best to fulfill those needs could also be

impactful regarding burnout (Vaughn 2016). Wilson et al. found that supervision and mentorship was highly impactful on retention of campus crisis responders, and so this may be a key area to look at regarding training and coaching of folks in a supervisory role to increase their awareness and ability with those skills.

Conclusion

In general, it is disconcerting that the overall burnout score for this population was considerably higher than other populations that have been measured using the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (Kristensen et al., 2005). The additional data comparisons not showing any significant relationship between job factors, demographics, and burnout is cause for alarm. It is unclear what is causing such high burnout scores in this population without additional research as recommended above. This information indicates that regardless of outside factors, the job of a campus crisis responder is generally designed to result in such high burnout that interventions may not be effective. Student Life and Higher Education professionals should be examining this phenomenon and looking at the structure of those positions as a field.

REFERENCES

- ACPA—College Student Educators International, & NASPA—Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. (2015). Professional competency areas for student affairs educators. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Aronson, G., Theorell, T., Grape, T., Hammarstrom, A., Hogstedt, C., Marteinsdottir, I., Skoogs, I., Träskman-Bendz, L., Hall, C. (2017). A systematic review including meta-analysis of work environment and burnout symptoms. *BMC Public Health*, 17-64.
- Asmussen, K. J., Cresell, J. W. (1995). Campus Response to a Student Gunman. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 66(5), 575-591.
- Belch, H.A., Wilson, M.E. & Dunkel, N.W. (2008). Best practices in the recruitment and retention of entry-level, live-in staff. In *Recruitment and Retention of entry-level staff in housing and residence life: A report on activities supported by the ACUHO-I Commissioned Research Program* (pp. 8-9). Columbus, OH: Association of College and University Housing Officers-International.
- Boin, Argen & McConnell, Allan. (2007) Preparing for Critical Infrastructure Breakdowns: The Limits of Crisis Management and the Need for Resilience. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 15(1).
- Borritz, Marianne, Rugulies, Reiner, Bjorner, Jakob, Villadsen, Ebbbe, Mikkelsen, Ole, & Kristensen, Tage (2006). Burnout Among Employees in Human Service Work:

- Design and Baseline Findings of the PUMA Study. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*. 2006(34), 49-58.
- Collins, Denise & Hirt, Joan. (2006) The Nature of Professional Life for Residence Hall Administrators. *Journal of College and University Student Housing*, 34(1).
- Creswell, John W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications, Incorporated.
- Iwanicki, E. F., & Schwab, R. L. (1981). A cross validation study of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 41(4), 1167-1174.
- Fein, Albert H., Isacson, Nancy S. (2009). Echoes of Columbine: The Emotion Work of Leaders in School Shooting Sites. *American Behavioral Scientist* 52, 1327-1346.
- Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burn-out. *Journal of Social Issues*, 30 (I), 159-165.
- Gutherie, V. L., Woods, E., Cusker, C., & Gregory, M. (2005, Spring). A portrait of balance: Personal and professional balance among student affairs educators. *The College Student Affairs Journal*, 24(2), 110–127.
- Hipple, S. F. (2016, September). Labor force participation: what has happened since the peak?, *Monthly Labor Review*, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Hodge, L. S. (2016). Vicarious trauma, emotional intelligence, and the impact on job satisfaction in residence life staff. Dissertation: University of Central Florida.

- Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., Christensen, K. (2005). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work & Stress*, 19(3), 192-207
- Lorden, L. P. (1998). Attrition in the student affairs profession. *NASPA Journal*, 35, 207-216.
- Marshall, Moore Gardner, Megan, Hughes, Carole, Lowery, & Ute (2016). Attrition from Student Affairs: Perspectives from Those Who Exited the Profession, *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 53(2), 146-159.
- Maslach, C. (1976). Burned-out. *Human Behavior*, 5(9), 16-22
- Maslach, C. (1978). Job burn-out: How people cope. *Public Welfare*, 36, 56-58.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 2(2): 99–113.
- Maslach, C., & Leiter MP. (1997). *The Truth About Burnout*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 498–512.
- Maslach C., Leiter M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry* 15 103–111.
- Maslach, C., & Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job Burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology* 52:397-422.

- Milfont, T., Denny, S., Ameratunga, S., Robinson, E., Merry, S. (2007). Burnout and Wellbeing: Testing the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory in New Zealand Teachers. *Social Indicators Research* 89: 169-177.
- Purvanova, R., Muros, J. (2010). Gender Differences in Burnout: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 77(2010), 168-185.
- Rankin, Pressley R. & Gulley, Needham Y. (2018). Boundary Integration and Work/Life Balance When You Live Where You Work: A Study of Residence Life Professionals. *Journal of College & University Student Housing*. 44(2):64-81.
- Reason, Robert D., Saunders, Kevin P. (2003). The Conflict Between Personal and Professional Roles of Senior Student Affairs Officers During a Time of National Crisis. *College Student Affairs Journal*. 22(2), 137-149.
- Schaufeli WB, Maslach C, Marek T. (1993). *Routledge Library Editions: Human Resource Management*. Professional Burnout: Recent Developments in Theory and Research. 33.
- Shaw, Mahauganee (2018). Teaching Campus Crisis Management Through Case Studies: Moving Between Theory and Practice. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*. 55(3), 308-320.
- Stein, Andi (2006). We Thought It Could Never Happen Here: The Crisis Communications Response to the Thurston High School Shootings. *Journal of Promotion Management*. Vol. 12(3/4), 99-128.

- Vaughn, Adam D., A Quantitative Correlational Study of Burnout Among Student Affairs Professionals (2016). Doctoral Dissertation.
- Wilkinson, David, Birmingham, Peter (2003). *Using Research Instruments: A Guide for Researchers*. New York, NY: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Wilson, Maureen E., Recruitment and retention of entry-level staff in housing and residence life: A report on activities supported by the ACUHO-I Commissioned Research Program (2008). *Higher Education and Student Affairs Faculty Publications*. Paper 29.
- Zdziarski, E.L. (2006). Crisis in the context of higher education. In K.S. Harper, B.G. Paterson, & E.L. Zdziarski (Eds.), *Crisis management: Responding from the heart* (pp. 3-24). Washington, DC: NASPA.
- Zdziarski, E. L., Dunkel, N. W., & Rollo, J. M. (2007). *Campus crisis management: A comprehensive guide to planning, prevention, response, and recovery*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

APPENDIX A

Research Survey

You are invited to take part in a research study because you are currently serving in a crisis response rotation on a college campus.

Campus crisis has been largely covered by the media, particularly campus shootings and other large scale crisis events. Research has been done regarding communication efforts and how those large scale crises are handled making it evident that having campus leadership with crisis management experience is critical in times of need. However, anecdotally it is obvious that staff members who work in crisis management tend to burn out at a fast rate and often either leave the field of Higher Education or at the very least leave residence life work. If we as a field are burning these professionals out before they reach positions of executive leadership on campus, their wisdom and experience in handling crises leaves with them. This puts any university in a vulnerable position when it comes to handling both routine and extreme crises in a manner that best supports individuals and the campus community.

Surveys of campus crisis responders will be done to obtain more information about job factors that influence burnout in crisis responders on college campuses. This can better inform hiring and retention of these staff members.

The survey should take you approximately 10 minutes to complete. Your answers will remain anonymous. If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has hurt you, contact the researcher at mdepreto@gmail.com, 215-895-6229, 101 North 34th Street Philadelphia, PA 19104.

I consent to continue with this research

Please answer the following questions with regards to your current position as a crisis manager on campus.

What is your current salary AND how many months per year do you work? *
Please round off to nearest 100 or 1000

Format: Salary/Months
Example: 35000/12

Is a Masters degree REQUIRED for this position?

- Yes
 - No
 - Depends
-

Is a person in your position permitted to live with someone to whom they're not married(regardless of gender)?

- Yes
 - No
-

Is a meal plan provided? *
Consider only while school is in session

- Yes, full--or close to full
 - Partial meal plan (covers around half of food expenses)
 - No
-

What is the total number of residents within the building(s) you supervise?

Approximately how much money are you provided this year for professional development?

Think about how much is covered for conference attendance

What type(s) of pets, if any, are permitted in your apartment? *
Check all that apply

NONE

Fish

Small pets in tanks or cages

Birds

Cats

Dogs

How many structured office hours are you required to work per week?
We're talking # of hours you must be in an office

How often do you feel tired?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

How often are you physically exhausted?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

How often are you emotionally exhausted?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

How often do you think: "I can't take it anymore"?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

How often do you feel worn out?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

How often do you feel weak and susceptible to illness?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

Is your work emotionally exhausting?

- To a very high degree
 - To a high degree
 - Somewhat
 - To a low degree
 - To a very low degree
-

Do you feel burnt out because of your work?

- To a very high degree
 - To a high degree
 - Somewhat
 - To a low degree
 - To a very low degree
-

Does your work frustrate you?

- To a very high degree
 - To a high degree
 - Somewhat
 - To a low degree
 - To a very low degree
-

Do you feel worn out at the end of the working day?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

Are you exhausted in the morning at the thought of another day at work?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

Do you feel that every working hour is tiring for you?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

Do you have enough energy for family and friends during leisure time?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

Do you feel supported by your supervisor?

- To a very high degree
- To a high degree
- Somewhat
- To a low degree
- To a very low degree

Please answer the following questions where "clients" are the students at your institution.

Do you find it hard to work with clients?

- To a very high degree
 - To a high degree
 - Somewhat
 - To a low degree
 - To a very low degree
-

Do you find it frustrating to work with clients?

- To a very high degree
 - To a high degree
 - Somewhat
 - To a low degree
 - To a very low degree
-

Does it drain your energy to work with clients?

- To a very high degree
 - To a high degree
 - Somewhat
 - To a low degree
 - To a very low degree
-

Do you feel that you give more than you get back when you work with clients?

- To a very high degree
 - To a high degree
 - Somewhat
 - To a low degree
 - To a very low degree
-

Are you tired of working with clients?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

Do you sometimes wonder how long you will be able to continue working with clients?

- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never/Almost Never

How long have you been working as a live-in/live on campus crisis responder?

- Less than 1 year
 - 1-3 years
 - 3-5 years
 - 5-7 years
 - More than 7 years
-

In which state are you currently employed?

▼ Alabama ... I do not reside in the United States

What is your current institution type?

- Public
 - Private (non-affiliated)
 - Private (faith-based)
-

How many students are you responsible for in your on call rotation? (Just students in your area, all residential students, or all enrolled students?)

- Less than 1,000
 - 1,000-3,000
 - 3,000-5,000
 - 5,000-7,000
 - More than 7,000
-

What is your current position title?

What is your gender identity?

- Man
 - Woman
 - Transgender
 - Gender Non-Conforming/Gender Non-Binary
 - Agender
 - Prefer not to say
 - Write in your own _____
-

Choose one or more races/ethnicities that you consider yourself to be (select all that apply)

White

Black or African American

American Indian or Alaska Native

Asian

Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander

Hispanic

Write in your own _____

Prefer not to say

What is your age in years?

Are you now married, widowed, divorced, separated or never married?

- Married
 - Widowed
 - Divorced
 - Separated
 - Never Married
-

What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

- Associate degree in college (2-year)
- Bachelor's degree in college (4-year)
- Master's degree
- Doctoral degree
- Professional degree (JD, MD)

APPENDIX B

Live-In/On Report

What is the average starting salary AND for how many months per year *
Please round off to nearest 100 or 1000

Format: Salary/Months

Example: 35000/12

Is a Masters degree REQUIRED for this position?

- Yes
- No
- Depends

Is the person in this position permitted to live with someone to whom they're not married(regardless of gender)?

- Yes
- No

Is a meal plan provided for this professional? *
Consider only while school is in session

- Yes, full--or close to full
 - Partial meal plan (covers around half of food expenses)
 - No
-

What is the average number of RESIDENTS within the buildings supervised by this professional?

Approximately how much money is provided this year for the live-in/on's professional development?
Think about how much is covered for conference attendance

What type(s) of pets, if any, are permitted in the professional's apartment? *
Check all that apply

- NONE (1)
- Fish (2)
- Small pets in tanks or cages (3)
- Birds (4)
- Cats (5)
- Dogs (6)

How many structured office hours are required per week?
We're talking # of hours the professional must be in an office

APPENDIX C

Copenhagen Burnout Inventory

How often do you feel tired?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

How often are you physically exhausted?

- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never/Almost Never

How often are you emotionally exhausted?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

How often do you think: "I can't take it anymore"?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

How often do you feel worn out?

- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never/Almost Never

How often do you feel weak and susceptible to illness?

- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never/Almost Never

Is your work emotionally exhausting?

- To a very high degree
 - To a high degree
 - Somewhat
 - To a low degree
 - To a very low degree
-

Do you feel burnt out because of your work?

- Always To a very high degree
 - To a high degree
 - Somewhat
 - To a low degree
 - To a very low degree
-

Does your work frustrate you?

- To a very high degree
 - To a high degree
 - Somewhat
 - To a low degree
 - To a very low degree
-

Do you feel worn out at the end of the working day?

- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never/Almost Never

Are you exhausted in the morning at the thought of another day at work?

- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never/Almost Never

Do you feel that every working hour is tiring for you?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

Do you have enough energy for family and friends during leisure time?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

Do you find it hard to work with clients?

- To a very high degree
 - To a high degree
 - Somewhat
 - To a low degree
 - To a very low degree
-

Do you find it frustrating to work with clients?

- To a very high degree
- To a high degree
- Somewhat
- To a low degree
- To a very low degree

Does it drain your energy to work with clients?

- To a very high degree
- To a high degree
- Somewhat
- To a low degree
- To a very low degree

Do you feel that you give more than you get back when you work with clients?

- To a very high degree
 - To a high degree
 - Somewhat
 - To a low degree
 - To a very low degree
-

Are you tired of working with clients?

- Always
 - Often
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never/Almost Never
-

Do you sometimes wonder how long you will be able to continue working with clients?

- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never/Almost Never

APPENDIX D

RECRUITMENT EMAIL LANGUAGE

You are invited to take part in a research study because you are currently serving in a crisis response rotation on a college campus.

Click here to access the survey:

https://drexel.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_1ZzV6ck1LUjroDX

Campus crisis has been largely covered by the media, particularly campus shootings and other large scale crisis events. Research has been done regarding communication efforts and how those large scale crises are handled making it evident that having campus leadership with crisis management experience is critical in times of need. However, anecdotally it is obvious that staff members who work in crisis management tend to burn out at a fast rate and often either leave the field of Higher Education or at the very least leave residence life work. If we as a field are burning these professionals out before they reach positions of executive leadership on campus, their wisdom and experience in handling crises leaves with them. This puts any university in a vulnerable position when it comes to handling both routine and extreme crises in a manner that best supports individuals and the campus community.

Surveys of campus crisis responders will be done to obtain more information about job factors that influence burnout in crisis responders on college campuses. This can better inform hiring and retention of these staff members.

The survey should take you approximately 10 minutes to complete. Your answers will remain anonymous.

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has hurt you, contact the researcher at mdepreto@gmail.com, 215-895-6229, 101 North 34th Street Philadelphia, PA 19104.

This research has been reviewed and approved by an Institutional Review Board. You may talk to them at (215) 707-3390 or e-mail them at: irb@temple.edu.

APPENDIX E

IRB APPROVAL



Research Integrity &
Compliance Student Faculty
Center
3340 N. Broad Street, Suite 304
Philadelphia PA 19140

Institutional Review
Board Phone: (215)
707-3390
Fax: (215) 707-9100
e-mail: irb@temple.edu

Certification of Approval for a Project Involving Human Subjects

Date: 21-Sep-2019

Protocol Number: 25444
PI: DUCETTE, JOSEPH
Review Type: EXEMPT
Approved On: 21-Sep-2018
Approved From:
Approved To:
Committee: A2
School/College: EDUCATION (1900)
Department: PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES IN ED (19040)
Sponsor: NO EXTERNAL SPONSOR
Project Title: Job factors that influence burnout in campus crisis responders

The IRB approved the protocol 25444.

If the study was approved under expedited or full board review, the approval period can be found above. Otherwise, the study was deemed exempt and does not have an IRB approval period.

If applicable to your study, you can access your IRB-approved, stamped consent document or consent script through ERA. **Open the Attachments tab and open the stamped documents by clicking the Latest link next to each document.** The stamped documents are labeled as such. Copies of the IRB approved stamped consent document or consent script must be used in

obtaining consent.

Before an approval period ends, you must submit the Continuing Review form via the ERA module. Please note that though an item is submitted in ERA, it is not received in the IRB office until the principal investigator approves it. Consequently, please submit the Continuing Review form via the ERA module at least 60 days, and preferably 90 days, before the study's expiration date.

Note that all applicable Institutional approvals must also be secured before study implementation. These approvals include, but are not limited to, Medical Radiation Committee ("MRC"); Radiation Safety Committee ("RSC"); Institutional Biosafety Committee ("IBC"); and Temple University Survey Coordinating Committee ("TUSCC"). Please visit these Committees' websites for further information.

Finally, in conducting this research, you are obligated to submit the following:

- **Amendment requests - all changes to the study must be approved by the IRB prior to the implementation of the changes unless necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to subjects**
- **Reportable new information - using the Reportable New Information form**, report new information items such as those described in the Investigator Guidance: Prompt Reporting Requirements HRP-801 to the IRB **within 5 days**
- **Closure report** - using a closure form, submit when the study is permanently closed to enrollment; all subjects have completed all protocol related interventions and interactions; collection of private identifiable information is complete; and Analysis of private identifiable information is complete.

For the complete list of investigator responsibilities, please see the Policies and Procedures, the Investigator Manual, and other requirements found on the Temple University IRB website: [: http://research.temple.edu/irb-forms-standard-operating-procedures#POLICY](http://research.temple.edu/irb-forms-standard-operating-procedures#POLICY)

Please contact the IRB at (215) 707-3390 if you have any questions