The relationship between college counselor work responsibilities and burnout

by

Gregory Lee Bohner

B.S., William Jewell College, 2004
M.A., University of Mary Hardin-Baylor, 2010

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Special Education, Counseling, and Student Affairs
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2018

Abstract

College counseling has been a unique profession among the helping professions that seeks to provide mental health and academic support to college students. One vocational danger for college counselors has been the onset of burnout. The loss of resources leading to burnout, as explained by the Conservation of Resources theory, may have been connected to today's higher education administrative position of performing more responsibilities with less staffing. This research study examined the relationship between work duties assigned to college counselors, as measured by the College Counselor Activity Rating Scale, and the level of burnout for those counselors, as measured by the Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure. The first five hypotheses examined the relationship between burnout and non-counseling duties by utilizing a hierarchical multiple regression analysis with various tests of mediation and moderation. The sixth hypothesis explored the assertion that college counselors at small institutions of higher education (institutional enrollment less than 5000 students) are more likely to engage in non-counseling duties. Members of the American College Counseling Association were recruited to serve as the population sample frame for the study. Because no instrument existed to measure counseling and non-counseling duties for college counselors, the College Counselor Activity Rating Scale was developed as a part of the study. Validation procedures were utilized in the form of an expert panel and pilot study for the College Counselor Activity Rating Scale. Of the six null hypotheses, all six were retained with limited power. Further analysis showed statistically significant relationships between burnout, perceived workload, and meaningful work. In addition, three non-counseling duties items, all related to administrative duties, were statistically significantly related to burnout. The key findings, implications and recommendations for future research were discussed.

The relationship between college counselor work responsibilities and burnout

by

Gregory Lee Bohner

B.S., William Jewell College, 2004
M.A., University of Mary Hardin-Baylor, 2010

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Special Education, Counseling, and Student Affairs
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2018

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. Judy Hughey

Abstract

College counseling has been a unique profession among the helping professions that seeks to provide mental health and academic support to college students. One vocational danger for college counselors has been the onset of burnout. The loss of resources leading to burnout, as explained by the Conservation of Resources theory, may have been connected to today's higher education administrative position of performing more responsibilities with less staffing. This research study examined the relationship between work duties assigned to college counselors, as measured by the College Counselor Activity Rating Scale, and the level of burnout for those counselors, as measured by the Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure. The first five hypotheses examined the relationship between burnout and non-counseling duties by utilizing a hierarchical multiple regression analysis with various tests of mediation and moderation. The sixth hypothesis explored the assertion that college counselors at small institutions of higher education (institutional enrollment less than 5000 students) are more likely to engage in non-counseling duties. Members of the American College Counseling Association were recruited to serve as the population sample frame for the study. Because no instrument existed to measure counseling and non-counseling duties for college counselors, the College Counselor Activity Rating Scale was developed as a part of the study. Validation procedures were utilized in the form of an expert panel and pilot study for the College Counselor Activity Rating Scale. Of the six null hypotheses, all six were retained with limited power. Further analysis showed statistically significant relationships between burnout, perceived workload, and meaningful work. In addition, three non-counseling duties items, all related to administrative duties, were statistically significantly related to burnout. The key findings, implications and recommendations for future research were discussed.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1 - Introduction

Addressing the topic of why people become counselors, the National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC, 2014) stated all counselors share one common goal, "a desire to help people work through life's challenges." For college counselors, the positive aspects of work have taken shape through witnessing the power of change, contributing to client change, feeling hopeful for clients, perceiving work as meaningful and valuable, experiencing personal growth and competence, forming meaningful connections, developing a sense of counselor beliefs and values, receiving support, observing the positive personal characteristics in clients, and experiencing work-related diversity and resourcefulness (Kadambi, Audet, & Knish, 2010). With these varied benefits as guiding motivators for the work they performed, college counselors have needed to understand the personal risks involved in working in the counseling profession (Meyer & Ponton, 2006). A lack of job resources, high demands from their employer (Bakker, Demerouti, & Euwema, 2005), and personal, unrealistic expectations of being satisfied solely by the completion of client goals (Warnath & Shelton, 1976) led to burnout for counseling professionals. In turn, this burnout led to the depletion of emotional, mental, and physical resources, the inability to attain one's personal goals, and feeling trapped in emotionally draining relationships (Watkins, 1983). According to Leiter, Bakker, and Maslach (2014), burnout produced a steady body of research beginning in the 1970's, but there is a need for further research that matches scientific rigor with practical application.

College counselors have the unique task of meeting the varied academic, emotional, and social needs of today's college students (Spooner, 2000). College counseling traced its roots over 100 years and seen many facelifts throughout the decades (Hodges, 2017b; Sharkin, 2012). In that time, the role and function of the college counselor adapted to meet the needs of students as

well as the demands of the culture at large (Bishop, 2006; LaFollette, 2009; Prescott, 2008). Research indicated an increase in the number of students entering institutions of higher education with severe mental illness diagnoses (Bishop, 2006; Brunner, Wallace, Reymann, Sellers, & McCabe, 2014; Carter & Winseman, 2003), though there are those who debated such assertions (Much & Swanson, 2010; Schwartz, 2015; Sharkin, 2012). Regardless of the severity of college students' presenting concerns, college counseling has been a specialty within the field of counseling with its own sense of identity (Sharkin, 2012) and required quality research about its practices, students, and clinicians (Bishop, Gallagher, & Cohen, 2000; Humphrey, Kitchens, & Patrick, 2000; Sharkin, 2012).

General Statement of the Problem

Current economic conditions and campus population sizes have required college counseling professionals to adapt work conditions and behaviors in innovative ways (LaFollette, 2009; Watson, 2013). Because budgets were strained, part of this adaptation required counselors to perform more services with fewer resources: the colloquial "do more with less" (Center for Collegiate Mental Health [CCMH], 2017; Espinoza, 2012; Ghetie, 2007; Humphrey et al., 2000; Mullin, 2010; Sharkin, 2012; Smith et al., 2007). Of concern for college counselors has been the lack of resources, along with a lack of training and increased emotional strain, which could lead to burnout (Much, Wagener, & Hellenbrand, 2010).

Despite the large body of literature in regard to burnout with mental health professionals in general (e.g. Acker, 2003; Ackerly, Burnell, Holder, & Kurdek, 1988; Boy & Pine, 1980; Coll, Kovach, Cutler, & Smith, 2007; Farber, 1988; Gallavan & Newman, 2013; Jackson, 2004; Kirk-Brown & Wallace, 2004; Kraus & Stein, 2013; Kruger, Bernstein, & Botman, 1995; Lambie, 2006; Lee, Cho, Kissinger, & Ogle, 2010; Lent & Schwartz, 2012; Magnuson, Norem, &

Wilcoxon, 2002; Maslach & Florian, 1988; Meyer & Ponton, 2006; Miller et al., 2011; Miner, 2010; Moore, 2011; Ross, Altmaier, & Russell, 1989; Ryan, 1996; Skovholt, Grier, & Hanson, 2001; Warnath & Shelton, 1976; Watkins, 1983) and with school counselors (e.g. Bardhoshi, 2012; Bardhoshi, Schweinle, & Duncan, 2014; Butler & Constantine, 2005; Cummings & Nall, 1982; Falls, 2009; Hurt, 2014; Kesler, 1990; Kim, 1993; Lambie, 2007; Moyer, 2011; Nelson, Robles-Pina, & Nichter, 2008; Stephan, 2005; Wachter, Clemens, & Lewis, 2008; Wilkerson, 2009; Wilkerson & Bellini, 2006; Willingham, 2009; Yildirim, 2006), there has been minimal research exploring burnout in college counselors (Arricale, 2001; Burke, 1985; Davis, 2014). This has highlighted the need for further research about burnout in the college counseling profession. Considering the specialized nature of college counseling (Sharkin, 2012), it is increasingly important to identify potential areas of burnout specific to college counselors.

Recently, there has been an increased interest in the literature surrounding school counselors performing non-counseling duties and the effects on job performance and burnout (Bardhoshi, 2012; Falls, 2009; Hurt, 2014; Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005; Moyer, 2011; Nelson et al., 2008; Smith, 2009; Woods, 2009). As Bardhoshi (2012) noted, having non-counseling duties puts school counselors at risk for experiencing role ambiguity, role conflict, and work overload, all of which contribute to burnout. With the increased demand and differentiation of services experienced by college counselors, work overload has been of particular concern. However, the field of college counseling has not addressed the impact of non-counseling duties on the severity of burnout for college counselors. Non-counseling duties have been identified as additional roles and contributions by Sharkin (2012). They were also a theme in Davis' (2014) research of role conflict in community college counselors, but a direct relationship to burnout was not established. In addition, Sharkin (2012) noted that counselors at smaller campuses are more

likely to serve as academic advisors for students and perform other non-counseling duties, while LaFollette (2009) discussed an increase in administrative duties taking away from time spent counseling college students. Since non-counseling duties have been shown to contribute to work overload in school counselors (Bardhoshi, 2012), college counselors have needed to explore non-counseling duties since the negative aspects of work overload have been shown to increase burnout (Barkhuizen, Rothmann, & van der Vijver, 2014; Ben-Itzhak, Dvash, Maor, Rosenberg, & Halpern, 2015; deBeer, Pienaar, & Rothmann, 2016; Schaufeli, 2017; Schaufeli & Salanova, 2014; Weigl et al., 2016) However, research has also shown that finding meaning in one's work can decrease burnout (Dik, Duffy, & Eldridge, 2009; Rasmussen et al., 2016; Shanafelt, 2009; Steger, Dik, & Duffy, 2012). The previous research that explored burnout has shown it to be complex and has required continued research to better understand its predictors and impacts (Leiter et al., 2014).

A void has remained in the literature about the understanding of burnout in college counselors, specifically whether factors of burnout in general mental health clinicians and school counselors (e.g., non-counseling duties) impact college counselors as well. Therefore, further research has been needed to enhance understanding about the work performed by college counselors and how it impacts the college counselor in terms of burnout.

Purpose

Due to the need for research into the relationship between the work tasks of college counselors and burnout, the purpose of this study was to measure the relationship between burnout, as measured by the Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure (SMBM; Shirom & Melamed, 2006), and college counselor non-counseling duties, as measured by the College Counselor Activity Rating Scale (CCARS), a measure adapted from the School Counselor Activity Rating

Scale (SCARS; Scarborough, 2005). Moderating effects were tested for meaningfulness of work, as measured by the Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI; Steger et al., 2012), as well as the number of years working at the current institution, as measured by a demographic questionnaire. The mediating effects of work overload, as measured by the Perceived Workload Scale (PWS; Moore, 2000) was also examined. Most of the hypotheses for this study were addressed as correlational relationships.

Since little research had been completed about the non-counseling duties performed by college counselors, a second purpose of this research was to explore the occurrences of college counselors engaging in non-counseling duties. To do this, comparisons of non-counseling duties between college counselors of varying institution sizes was measured by the CCARS and the demographic survey.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Due to the need for further research about the relationship between burnout and non-counseling duties in college counselors, the following research questions were addressed:

1. Is there a relationship between burnout and non-counseling duties?
    a. Is the number of years working as a mental health professional a moderator between non-counseling duties and burnout?
    b. Is the number of years working at the current institution a moderator between non-counseling duties and burnout?
    c. Is work overload a mediator between non-counseling duties and burnout?
    d. Does finding meaning in work moderate the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout?

2. Is it more common for college counselors at small institutions of higher education (< 5000 students at the specific campus) than college counselors at larger institutions of higher education to engage in non-counseling duties?

The first hypothesis was the relationship between burnout and non-counseling duties will be statistically significant. Non-counseling duties have been shown to contribute to burnout in school counselors (Bardhoshi, 2012; Moyer, 2011). This hypothesis was based upon the previous research to test whether non-counseling duties are related to burnout in college counselors as well. This hypothesis was tested with a hierarchical regression analysis in order to analyze the effects of adding other variables to the model.

The second hypothesis was the number of years working as a mental health professional will statistically significantly moderate the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout. Skovholt and Trotter-Mathison (2011) noted that seasoned professionals are more likely to seek diverse activities to protect against monotony in their work. One way for the experienced college counselor to do this has been to engage in activities outside of the regular counseling activities. Because non-counseling duties may have been a coping mechanism to protect the counselor from the stress that leads to burnout, it may have impacted the strength of the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout. The veracity of this assertion was tested with a hierarchical regression model.

The third hypothesis was the number of years working at the current institution will statistically significantly moderate the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout. According to Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001), people have sought to ameliorate burnout through job withdrawal, including job turnover. As a result, working at a new institution may have been a coping mechanism to decrease burnout, thereby affecting the strength of the

relationship between burnout and non-counseling duties. This hypothesis was tested with a hierarchical regression model.

The fourth hypothesis was work overload will statistically significantly mediate the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout. With the aforementioned direct links between work overload and burnout, it was important to test whether work overload explains the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout. This hypothesis was tested with a hierarchical regression model and the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2017).

The fifth hypothesis was that finding meaning in work will statistically significantly moderate the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout. Having meaningful work has helped employees cope with the stress of limited resources and work overload (Krok, 2016; Rosso, Dekas, & Wrzesniewski, 2010). This in turn has affected the level of burnout. This hypothesis used a hierarchical regression model to test the moderation effects of meaningful work.

The final hypothesis was there is a statistically significant difference between counselors at institutions of higher education with a campus enrollment of less than 5,000 than counselors at larger institutions regarding non-counseling duties. This sought to confirm the assertions of Sharkin (2012) that smaller institutions of higher education engage in non-counseling duties more frequently than larger institutions of higher education. No distinction was made regarding the type of institution, such as community college versus four-year institution or private versus public institutions. If this hypothesis was confirmed, and a relationship was found between burnout and non-counseling duties in the first hypotheses, then further research and intervention regarding burnout would be warranted for college counselors working at smaller institutions. An independent *t*-test was used to test this hypothesis.

The null hypotheses were as follows:

1) There is no statistically significant relationship between burnout and non-counseling duties.
2) The number of years working as a mental health professional will not statistically significantly moderate the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout.
3) The number of years working at the current institution will not statistically significantly moderate the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout.
4) Work overload will not statistically significantly mediate the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout.
5) Finding meaning in work will not statistically significantly moderate the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout.
6) There is no statistically significant difference between counselors at institutions of higher education with a campus enrollment of less than 5,000 than counselors at larger institutions regarding non-counseling duties.

Statement of Potential Significance

College counseling has been a unique brand of counseling (Sharkin, 2012) with its own set of rewards and struggles. Because of the lack of research regarding non-counseling duties and burnout amongst college counselors, the goal of this research was to explore a previously unexplored dynamic in the college counseling profession. In addition, with a better understanding of the relationships associated with burnout in college counselors, this study could be the first step in future research to best practices within the field of college counseling.

Another benefit of this research was providing college counselors with a valid and reliable instrument to measure the counseling and non-counseling duties they perform. Much of

the research provided for the college counseling field has focused upon the relationship between college counselors and student outcomes. This new tool could enable future research examining the dynamics of working in a college counseling center.

Definitions of Terms

For this study, several operational definitions from the existing research literature were utilized and defined as follows:

Burnout. The definition of burnout has seen an evolution from the first definition provided by Freudenberger (1974) as a process in which a staff member begins to "fail, wear out, or become exhausted by making excessive demands on energy, strength, or resources" (p. 159). Exhaustion remained a major component of Maslach's popular conceptualization that saw burnout as "a prolonged response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors on the job defined by exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy" (Maslach et al., 2001, p. 397). However, Hobfoll and Shirom (2001) were critical of this definition because of the potential for the variables to confound burnout with the coping mechanisms for and criteria of burnout. As a result, this study utilized the following definition paraphrased from Hobfoll and Shirom (2001); burnout is the wearing down of a person's intrinsic energetic resources: emotional, cognitive, and physical fatigue by means of collective job stress gradually over time. Burnout was measured as the Total Exhaustion score on the SMBM.

College counselor. A college counselor was defined in this study as a mental health practitioner who works at an institution of higher education. Though there have been certifications and specialties in college counseling, there has been no distinct educational program (Sharkin, 2012). Instead, the educational background of college counselors has been diverse; most often psychology, counselor education, social work, and/or marriage and family

therapy (Hodges, 2017b; Sharkin, 2012). Historically, college counselors have needed a doctoral degree to practice, but there has been a growing number of master's-level practitioners (Sharkin, 2012). The sample for this study consisted of college counselors from across the United States with varying professional licenses.

Meaningful work. Meaningful work was defined as work that is both personally enriching and positively impacts others (Bailey, Madden, Alfes, Shantz, & Soane, 2017). This has been different than previous definitions of meaning of work in that the utilized definition carries an implicit connotation of positive regard towards work. For this study, meaningful work was measured as the Meaningful Work score on the WAMI.

Non-counseling duties. Often alluded to, but rarely defined in the literature, this study defined non-counseling duties as job responsibilities required by higher education administration that are outside of the standardized practices of college counselors. The standardized practices were identified by inclusion in the International Association of Counseling Services (IACS) standards and the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) standards for college counselors. In order to identify which job responsibilities were non-counseling in nature, a list of common job duties was gathered from the research literature (e.g. Hodges, 2017b; Sharkin, 2012). After this list was created, the standardized practices were removed, and any remaining job responsibilities were deemed to be non-counseling in nature. Non-counseling duties included administrative tasks, committee work outside of the counseling center, providing disability services, advising students, leading a behavioral intervention team/threat assessment team (BIT/TAT), etc. Non-counseling duties were measured by the mean score of the items from the Other Activities section of the CCARS.

Work overload. Work overload occurs when a job's demands exceed the resources available to an employee (Gilboa, Shirom, Fried, & Cooper, 2008). To measure work overload, the mean score of the items on the Perceived Workload Scale was used.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

This study was based upon the conceptualizations of burnout as explained by the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory. According to COR, when a person has been threatened with resource loss, has experienced actual resource loss, or has not gained expected resources, they experience psychological stress (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). COR specifically identified burnout as the byproduct of psychological stress that has resulted from the threats, losses, and inadequate supply of emotional, physical, and cognitive energy related to work. COR will be discussed in further detail in the next chapter. Concepts from COR informed the exploration of non-counseling duties as a threat and drain on a college counselor's energy for this study. Using the CCARS, SMBM, WAMI, and PWS instruments, a correlational field study methodology was used to explore whether a relationship exists between non-counseling duties and burnout.

Chapter 2 - Review of the Literature

As discussed in the previous chapter, college counselors have been asked to do more with less (Espinoza, 2012; Ghetie, 2007; Humphrey et al., 2000; Mullin, 2010; Sharkin, 2012; Smith et al., 2007). Based upon the tenets of COR, this multifaceted threat to resources has contributed to an increase in counselor stress which, unmitigated over time, leads to burnout (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). To better understand this threat in college counselors, a thorough examination of the professional literature of the college counseling profession and burnout was needed.

This chapter begins with a review of the history of the college counseling profession and describes the major roles and responsibilities often performed by college counselors. Next, historical and current definitions from research literature of burnout are discussed. Finally, the theoretical framework of COR and its relationship to burnout are explored.

The History of College Counseling as a Profession

The profession of college counseling has had a long history going back to the initial offering of services at Princeton University in 1910 (Prescott, 2008). At that time, it was primarily the responsibility of faculty to offer counseling to students, regardless of whether the faculty was formally trained or simply had an interest in assisting students (Hodges, 2017b). Additionally, universities began forming student mental hygiene clinics to address the educational concerns of students (Meadows, 2000). However, many of these services carried a significant, negative stigma about usage (Sharkin, 2012).

Following World War II, college counseling centers responded to the needs of returning veterans by expanding vocational guidance services for students (Hodges, 2017b; Meadows, 2000). There was also a change in the identity of college students as more non-traditional students, those older than their late teens to early 20s, began to enroll in classes (Prescott, 2008).

Meadows (2000) remarked that due to the "educational and career needs of veterans, major developments in college counseling organizations, expansion of college counseling preparation programs, and theoretical advances" (p. 21) this time frame was the most influential in the creation of college counseling centers across the country. This was followed by the expansion of the college counseling preparation programs, along with the development of professional organizations during the 1940's and 1950's. With these changes, the college counselor was identified as a professional position in the campus community and not a side component of a professor or other student affairs professional's (e.g., dean's) work responsibilities (Meadows, 2000).

With the influence of the 1940's and 1950's, college counseling centers expanded in the 1960's, particularly in two-year institutions and smaller colleges (Meadows, 2000). However, economic difficulties in the 1960's and 1970's put a strain on the ability of many college counseling centers to maintain the same level of care and, in some cases, survive (Prescott, 2008). Out of this challenge a diversity of attitudes and collaborations evolved (Meadows, 2000). Prevention, along with student and organizational development, became primary motivators of counseling centers. To meet these new directions, a higher level of collaboration with students, faculty, and administration was needed. Additionally, counselors engaged in more psychoeducational activities on campus, resulting in greater visibility in the college community.

The changing economics of the 1970's ushered in changes during the 1980's to health insurance and methods of practice, including mental health concerns (Prescott, 2008). This resulted in a new mindset among counseling professionals, including college counselors. Instead of maintaining a broad range of activities and scope of practice, college counselors became increasingly inundated with more severe psychopathological presenting problems (Meadows,

2000), which led the profession towards the medical model of practice (LaFollette, 2009). Meadows (2000) also noted an increase in the potential for increased psychopharmacological treatments, community agency referrals, and outsourcing during this time. As a result, the focus of practice for college counselors shifted from academic and vocational counseling to mental health counseling. The shift to a medical model also conflicted with the previously utilized developmental models, resulting in an increased focus on addressing psychopathology and less on guidance and the fostering of developmental milestones (Kitzrow, 2003).

In the past 25 years, college counseling centers developed into triage and trauma centers that provided brief counseling, group counseling, prevention outreach, consultation, and administrative duties (Meadows, 2000). During this time, there was also a major push for all college counselors to hold professional licensure in the state where they work (Kitzrow, 2003). The "Standards for University and College Counseling Services" by IACS (2016) identified nine current program functions performed by college counselors: individual and group counseling, crisis intervention and emergency services, outreach interventions, consultation interventions, referral resources, research, program evaluation, professional development, and training programs.

Since its formation in the early 1910's, the profession of college counseling has seen many changes in its provision of services. Oftentimes, these changes were a result of meeting the needs of the college student population. It was these changes that have led to the current role and responsibilities expected of college counselors.

The Role of the College Counselor

A new identity for college counselors emerged in the 21st century (Hodges, 2017b; Sharkin, 2012). No longer was the college counselor limited to the developmental and vocational

needs of students. A more expansive skill set and scope of practice were necessary to meet the various developmental, vocational, psychological, and academic problems that students often present (Sharkin, 2012). This section will explore the nine program functions as delineated by IACS and discussed in the professional literature. Non-counseling duties commonly assigned to college counselors will also be examined. It is worth noting that not all college counselors have engaged in each of these ten areas but they constitute the broad range of services offered by most college counseling centers.

Individual and group counseling. Counseling has been the primary service provided by college counselors (Sharkin, 2012). Specifically, individual counseling has been the most expected and requested service by students and administrators. According to the Association for University and College Counseling Center Directors' (AUCCCD) 2016 survey, approximately 61% of all services were direct clinical services (Reetz, Bershad, LeViness, & Whitlock, n.d.). However, due to the limited resources of time and number of professionals, counseling centers have had to identify specific strategies to maximize efficiency of resources (Lyn, 2017a).

Both individual and group counseling covered a wide range of topics (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education [CAS], 2014), generally pertaining to developmental and clinical mental health issues. AUCCCD identified the top presenting problems as anxiety, depression, relationship concerns, suicidal ideation, self-harm behaviors, and alcohol abuse (Reetz et al., n.d.). To address these issues, many college counselors utilized different modalities including individual counseling, group counseling, couples and family counseling, substance abuse counseling, academic counseling, and career counseling (Sharkin, 2012). These services have been both active and/or preventive in nature (CAS, 2014).

Brief individual counseling. Many colleges have utilized a brief model of therapy to maximize efficiency (Lyn, 2017a). This has often involved implementing session limits and referral to other campus services or community resources. Beyond efficiency of counseling center resources, college students have been well suited for brief counseling because their problems are often situational or transient, they have only been interested in direct interventions to address the situational problems, and the problems were often developmental in nature. This has explained why the average number of sessions was six (Sharkin, 2012). While brief counseling has been beneficial to both colleges and students, it was recommended that counseling centers bear in mind that effective treatment for mild complaints has been reached by 14 sessions on average, while medium-to-severe complaints required 20 or more sessions (Lyn, 2017a).

Other opportunities have also been available to create efficient and effective services for students. One such option has been to design the intake or initial session with the goal of identifying and understanding the problem and providing initial interventions (Lyn, 2017a). Since the modal number of sessions has been one, this has allowed students to gain an initial exposure to what counseling would entail. Students have then left treatment with at least one intervention to utilize in addressing their problem, if they did not return for more sessions.

In addition, many colleges have engaged in stepped-care models of service (Lyn, 2017a). The stepped-care model was designed so that a student who came for an intake interview with a counselor was evaluated and then assigned to the least intensive treatment. This meant attending psychoeducational workshops or group counseling rather than going immediately to individual counseling for some students. For students in emergency situations, triage and crisis intervention

services were immediately offered. This allowed counseling centers the opportunity to prioritize resources to those students most in need.

Group counseling. Group counseling has been an effective way to manage counseling center resources (Sharkin, 2012). Developmental problems have often been addressed with psychoeducational workshops, which served many students simultaneously, in coordination with brief counseling. One or two counselors have been able to see several students in the same time frame they would have been able to see one or two students. Group counseling has become a popular preferred modality because it has allowed students to connect with others who were experiencing similar struggles and expand their cultural perspectives (Lyn, 2017a).

Groups generally have taken one of three forms: interpersonal process, theme, and psychoeducational (Lyn, 2017a). With interpersonal process groups, students have been exposed to varying problems and resolutions in a semi-structured format. The main function of the counselor has been to encourage group cohesion and focus on healthy group interactions. Through these interactions, the group members have become self-motivated for change on their individualized presenting concern.

Unlike interpersonal process groups, theme groups have been used to target a common demographic, topic, or presenting problem that connected all participants (Lyn, 2017a). This has been particularly beneficial for connecting with minority students, such as those who were non-traditional students, first-generation students, or LGBTQI, if the cultural distinction was the common connection between students. Topics, such as social anxiety, depression, and relationship issues have been utilized to give specific direction for the group. While these themes tied together the group focus, the emphasis was still placed on connection between group members as opposed to direct feedback from the counselor who led the group.

Finally, psychoeducational groups have functioned as workshops to cover a variety of topics (Lyn, 2017a). There has often been less stigma surrounding psychoeducational workshops. In addition, because they were often more lecture oriented, the students did not have to self-identify or share personal experiences. This has been a valuable outreach tool for students to become more familiar with the counseling center staff and the types of problems that were addressed by the counseling center.

Other modalities. While individual and group counseling have been the most requested and utilized treatments in college counseling centers (Sharkin, 2012), there have been other ways in which college counselors have provided direct services to students. Career counseling was one of the earliest duties of college counselors and has continued to the present (Hodges, 2017b; Meadows, 2000). Career counseling has generally assisted students in making and implementing career-related decisions, adjusting to work, managing one's career, and negotiating the transition from school to career (Lent & Brown, 2013). Though there has been a shift to automate career placement and exploration through computer-based assessments, interactions with a counselor have had a stronger effect on long-term job satisfaction (Lent & Brown, 2013). Career counseling has remained an important aspect of the college counseling center (Hodges, 2017b; Sharkin, 2012).

Couples counseling and family counseling have also been available in some college counseling centers (Sharkin, 2012) though many counseling centers have required both partners to be students of the institution (Lyn, 2017a). Part of the avoidance on the part of counseling centers to provide couples or family counseling has stemmed from college counselors feeling inadequately prepared to offer couples or family counseling (Sharkin, 2012). Regardless, with relationship concerns representing nearly a third of the presenting problems seen in counseling

(Reetz et al., n.d.), these modalities have been a beneficial tool for college counselors to utilize (Sharkin, 2012).

Testing and assessment. A final area of direct service has been psychological testing and assessment. Lyn (2017a) noted there is little information in the professional literature regarding the use of psychological tests in the college counseling center, though it has been a function of its services. It may have been more common for counselors to use simple inventories as opposed to full psychological batteries (Sharkin, 2012) due to the time and expense of performing a full psychological battery (Lyn, 2017a). One use of the assessments has been to provide documentation of a disability for students to qualify for academic accommodations on campus (Shelton, 2017). Though it may have constituted a small portion of the direct services provided to students, testing and assessment have been an important aspect of the work of the college counseling center (Sharkin, 2012).

Crisis Intervention and Emergency Services. Crisis intervention and emergency services have become an increasingly important aspect of the work performed by college counselors, especially suicide assessment (Hodges, 2017d; Sharkin, 2012). In addition to suicidal crises, crisis intervention has included emergency walk-ins, urgent referrals, after-hours emergencies, and postvention in the aftermath of a death on- or off-campus (Sharkin, 2012). According to Coulter, Offutt, and Mascher (2003), crisis intervention, especially after normal working hours, has been one of the least favorite aspects of the work performed by college counselors. One reason for this dislike has been the increased responsibility surrounding crisis intervention coupled with a lack of corresponding resources (Drum, Brownson, Denmark, & Smith, 2009). In addition, this role has carried increased scrutiny and pressure to quickly resolve crises while maintaining the proper ethical and legal guidelines (Coulter et al., 2003) considering

the increased media attention given to campus suicides (Sharkin, 2012). While there has been increased pressure from society for counseling professionals to release private health information about at-risk students and prevent suicide completion, Lewis (2015) discussed the need for college counselors to continue advocating for the protection of confidentiality in balance with duty-to-warn situations.

To better meet the needs of the campus in the wake of a crisis, a crisis intervention response team [CIRT] or crisis management team has been an option for colleges and universities to plan and implement the procedures for handling a crisis (Hodges, 2017d). While there has been no singular recipe for creating a CIRT, Hodges (2017d) recommended creating collaborations between counseling services, campus police, medical staff, faculty representatives, campus clergy, administrative representatives, student representatives, and representatives from the local community (e.g., local police, mental health therapists, religious organizations). An example of CIRT responsibilities have included training CIRT members on the crisis response plan; coordinating first responders and campus resources during or immediately after a crisis; designating and operating a command center; arrange communications between administrators, students, family members, and the media; relocating students; providing counseling, debriefing, and memorial services; and evaluating the effectiveness of the CIRT's response to the crisis.

Outreach Interventions. According to Sharkin (2012), outreach interventions have consisted of "activity that literally takes counselors outside of their offices and into the campus community, presenting psychoeducational and prevention programs" (p. 35). By providing workshops, training, and publicity events, college counseling centers have sought to destigmatize the negative cultural perceptions of the campus community (Mier, Boone, & Shropshire, 2009).

Outreach activities have connected services of the counseling center to students who would otherwise be reluctant to walk into the counseling center and promoted awareness of the services offered by the counseling center (Lyn, 2017b; Marks & McLaughlin, 2005).

There has been a particular interest in the literature regarding outreach to multicultural and at-risk students (Haas et al., 2008; Mesidor & Sly, 2014; Schwartz, Nissel, Eisenberg, Kay, & Brown, 2012). Most notably, Mesidor and Sly (2014) found African Americans and international students were more likely to seek counseling services if outreach efforts help the students know about the services they could access. This aligned with Wright's (2000) discussion that college counselors must step outside of their usual routines and become immersed in diverse cultures and communities to enrich counseling services for multicultural students.

Consultation Interventions. Sharkin (2012) defined consultation as professional knowledge and expertise that "is typically provided to students, faculty, staff, administrators, and parents and tends to revolve around concerns about the well-being of specific students" (p. 35). An important point of distinction was that whoever contacted the counseling center was the client, not the student of concern (Mier et al., 2009). This meant the counselor's job was to provide information and guidance to the client about how to best assist the student.

The IACS standards emphasized the need for ethical considerations within the consultation process (IACS, 2016). Specifically, they offered three guidelines to help college counselors navigate the consultation process. The first guideline was that consultation with faculty and staff members must respect confidential counseling relationships with students. While counselors responded to the information provided by faculty and staff, they should not acknowledge a previous or current relationship with students who were being discussed. In

accordance with Section D.2.b of the *ACA Code of Ethics* (American Counseling Association [ACA], 2014), counselors had a responsibility of clearly outlining their role in the consultation relationship with faculty and staff members, particularly so that matters of confidentiality were not violated. The second standard also concerned confidentiality except it referenced entities outside of the college environment, such as parents, spouses, and community agencies (IACS, 2016). There was also a provision in this guideline for the counselor to be involved in a student's safety plan. Finally, the third guideline outlined that college counselors may act as consultants but should not be responsible for decision-making in administrative and academic student situations.

Mier et al. (2009) outlined the steps of the consultation process. One of the top priorities whenever a client contacted the counseling center was for the counselor to assess the level of urgency of the situation to determine whether crisis intervention was needed. In emergency situations, such as a student threatening harm to self or others or being unexpectedly absent from classes and social media, it was important to arrange for immediate intervention. This intervention included working with campus police and the Dean of Students office to locate the student. Sharkin (2012) recommended college counselors should not assume the responsibility alone for locating and convincing/coercing students to come to the counseling center. Though clients have often requested for counselors to do this, and it may create a point of contention when denied, assuming this responsibility would have been an ethical violation. It would have been a violation of the student's autonomy, which has been a fundamental principle of professional ethical behavior (ACA, 2014). Mier et al. (2009) noted that the counselor may become the point person in the situation, collecting information from different parties and

coordinating an intervention for the student. However, this still utilized a team approach and did not suggest a counselor should approach crisis intervention alone.

If the current situation was not an immediate concern, Sharkin (2012) and Mier et al. (2009) differed in their recommended approaches. Sharkin (2012) suggested working with the client (i.e. faculty, parent, staff) to refer the student to the counseling center. Ideally, he recommended the client have the student present when they called counseling services for consultation. Mier et al. (2009) recommended the counselor give instructions to the client about how to work with the student, particularly if the client is a faculty or staff member. Their assertion assumed the client had already unsuccessfully tried to refer the student to counseling services if he or she is calling the counseling center for guidance. Over time, as the client connected with the student and a collaborative relationship grew between them, the client would find he or she could more successfully provide support to the student and advocate for the student regarding institutional policies and barriers.

Referral Resources. There have been times when a student's needs exceeded the scope of the counseling center (Sharkin, 2012). Students have needed tutoring or advising that was handled by another office on campus. Or students may have been prevented from being seen in a timely manner due to case overload and waitlists, a result of higher demand with lower resources (Lacour & Carter, 2002). Additionally, some counseling centers have imposed session limits and referred students to off-campus resources when the presenting concerns exceeded the brief therapy approach (Lyn, 2017a). Whatever the reason, making an appropriate and timely referral has been the ethical responsibility of college counselors and a necessary work duty. According to the American Psychological Association's *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct* (2010), "Psychologists consult with, refer to, or cooperate with other professionals and

institutions to the extent needed to serve the best interests of those with whom they work." This aligned with "The primary responsibility of counselors is to respect the dignity and promote the welfare of clients" in the *ACA Code of Ethics* (ACA, 2014).

Making off-campus referrals has oftentimes been complex and difficult to arrange (Lacour & Carter, 2002; Lyn, 2017a; Sharkin, 2012). Part of the difficulty has involved the costs associated with off-campus referrals. Students may not have had the discretionary income, had access to health insurance, or wanted to utilize health insurance with an off-campus provider (Sharkin, 2012). These limitations have restricted students to utilizing community mental health resources, unless alternative arrangements were made. An example of alternative arrangements, described by Lacour and Carter (2002), highlighted the University of Florida Counseling Center's work with local, private practice therapists offering pro bono services to students referred for long-term treatment. However, having such an arrangement took collaboration and work from the counseling center staff (Lyn, 2017a). Having a dedicated referral staff member helped streamline the process and increased the effectiveness of providing referrals (Lacour & Carter, 2002). As noted by Owen, Devdas, and Rodolfa (2007), 42% of students did not use referral information when it was provided to them. And of particular concern, minority students were 25% less likely to utilize an off-campus referral than white students at 57.4% and 32.4% respectively. This emphasized the importance of good outreach practices and a dedicated referral plan to be sure students received continuity of care for their mental health needs.

Research. Conducting current and relevant research about the profession and best practices of college counseling has been an important part of the work performed by college counselors (CAS, 2014; IACS, 2016). However, research has often been viewed as a non-essential function by college counselors (Bishop et al., 2000). Sharkin (2012) suggested this was

because college counselors see themselves primarily as practitioners, have limited time to devote to research, and do not receive tangible rewards for conducting research, such as tenure or promotion. Whatever the case may be, research has been a needed function of college counselors so the profession can stay informed about empirically-tested treatments to use in evidence-based approaches while working with students (Lyn, 2017c; Sharkin, 2012).

One way college counselors can participate in research has been to partner with various organizations that conduct research within the college counseling profession (Sharkin, 2012). Both ACCA and AUCCCD conduct yearly surveys of their membership regarding current practices within college counseling centers. ACCA has focused on community colleges while AUCCCD has focused primarily on four-year institutions. In addition, the CCMH at Pennsylvania State University has collected information from counseling centers to create national norms about college counseling services (CCMH, n.d.). Though these pieces of research have often corresponded with data collected regarding program evaluation, they also fulfill the research standards of practice for college counseling centers.

Program Evaluation. According to the Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (2010), program evaluation has involved systematically collecting, analyzing, and applying data to basic questions about a program. Specific to college counseling, program evaluation has been the "regular review of the counseling service based on data from center evaluation efforts" (IACS, 2016, p. 6) and "explores whether the program or service is functioning effectively to achieve its mission and how it can be improved" (Dean, 2011, p. 2). While student satisfaction surveys and criterion assessments may have been a part of this process, both IACS and CAS have provided comprehensive standards for evaluation of a college counseling center.

Dean (2011) discussed two primary ways to assess a college counseling center for program evaluation efforts. The first way was to utilize an external accreditation agency, such as IACS. This has been an effective, efficient, and preferred approach due to the accreditation agency's objective interpretation of standards and its familiarity with the evaluation process. However, not all counseling centers have had the necessary funds, met the accreditation requirements, or had a desire to be an accredited program. Instead, these counseling centers have often elected to use a self-assessment approach utilizing a set of professional standards, such as those created by CAS. Although mental health counselors have not often been educated or experienced in performing program assessment, they can develop this skill through practice, consultation, and review of program standards.

Whether contracting with an outside accrediting group or performing a self-assessment, the process of program evaluation was similar (Dean, 2011). First, the purpose and scope of the assessment were identified. Was the assessment used for internal, strategic planning, or accreditation review? Though both directions required an objective and systematic process be applied, knowing the target audience and requirements helped guide the completion of the final product. Second, the assessment team was assembled. When doing a single-area or department self-assessment, Dean (2011) recommended three to five individuals comprise the team. Since the final product was reported to the director of the department, it was more beneficial for this person to be a consultant rather than serving on the committee. Specifically, Dean (2011) recommended a rotating assessment process where the chair of the team was the next department to be reviewed. In this way, the chair was aware of the process and what documentation was needed when their department underwent the same process. Once the team was assembled, they

needed to be trained in conducting the review, if they were unfamiliar with the process or the specific department.

After the purpose was determined and the team was assembled and trained, the gathering of information was the next step in completing a program evaluation (Dean, 2011). There were several sources of information that could be considered. Much of it may already have existed in the form of annual reports, student handbooks, marketing material, organizational charts, job descriptions, staff resumes, satisfaction surveys, etc. With this information, and the specified tasks for which the team had been trained, team members evaluated the department against an established set of criterions or criteria. In the final step, these evaluations were combined and presented to the department for review in order that an action plan may be developed. Dean (2011) recommended strengths, discrepancies, areas for improvement, and areas needing documentation as possible topics for guiding the department head into the action planning stage.

Professional Development. To stay up-to-date with relevant best practices and evidence-based treatments, professional development has been an important aspect of the college counseling center (Lyn, 2017c; Sharkin, 2012). Many college counselors have been licensed mental health practitioners in their state and have needed continuing education for their licensure requirements (Sharkin, 2012). This professional development has taken the form of case conferences amongst staff, workshops provided by the counseling center, or external workshops and conferences (IACS, 2016).

While state and regional conferences have been a good source of generalist information, Bishop (2016) recommended that college counseling centers emphasize opportunities for staff to learn specialized skills and knowledge that was directly pertinent to the college student population. This was where opportunities such as the ACCA National Conference and the

AUCCCD Annual Conference could meet this need. Maples (2000) also noted that networking with other professionals was an important benefit of attending external professional development events.

Training Programs. Another purpose of the college counseling center has been to serve as a training program for graduate student interns, newly licensed professionals, and postdoctoral residents (Sharkin, 2012; Shelton & Hunter, 2017). Depending upon the stage of training and experience of the trainee, the number of hours and caseload have varied. Supervision has often taken the form of one-on-one dyads, case disposition and assignment teams, case presentations, and supervision-of-supervision dyads (Lyn, 2017c). To oversee these services, some counseling centers have assigned a staff member responsibilities as the training director for the center: recruiting and selecting new trainees, coordinating with academic training coordinators, creating learning contracts, overseeing trainee supervision, and evaluating the training program (Sharkin, 2012). With the increased demand for various types and availability of services (Watkins, Hunt, & Eisenberg, 2011), a training program has been a cost-efficient way to increase the number of available clinicians and undertake outreach initiatives (Shelton & Hunter, 2017). However, Sharkin (2012) cautioned that counseling centers needed to balance the needs of the center, the trainee, and the clients (i.e., students) in assigning trainee responsibilities.

There have been ethical implications to consider in the use of trainees and supervisors (Harris, 2002; Shelton & Hunter, 2017). The first has been that trainees should only perform the tasks in which they are competent (Shelton & Hunter, 2017). Because trainees could be at different stages of their training and experience, it has been the responsibility of supervisors to ensure each trainee's competence level has been evaluated and tasks have been assigned were

appropriate. In addition, supervisors have been+ responsible for self-evaluating their own expertise in providing supervision regarding the trainee's caseload.

A second ethical concern has been multiple relationships. Multiple relationships have occurred between trainees and other students at the institution, trainees and counseling center staff through on-campus activities, and trainees and counseling center staff friendships (Shelton & Hunter, 2017). However, even though both the ACA and APA code of ethics have recommended multiple relationships be avoided, they are not strictly prohibited (Harris, 2002; Shelton & Hunter, 2017). In some cases, they may have been beneficial for the development of the trainee (Harris, 2002). Shelton and Hunter (2017) also identified areas where multiple relationships with a clinical supervisor were professionally beneficial for the student, such as working on research projects or in a professional mentoring relationship. However, for clinicians to be wary of potential, ethical issues, it was important to mindfully evaluate whether any problems were developing due to the multiple relationships.

The final ethical concern discussed by Shelton and Hunter (2017) was identification of impairment. With the stress of completing coursework and negotiating work-life balance, supervisors have had the role of a gatekeeper in monitoring the work of trainees. If trainees exhibit behaviors that were dangerous to counseling center clients or the well-being of the trainee, supervisors had an obligation to intervene before resorting to formal remediation plans and/or recommending termination of the supervisory relationship.

In addition to overseeing the provision of services and providing supervision, training programs have engaged in activities to inform the practice of all staff, including trainees (Shelton & Hunter, 2017). This may have included training seminars, case consultation meetings, treatment teams, professional development opportunities, and supervision of supervision

meetings. Even though each of these approaches has been different, they all served the same purpose in providing learning opportunities for all involved, from counseling center directors to trainees.

Other Responsibilities. The programmatic areas identified as the roles and functions of a college counseling center were individual and group counseling, crisis intervention and emergency services, outreach interventions, consultation interventions, referral resources, research, program evaluation, professional development, and training programs (IACS, 2016). However, depending upon the structure of the institution and counseling center, and the job requirements of the counselors, there have been other responsibilities that have required a college counselor's attention (Sharkin, 2012). These responsibilities have included administrative tasks, university-wide activities, teaching, disability support services, academic advising, and student behavior response and are known as non-counseling duties.

The relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout has been a topic of interest in the field of school counseling. Several studies have shown a positive relationship between the number of non-counseling duties and the level of burnout. Kim and Lambie (2018) performed a review of the research literature on the topic of burnout and professional school counselors. Non-counseling duties was one of the primary areas identified as contributing to burnout in the research literature. Two of the studies that specifically studied the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout were Bardhoshi et al. (2014) and Moyer (2011). In Bardhoshi et al. (2014), the SCARS was used to measure non-counseling duties while the Counselor Burnout Inventory was used to measure burnout. Specifically, clerical duties had moderate effects on burnout for the three subscales Exhaustion ($R^2 = .27$, $p < .001$), Negative work environment ($R^2 = .13$, $p < .06$), and Deterioration in personal life ($R^2 = .25$, $p < .001$). Moyer (2011) also used the

Counselor Burnout Inventory but used a frequency scale to measure the number of hours devoted to non-counseling duties as identified by the school counselor. The non-counseling duties had a statistically significant moderate effect on each subscale of the Counselor Burnout Inventory. This evidence of the connection between burnout and non-counseling duties in school counselors furthers the need for identification of non-counseling duties in college counselors and research to explore the relationship between these responsibilities and burnout. While discussing these responsibilities, it is important to note that this is not an exhaustive list of non-counseling duties in which college counselors have engaged. In addition, no judgement is made as to whether or not it is appropriate for college counselors to engage in these activities.

Administrative tasks. The first area of non-counseling duties has been the administrative tasks completed by counseling center directors. Though director responsibilities may include counseling activities, such as program evaluation and training program responsibilities, there have been other tasks that were specifically non-counseling in nature. These have included strategic planning, policy review, budget management, staff management, and completion of reports (Sharkin, 2012). According to IACS (2016), directors have been responsible for the overall administration of the counseling center by coordinating the available resources and services.

University-wide activities. Another set of non-counseling duties included interdepartmental activities. Whether serving on committees, contributing to student retention efforts, or participating in institution-wide programming events (e.g., service learning activities), there have been many ways college counselors have participated in activities across campus (Sharkin, 2012). Counselors have been a valuable contribution to institutional committees due to their training in group processes and attention to multicultural needs. Participating on

committees has also helped college counselors to create alliances with faculty and other departments and identify ways to better serve students on campus. One possible alliance has been serving on retention committees. College counselors have been able to use this opportunity to show the positive impact of counseling on retention as well as collaborate in efforts organized by other departments.

Teaching. Teaching classes has been another way for college counselors to connect with other departments on campus (Sharkin, 2012). By serving as an instructor, counselors have been able to network with full-time faculty. However, one ethical consideration has been the potential for dual relationships. What happens if the counselor was teaching a required course and a former or current client must take the class? Or what if there was only one counselor on campus and they previously had a client as a student? Though these types of questions should not have prevented a counselor from teaching, they needed to be considered before beginning in the role of an educator.

Disability support services. A fourth set of non-counseling duties a counselor or counseling center may have been required to perform were those for students with disabilities (Sharkin, 2012). While students have often been referred to the counseling center for academic and psychological counseling regarding disabilities such as attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, autism spectrum disorders, learning disabilities, and others (Hodges, 2017c; Sharkin, 2012), college counselors have also overseen the tasks assigned to an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) coordinator or disability service support staff. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 required any college, private or public, that receives federal funding to provide reasonable accommodations to students with disabilities (United States Department of Education, October 15, 2015). The tasks associated with providing support have included

evaluating disability documentation, determination of reasonable accommodations, implementation of accommodations, resolving disputes/grievances, advocacy for students needs and concerns, providing professional development and training to the institution, acquiring assistive technology, and developing capital improvement plans for physical accessibility (Friend, Judy, & Reilly, 2005).

Academic advising. Academic advising has been another non-counseling duty performed by some college counselors (Hodges, 2017a; Sharkin, 2012). According to Cate and Miller (2015), academic advising has transitioned through four eras. It was during the third era that an increase of non-faculty academic advisors rose from 2% to 72%. Many of these advisors were college counselors, particularly at community and technical colleges. In 2003, the fourth era began with a shift to a new professional identity for academic advisors, including a new, independent professional organization. While advising responsibilities varied from institution to institution, it generally involved course scheduling and registration, developing plans of study, assisting with new student orientations, academic major exploration, and serving on various campus committees. Though there has been a move to provide the body of research needed to be recognized as a distinct profession (Cate & Miller, 2015), there have still been many college counselors performing the role of an academic advisor, particularly at smaller institutions (Sharkin, 2012).

Student behavior response. Lastly, college counselors have been asked to participate in student behavior response groups such as behavioral intervention teams (BIT) or threat assessment teams (TAT) as they have been commonly called (Sharkin, 2012). According to the National Behavioral Intervention Team Association (NaBITA; 2017), a BIT has generally been a multi-disciplinary team of professionals whose job was to track potential situations and concerns

over time and detect behavioral patterns, trends, and disturbances on campus, whether in individual or group behavior. The function of a BIT has been to receive reports of troubling behavior, conduct investigations, perform threat assessments, and determine the best method for providing support, intervention, warning, and response. In addition, a BIT has provided educational opportunities on campus about how to report suspicious activity, how to respond in a crisis, and what behavior constituted a threat to self or community.

While NaBITA listed several common names of BITs (e.g., TAT, CIRT), Sharkin (2012) noted that the behavioral response plan may look different at any given campus. For example, at The University of Alabama (2017) the BIT primarily focused upon students and helping to find solutions for problems or difficulties that arose. However, the TAT was tasked with identifying any threat to campus, whether internal or external, and responding to the perceived or realized threat. On another campus, the BIT may have been responsible for all of these tasks. Sharkin (2012) also differentiated CIRTs from BITs and TATs in that the BITs and TATs often focus on prevention of incidents while CIRTs deal with intervention and postvention.

Regardless of the form, college counselors have often been invited or required to serve on CIRTs, BITs, and TATs (Sharkin, 2012). This role may have been more consultative in nature, providing psychological and developmental expertise to explain behavior. Counselors also may have been asked to provide mandated assessments and/or counseling reports of a particular student to provide more pertinent information to the BIT. However, college counselors have had to be aware of ethical constraints of disclosure as governed by their professional code of ethics and applicable federal and state laws.

Burnout as a Theoretical Construct

Burnout, as a psychological construct, was most often attributed to Freudenberger's work in the 1970's. Freudenberger (1974) utilized the dictionary definition of burnout; "to fail, wear out, or become exhausted by making excessive demands on energy, strength, or resources" (p. 159). This original definition specifically applied burnout to those occupations in mental health that were chronically taxing, both emotionally and physically (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). This view was expanded by Maslach (1982) as a combination of three key components: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lack of personal accomplishment. The three-component expansion has been widely utilized, especially through the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Qiao & Schaufeli, 2011). In addition, both the MBI and the conceptualization of burnout have been generalized to apply to any occupation (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). A measure created specifically for use with counselors, the Counselor Burnout Inventory, utilized the same three components but was expanded to measure self-esteem and job satisfaction and used language specific to the profession of counseling (Lee et al., 2007).

Since the first definitions of burnout emerged, there have been multiple attempts to measure burnout in different ways (Schaufeli, Leiter, & Maslach, 2009). One common way was to collapse burnout into a single construct. This could be seen in Pines' (1993) Burnout Measure, the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI; Kristensen, Borritz, Villadsen, & Christensen, 2005) and the Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure (SMBM; Shirom & Melamed, 2005), which all measure burnout as exhaustion. Even though the CBI and SMBM have measured a single construct, they both have subscales. The CBI subscales measured different domains where burnout may manifest (Kristensen et al., 2005) while the SMBM measured three different types

of exhaustion: physical fatigue, emotional exhaustion, and cognitive wear (Shirom & Melamed, 2006).

Not all instruments have viewed burnout as a one-dimensional or three-dimensional construct. One such measure has been the Professional Quality of Life scale (Stamm, 2009), which has conceptualized burnout as a construct within the greater definition of compassion fatigue. In addition, the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (Halbesleben & Demerouti, 2005) has measured two separate factors for burnout; exhaustion and work disengagement.

One criticism of Maslach's construction of the MBI has been its atheoretical, exploratory development (Shirom, 2012; Taris, Le Blanc, Schaufeli, & Schreurs, 2005). Since the early definitions of burnout, several models and theories have been developed to explain burnout including the Compassion Satisfaction-Compassion Fatigue theory (Stamm, 2009), the Job Demands-Resources model (Bakker, Demerouti, & Verbeke, 2004), and COR (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). Of these different theoretical conceptualizations, COR was selected for the theoretical framework of this study because of its emphasis on resources and the role they play in burnout.

Recently, two meta-analyses reviewed the literature regarding burnout and mental health professionals. The first, by O'Connor, Neff, and Pitman (2018), examined the literature for the prevalence of burnout in mental health professionals as well as the factors that contribute to burnout. The analysis of the prevalence of burnout showed emotional exhaustion was most common for mental health professionals with a high level at an estimated 40%. Depersonalization was estimated to be at a moderate level at 22% while sense of personal accomplishment was low at 19%. When examining the factors, they were split into individual and organizational factors. Age was the most relevant individual factor, which most often was

related to depersonalization but also an increased sense of personal accomplishment. Among the organizational factors, increased workload was consistently related to increased burnout across all studies while a sense of autonomy and ability to influence decisions were related to a decrease in burnout.

The second meta-analysis, by Dreison et al. (2018), examined the effectiveness of interventions in treating burnout for mental health professionals. For the various interventions, effect sizes were small, between .13 and .22. In addition, the meta-analysis revealed that the effects of interventions persisted over time and were more likely to address depersonalization and emotional exhaustion than sense of personal accomplishment. Because of the small effect size for the interventions, further research into effective treatment options was recommended.

Theoretical Framework

Conservation of Resources Theory. COR was a response to the question, "What is stress?" (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). According to Hobfoll and Shirom (2001), some psychologists had identified stress as "a state that occurs when demands outstrip coping resources" (p. 58). However, Hobfoll (2001) stated this was "inaccurate and misleading" (p. 58) and therefore presented a new definition of stress where stress was the threat of resource loss, actual resource loss, or the failure to gain resources. Resources have not been limited to objects. They could also have been conditions, personal characteristics, and energies. If an employee has been feeling stressed at work, then it was likely because the employee felt they were unable to protect, gather, or conserve their resources. COR followed four key corollaries (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). The first of these was that individuals are required to invest resources to limit the loss of, protect, and gain resources. This idea has been similar to the colloquial "You have to spend money to make money." An example given by Hobfoll and Shirom (2001) was that of an

interpersonal relationship, such as a husband and wife. To gain a more intimate relationship (condition resource) a husband may spend time (energy resource) with his wife at the opera. This could have created stress if the husband did not enjoy opera. However, he may have felt the benefit of developing a deeper relationship with his wife, a gained resource, was well worth the cost of time, a small loss of resource.

The second corollary was those individuals with a larger amount of resources are less vulnerable to resource loss and more capable of resource gain (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). The converse that those with low resources suffer more significantly from a loss of resources was also true. Hobfoll and Shirom (2001) explained this as a person with a safety net of close friendships has the necessary resources to survive through stressful events (e.g. loss of a job). By having an abundance of resources, the person did not feel the stress as deeply. However, if there was no support from interpersonal relationships, then the loss would have been more profound to the person experiencing the loss of resources.

Hobfoll and Shirom's (2001) third corollary of COR was stress does not happen as singular events but as a collective process. This corollary branched into two emphases; those with low amounts of resources were more likely to experience resource loss and initial losses led to further losses. The inverse of both is true as well; high amounts of resources were more likely to lead to resource gain, and initial gains will contribute to further gains. Because of the cyclical and collective process surrounding resources, having positive, or negative, resource acquisition continued to produce further resource gain or loss. Watching for vicious cycles, where one loss led to a perpetual state of loss, was an aspect to consider with this corollary.

The final corollary of COR, according to Hobfoll and Shirom (2001), was that those with a large pool of resources were more likely to engage in high risk/high reward opportunities. The

example provided by Hobfoll and Shirom (2001) involved an employee who already had a high amount of approval with his boss (condition resource) and had a high level of self-efficacy (personal characteristic resource). Because of this rich pool of resources, he was more likely to suggest new ideas. Suggesting the new idea could have been risky because it may have resulted in losing the boss's approval if the boss do not like the idea. Alternatively, a well-received idea would have resulted in increased approval from the boss. However, an employee who did not perceive a high level of approval from his supervisor may have avoided such opportunities to protect the current level of approval.

In addition to these four corollaries, Hobfoll and Shirom (2001) also emphasized two important assumptions of COR that separated it from other views of stress. The first was stress is a cyclical process that can be characterized as either a gain cycle or a loss cycle. This was connected to the third corollary in emphasizing the importance of viewing stress over time and not as isolated events. Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, and Schaufeli (2008) confirmed this through a longitudinal study that examined the relationships between personal resource, job resources, and work engagement. The second assumption was people generally attribute more impact to resource loss than resource gain (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). So, people were more likely to engage in practices that protect resources rather than take risks to gain more resources. Of course, if they had a high pool of resources, as discussed in the fourth corollary, they may have been more willing to risk the resource loss for a greater potential resource gain. These core concepts and corollaries have had an impact upon the view of burnout for employees and organizations.

Burnout as a Concept in COR. Burnout has been a consequence of unsuccessful coping of longitudinal stress, according to COR (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). Specifically, burnout has

resulted from the stress caused by the depletion of intrinsic energy resources, particularly emotional energy. When an individual has been unable to successfully cope with stress, there was a loss of physical vigor, emotional robustness, and/or cognitive agility. These three energy losses may have occurred together or independently. Individuals then entered a spiral of losses leading to burnout and, ultimately, to depression, cynicism, and the dehumanization of clients. While loss of resources spiraled exponentially, gain or protection of resources also spiraled. This inverse perspective has provided hope that a little change in an individual's resource allocation or coping strategies could have led to exponential elimination of burnout for the individual.

Considering this, Hobfoll and Shirom (2001) discussed the importance of burnout in relation to individual characteristics of employees according to COR. They acknowledged that organizational factors more easily explained the occurrence of burnout. However, if organizational factors are equal across all employees, such as the threat of layoff is equal for every person in an organization, then individual characteristics may help supervisors identify those employees more likely to experience burnout from the threat of resource loss.

One such factor identified by Hobfoll and Shirom (2001) was self-efficacy. Specifically, if employees did not have resources from the organization or support from their supervisors and exhibited low self-efficacy, they may have felt they lacked the necessary ability to complete assigned tasks. Further research has supported these claims (Shead, Scott, & Rose, 2016; Woods, 2009). Though Hobfoll and Shirom (2001) expressed a need for increased research into the relationships between personality traits and burnout, they acknowledged the previous findings that specific traits may indeed compound burnout.

Summary

Burnout has been a legitimate concern that has had a growing literature of support over the course of the past 40 years (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). COR has emphasized the threats to personal resources as a major source of stress that contributed to burnout over time (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). When viewing the history of college counseling, there has been an increase in various responsibilities (Sharkin, 2012) and a decline in supports (Espinoza, 2012; Ghetie, 2007; Humphrey et al., 2000; Mullin, 2010; Sharkin, 2012; Smith et al., 2007). These both represent threats to a college counselor's resources; which have had the potential to ultimately lead to burnout.

Chapter 3 - Method

There has been an increased demand placed on college counselors to do more with less (CCMH, 2017; Espinoza, 2012; Ghetie, 2007; Humphrey et al., 2000; Mullin, 2010; Sharkin, 2012; Smith et al., 2007) including providing duties that have been non-counseling in nature. By engaging in these non-counseling duties, counselors may have developed a deficit of available cognitive, emotional, and physical resources. According to COR (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001), this threat to resources could have led to burnout. The purpose of this study was to test the assumption that engaging in non-counseling duties was related to burnout within college counselors.

To test this assumption, a correlational design was utilized. According to Balkin and Kleist (2017), correlational research has been the most utilized type of quantitative research in the counseling profession. This type of research has examined the relationship between variables within a single set of participants. One positive aspect of using a single set of participants has been that it helps to limit the extraneous variables that have created internal validity threats.

This study utilized multiple regression procedures. With multiple regression analysis, several predictor variables were examined with one criterion variable (Balkin & Kleist, 2017). In this case, burnout was the criterion variable while non-counseling duties was the predictor variable, and meaningfulness of work, perceived work overload, number of years working at the current institution, and number of years working as a mental health professional were tested as interaction variables (i.e., mediators and moderators). Specifically, hierarchical regression analysis was used as well as the PROCESS macro for the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The PROCESS macro has been a tool used for testing interaction effects of mediators and moderators (Hayes, 2017).

Overview of the Research Design

For the experimental design, an ex post facto analysis was applied (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Though not a true experimental design looking for causation, this design utilized a cross-sectional view of participants and looked for relational patterns of regression amongst predictors and the criterion. No treatment was administered to the group. Instead, levels of each predictor variable determined relationships with the criterion variable. Because of this, the study deviated from other experimental and quasi-experimental designs provided by Campbell and Stanley (1963).

When discussing the validity of this experiment, an examination of internal and external validity threats was needed to make interpretations about the accuracy of the research and the generalizability to the broader population (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Of the internal validity factors, instrumentation and selection bias were the main concerns for validity threats. Because this experiment gathered data at a single time, the concerns regarding history, maturation, testing, mortality, selection and maturation interactions, and regression were minimized.

To address the instrumentation concerns, the SMBM was used to measure burnout. This instrument has been validated and utilized in previous studies (e.g., Armon, Melamed, Shirom, & Shapira, 2010; Breuer, Goldner, Jager, Werfel, & Schmid-Ott, 2015; Dorrian, Grant, & Banks, 2017; Schonfeld & Bianchi, 2016; Shirom & Melamed, 2006). The WAMI was used to measure the meaningfulness of work. It has also been tested in several previous research studies (e.g., Bailey et al., 2017; Dik et al., 2009; Steger et al., 2012). Finally, the PWS was used to measure work overload. This scale has often been attributed to Moore (2000) by more recent research because of the availability of the items, but it originated from Kirmeyer and Dougherty (1988), who attribute the creation of the items to research performed in the 1960's and 1970's. The more

recent research activities (Ahuja, Chudoba, Kacmar, McKnight, & George, 2007; Tabassum, Farooq, & Fatima, 2017; Tastan, 2016) have replicated the reliability and validity of the PWS.

There was no instrument to measure work activities of college counselors. However, the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) was a valid and reliable instrument for measuring counseling activities for the school counseling profession. Using the SCARS as a conceptual model, the researcher developed the College Counselor Activity Rating Scale (CCARS). Because this was a new measure, college counseling experts were consulted to ensure the CCARS measured activities commonly performed by college counselors. A pilot study was also conducted to provide further statistical validity and reliability for the instrument.

Selection bias was another concern for the internal validity of the study. However, by following selection processes recommended by Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2009) for survey data collection, these factors were controlled as well. Because this study was correlational and only included one participant group, selection bias of group assignment was not a concern. The larger concern was the generalizability of the results. There has been no estimate of the number of college counselors in the United States because this role can often overlap with other roles. Selecting participants from a professional organization was deemed an appropriate way to obtain a cross section of college counselors from across the country. AUCCCD has limited its membership to institutional memberships with one representative, generally the director. However, ACCA has been open to any college counselor and has had a diverse representation of college counselors from across the United States. Randomly selecting participants from ACCA's membership as a sampling frame was the primary method of controlling the threat of generalizability.

Selection bias has also presented itself as an external threat. Self-selection of participants has involved advertising for volunteers to participate in the specific study (Dillman et al., 2009). One method has been sending a call for participants to an organization's listserv or email list. However, the use of self-selection may have confounded the results as participants were included due to their interest in the topic as opposed to generating a random sample. Selection bias was controlled by obtaining the membership list from ACCA and randomly selecting participants from the membership. Dillman et al.'s (2009) tailored design method was utilized because it extends principles from Social Exchange theory to the survey research process in order to increase the benefits and decrease the costs of participation. The invitation for participation clearly explained the benefits of completing the research for the profession and provided an incentive in the form of a chance to win a free book.

Another benefit of following Dillman et al.'s (2009) tailored design method was that it increased the reliability of the survey by decreasing error. There are four types of error the tailored design method can decrease. The first error is coverage error. When coverage error has occurred, not all of the population has an equal opportunity to participate in the research. This was a limitation of the current study due to the nature of collecting a representative sample of college counselors.

The second error was sampling error (Dillman et al., 2009). When the sample size has not been adequately proportional to the sample frame, it was possible for error in the response to be generalized to the sample frame and overall population. To control this error, a sufficiently large sample was needed. ACCA had 1253 members at the time of the research. Of these members, approximately one-third were graduate students and retired members. After removing these membership types, 839 names remained. To have a measurement error of +/- 5% with a 90%

confidence interval with a conservative 50/50 split, 86 participants needed to respond (Dillman et al., 2009. To account for any non-response and attrition, 400 participants were targeted for inclusion in the study. After removing incomplete responses, this study had 107 responses, which addressed the concerns of sampling error.

Nonresponse error was the third type of error discussed by Dillman et al. (2009). If participants who have been randomly selected do not complete the study, it may have led to an overrepresentation of one demographic over another. To control for this error, participants were randomly selected and recruited for the study. Multiple emails were utilized to promote completion of the study. These pieces of communication emphasized that the participant was specifically chosen and explained the benefit the research would serve to the profession. In addition, Dillman et al. (2009) recommended the use of an incentive, even though it is not the strongest predictor of response. Participants were entered into a raffle to give away a copy of a relevant college counseling book, with three winners chosen.

The final error controlled by using Dillman et al.'s (2009) tailored design method was measurement error. This varied slightly from the internal validity threat mentioned previously. Measurement error in surveys is more closely aligned to how well the questions are worded and whether response sets are understandable and accurate. This research controlled for this error by utilizing instruments that have been found to be reliable and valid in previous research. Because the questions on the CCARS took the same form as the SCARS, the questions should be similarly understandable. To further control the measurement error, content experts were consulted on the wording of different tasks, as recommended by Crano, Brewer, and Lac (2012); Dillman et al. (2009); Dimitrov (2012), and Wolfe and Smith (2007).

Participants

The sampling frame for this research study was the approximately 1300 members of ACCA. Membership in ACCA was open to five groups (ACCA, n.d.). The professional membership included those with master's level or higher education. Closely related to this was the new professional membership for those who graduated in the past 12 months. Regular membership was for individuals who had interests in college counseling and related activities but do not qualify as professional members. Retired counselors were those who have had a history with ACCA but were currently retired. Finally, graduate students comprised the final grouping of membership. The sample frame was limited to the professional, regular, and new professional members. In addition, any college counselor who participated in the expert panel or pilot study was removed from the final stage of data collection. A sample was generated using simple random sampling, which gave each member of the sampling frame an equal chance of being selected for the study (Stapleton, 2010). The overall target was 300 participants, which was 75% of the 400 identified recruits. This target was chosen because it would have allowed for a factor analysis of the CCARS (Field, 2009) and provided a 95% confidence level with ± 5% margin of error (Dillman et al., 2009). However, only 107 participants responded, a 27% response rate. This was not much lower than the average response rate of 34% for web surveys (Shih & Fan, 2008) and still provided a 95% confidence level, albeit with a ±10% margin of error (Dillman et al., 2009).

Measures

The online survey consisted of five different sections. The first section was the CCARS. This was used primarily to measure the non-counseling duties in which college counselors engage. Section two measured the level of burnout as determined by the SMBM. The third

section consisted of the WAMI to measure the meaningfulness of work. The PWS was the fourth section in order to measure work overload. The final section was a demographic questionnaire. As recommended by Dillman et al. (2009) and Krosnick and Presser (2010), the demographic questions were at the end of the survey so that it did not prompt respondents to give socially desirable responses or become defensive.

College Counselor Activity Rating Scale (CCARS). The CCARS was an adaptation of the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005). The purpose of the CCARS was to measure the perceived frequency in which college counselors performed different job responsibilities. Items were created based upon the college counseling literature (e.g. Sharkin, 2012). The CCARS initially had 11 sections with a total of 63 questions (see Appendix A). The first nine sections were populated with items that fit the categories outlined in the IACS (2016) standards: individual and group counseling, crisis intervention and emergency services, outreach, consultation, referral, research, program evaluation, professional development, and training. The tenth section were the remaining items which were classified as other activities and considered non-counseling duties. The final section was an item that asked the participants to estimate the percentage of time they spent engaging in the ten sections. After an expert panel reviewed the initial items, the final form of the scale was reduced to 57 questions over the 11 sections (see Appendix D). Each question covered a different task and asked the participant to use a verbal frequency scale to answer how much they performed a task. The verbal frequency scale of the CCARS used the same seven-point scale as the SMBM to maintain consistency across the survey, as recommended by Dillman et al. (2009). The scale responses were (1) never or almost never; (2) very infrequently; (3) quite infrequently; (4) sometimes; (5) quite frequently; (6) very frequently; and (7) always or almost always. Items were grouped into the ten categories and mean scores of each category were

calculated. The final section asked participants to estimate the average percentage of time they spent in each of the job responsibility areas over the past academic year. The sum of the ten areas had to equal 100%. The academic year was chosen because there can be a large amount of variability in a college counselor's tasks from day-to-day, week-to-week, month-to-month, and semester-by-semester.

Before collecting data for this study, partial validation of the CCARS needed to occur. Dimitrov (2012) recommended a three-phase process for validation. The expert panel served as the item tryout while the pilot study provided the field test. A panel of experts reviewed the CCARS and provided feedback in the form of item ratings and open-ended questions, as described by Crano et al. (2015), Dillman et al. (2009), Dimitrov (2012), and Wolfe and Smith (2007). The experts consisted of eight officers from the American College Counseling Association Executive Council. In addition to an expert panel, a pilot study was utilized to provide initial statistical testing of the CCARS. The 24 respondents consisted of college counselors in Tennessee along with a few recruited from a university in Texas. Crano et al. (2015) described five major types of measurement construct validity: face validity, content validity, criterion validity, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. The expert panel addressed the first two types of validity.

Face validity was concerned with whether an instrument appeared to accurately measure a construct (Crano et al., 2015). Stated another way, did the items address the construct on the surface? For example, if an item on the CCARS asked how often students are depressed, this would not appear to be a measurement of activities performed by college counselors, even though this would have been valuable information for college counselors. Both the pilot study and the expert panel provided feedback about the face validity of the CCARS.

Content validity was the second type of validity discussed by Crano et al. (2015) and examined whether the instrument covered the breadth of the construct. Regarding the CCARS, it was important to determine activities in which college counselors could engage. The expert panel provided qualitative feedback regarding the appropriateness of each item and whether items were missing from any of the sections.

The third type of construct validity was criterion validity (Crano et al., 2015). Criterion validity measures how well a measure has explained or was related to a specific criterion or criterion. There are two types of criterion validity: concurrent and predictive. Concurrent validity has been difficult to measure because it has often been difficult to separate the relationship of the measure and the criterion. So, predictive validity has generally been more desirable and rigorous. However, it has been difficult to identify exact criteria upon which to measure relationships since many of the variables in the social sciences are complex in nature. One way to measure the criterion validity occurred within this present study.

The fourth was convergent validity and has been determined by comparing how well the instrument measures a construct compared to other instruments that measure the same or similar constructs (Crano et al., 2015). An example of this is Qiao and Schaufeli's (2011) research on the convergent validity of four burnout measures. One way to do this for the CCARS would be to run a comparison between its responses and the SCARS. However, this may be complicated since there are significant differences between the duties and responsibilities of school counselors versus college counselors. Additionally, the need for adapting the SCARS for the college counseling profession was because no instrument currently existed to measure the counseling responsibilities of college counselors. For this reason, convergent validity was a potential limitation of this study.

The final source of measurement construct validity was discriminant validity (Crano et al., 2015). Discriminant validity has been the converse of convergent validity in that it has been evaluated by comparing the instrument to another standard which should not show a relationship. One way to do this has been to choose a demographic variable with which the instrument is not expected to associate and show that it did not (Scarborough, 2005). For this study, the gender of the participant was not expected to have a relationship to the activities scores within the CCARS. So, a point-biserial correlational analysis was run between the Other Activities and the participant's gender to determine discriminant validity.

Validation of the CCARS has been a multi-step process. Face and content validity were confirmed before the collection of data. Criterion and discriminant validity were confirmed through analysis of the data that were collected. Convergent validity was identified as a limitation to the current study that should be addressed in later research.

Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure (SMBM). The SMBM was developed as an alternative to the MBI to measure burnout as a depletion of an individual's resources (Shirom & Melamed, 2006). In addition, it has had a theoretical basis (i.e., Hobfoll's COR) unlike the MBI. Because of its alignment to the theoretical framework of this study, the SMBM was chosen to measure burnout in college counselors.

The second version of the SMBM consisted of a 14-item instrument that utilized a seven-point verbal frequency scale (see Appendix E). The items were divided into three subscales, physical fatigue, emotional exhaustion, and cognitive weariness, with six questions, five questions, and three questions respectively. Scores were most often calculated as a mean score, either grouped according to the subscales or collectively as a global burnout score, and most often report a Cronbach's alpha measure of internal consistency as greater than .90 (Armon et al.,

2010; Breuer et al., 2015; Dorrian et al., 2017; Melamed, Shirom, Toker, & Shapira, 2006; Schonfeld & Bianchi, 2016; Toker, Shirom, Shapira, Berliner, & Melamed, 2005). A higher mean score was interpreted as a higher level of burnout.

Shirom and Melamed (2006) compared the internal consistency reliability and factor validity of the SMBM to the Maslach Burnout Inventory–General Survey (MBI-GS). The original Maslach Burnout Inventory specifically targeted human service professionals. To understand burnout in broader contexts, the MBI-GS was developed. Shirom and Melamed (2006) found the SMBM to be more reliable than the MBI-GS, though it was not a statistically significant difference. The SMBM also displayed no statistically significant difference between human service and other professionals. It is important to note that the Shirom and Melamed study utilized the first version of the SMBM, which only identified two factorial loadings (physical fatigue and cognitive weariness). After exclusion of two problematic items, the SMBM fit the theoretical model well (X^2 (119, n = 422; $p < .001$, CFI = .99, NNFI = .99, RMSEA = .07, SRMR = .02).

Qiao and Schaufeli (2011) tested the reliability and factorial validity of the second version of the SMBM. They found the alpha reliability for the three subscales to be .90, .85, and .75 for physical fatigue, cognitive weariness, and emotional exhaustion, respectively. In addition, the three-factor model was confirmed, particularly if two of the items on the physical fatigue subscale were allowed to correlate (X^2(73, n = 717; $p < .001$, CFI = .93, GFI = .91, TLI = .92, NFI = .92, RMSEA = .09). Through both studies, the SMBM has been shown to have a high internal reliability and a strong confidence of fit to the three-factor theoretical model.

Finally, the SMBM has been a noncommercial inventory (Melamed, n.d.). The authors have given permission for any person to use the instrument, for no charge. They requested that

the mean score, standard deviation, coefficient alpha of the subscales and the total instrument, description of the sample size, occupation, language, and country be sent to the authors to continue building the validity of the instrument.

Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI). The Work and Meaning Inventory (Steger et al., 2012) was used to measure the meaningfulness that college counselors experience as a part of their work. The WAMI was developed to capture experiential dimensions of what constitutes meaningful work (Steger et al., 2012). The inventory consisted of 10 questions such as "I understand how my work contributes to my life's meaning" and measures three dimensions of meaningful work: greater good motivations (GG), positive meaning in work (PM), and contribution to meaning-making through work (MM). A five-point Likert-type scale was used with the following responses: Absolutely Untrue, Mostly Untrue, Neither Ture nor Untrue, Mostly True, Absolutely True. The dimension scores were calculated by summing the values of the questions for the section. The value of item three was the only item that required transformation. The instructions indicated that the value of item three should be subtracted from the value of item six before being summed with item six and ten. Each of the dimension scores were summed to calculate the overall Meaningful Work score. Steger et al. (2012) performed the validation study for the WAMI and found it to be valid ($x^2(df = 30) = 64.19$; CFI = .96; NNFI = .95; SRMR = .05; RMSEA = .09; RMSEA 90% CI = [.06, .11]) and reliable, as a whole ($\alpha = .93$) and as individual subsections (GG $\alpha = .83$; MM $\alpha = .82$; PM $\alpha = .89$).

Perceived Workload Scale. The perceived workload scale was developed from previous research by Kirmeyer and Dougherty (1988) to measure when employees feel they have too much work to complete and not enough time to do it all. Through several studies (Ahuja et al., 2007; Kirmeyer & Dougherty, 1988; Moore, 2000; Tabassum et al., 2007; Tastan, 2016) the

reliability of the scale has ranged from .76 to .94. Though a validation study has not been performed for this scale, it was chosen because the prior research was related to burnout (e.g. turnover intention, job strain, work exhaustion) and the scale items were independent from the items on the SMBM. Moore (2000) performed a confirmatory factor analysis which showed the PWS items were distinct from the General Burnout Questionnaire. The four-question scale utilized a seven-point Likert scale for the first two questions and a seven-point verbal frequency scale for the last two questions. The last two questions were reversed scored before a mean of the four questions was generated. A higher mean score indicated the participant perceived a higher workload.

Demographic questionnaire. The final section of questions was a demographic questionnaire designed to capture demographic differences for control and to give an aggregate view of the diversity of the study (see Appendix H). These variables included: gender, ethnicity, total enrollment of the institution, caseload, institution type, number of years as a mental health professional, number of years working in higher education, tenure at current institution, and professional license type.

Data Collection

The initial data collection was an expert panel providing measurement construct validity for the CCARS. Approval from the Kansas State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) was obtained for the expert panel, pilot study, and research study. Eight officers from the American College Counseling Association Executive Council were asked to evaluate each of the items from the CCARS based on whether it was “appropriate,” “inappropriate,” or “neither appropriate nor inappropriate” for the proposed scale. A survey was created in the Qualtrics online survey software to provide the items and rankings and to give participants the opportunity

to provide qualitative feedback using open-ended questions. Because of the small sample size, data analysis occurred by hand and was triple-checked for accuracy.

The expert panel determined whether each of the 10 categories had sufficient items to outline the major responsibilities seen in college counseling centers. As outlined by Lawshe (1975), a simple scale of "essential," "useful, but not essential," and "not necessary" was used to rate each item. Because a wide range of potential tasks was being examined, evaluative language was changed. Participants were asked whether each item was "appropriate", "inappropriate", or "neither appropriate nor inappropriate" for the scale being developed. The content validity ratio, $CVR = (n_e\text{-}N/2)/(N/2)$ where n_e was the number of panelists indicating the item was appropriate and N was the number of panelists, was calculated for each item. According to Lawshe (1975), a score of .75 was needed from a participant pool of eight experts for an item to be selected for the final instrument. This meant that seven of the eight experts had to indicate an item was appropriate for it to be retained. The results of the CVR are reported in Appendix B.

In total, 32 of the items were called into question by the expert panel. Of the 32 items, six were completely removed from the scale and one was combined with another item. However, other procedures, such as a discrimination index, may be used to argue the benefit of retaining an item that does not meet the minimum requirement of the CVR. Of the remaining 25 items, the wording was changed on seven based upon feedback from the expert panel. The remaining 18 items were retained as they were. The rationale was that feedback from the expert panel indicated that there are college counselors who perform the activity, but that it was the opinion of the expert that the activity was inappropriate for the counselor. In this way, some of the expert panel misunderstood the purpose of broadly examining what responsibilities a college counselor may have to perform as opposed to what is appropriate due to educational, training, or

professional standards. If there was evidence of college counselors performing the task in professional literature, the item was retained. These decisions are outlined in Appendix C.

After the responses from the expert panel were analyzed and decisions about item selection were made, a new survey was created on the Qualtrics survey system consisting of the revised CCARS and the demographic questionnaire. A pool of 24 college counselors was recruited for participation in the pilot study. Data collection lasted several weeks to ensure enough responses were received. After the data were collected, the statistical reliability of the items was checked. For the verbal frequency scale questions, the reliability was high ($\alpha = .905$). The final question of the CCARS lowered the reliability of the scale greatly ($\alpha = .353$), though this was expected since the different parts of the question were additive and converged to the same value and the pilot study had a lower sample size. The question asked participants to estimate the percentage of time they spent across the 10 categories of the CCARS. It was retained for the final data collection to see if a larger sample contributed to a more reliable result.

The final stage of data collection was the research study. To gather the data for this study, an online survey was developed through the Qualtrics online survey tool. ACCA was contacted to request a copy of their most current membership list. This has been provided for free to graduate students if research results are shared with the organization (ACCA, 2016). After performing simple random sampling, participant information was added to Qualtrics.

A personalized invitation email was sent to the randomly selected participants. A reminder email was sent in one week intervals with the survey closing one day after the fourth reminder email. When accessing the survey, participants first saw a welcome screen, with the informed consent and IRB information included. After this screen, participants were asked whether they currently work with college students at an institution of higher education in a

counseling or other student life role. Participants who answered "No" were led to a thank you page concluding the survey. These responses were filtered out of the final analyses. For those who answered "Yes," they completed the edited CCARS, SMBM, WAMI, PWS, and the demographic questionnaire. A thank you page concluded the survey giving the participant the opportunity to submit their email address for a chance to win one of the college counseling books. This information was collected through a Google form and was separate from any survey responses.

Data Analysis

Data Storage. All data were initially stored in the Qualtrics online system except for those who chose to enter their email address for a chance to win a college counseling book. This information was initially stored in a Google form. After completion of the survey, the data were transferred to an encrypted file system for analysis. Analysis was completed utilizing the SPSS and G*Power software packages. All output files from SPSS were saved to the encrypted file system.

Coding. Demographic variables were only coded as necessary. This allowed variables that were already at the ratio level to remain there. For example, caseload, institution enrollment, and tenure in mental health, higher education, and at current institution were all recorded as ratio level values. The exception to this was that a dummy variable was added for total enrollment to test the fourth hypothesis. Participants who indicated their enrollment was less than 5000 were coded as '0' while those with enrollments higher than 5000 were coded '1'.

Institution classification, gender, ethnicity, and license type were coded as follows to collect descriptive statistics. Institution classification was coded as: 1, two-year institutions; 2, four-year institutions; 3, professional schools. Gender was coded as: 1, male; 2, female; 3, other;

4, rather not say. Ethnicity was coded as: 1, Asian American; 2, Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American; 3, East Asian American; 4, Latino/a or Hispanic American; 5, Middle Eastern or Arab American; 6, Native American or Alaskan Native; 7, Non-Hispanic White or European American; 8, Pacific Islander American or Hawaiian-Native; 9, South Asian American; 10, other; 11, rather not say. License type was coded as: 1, independent licensed professional counselor; 2, licensed chemical dependency counselor; 3, licensed clinical social worker; 4, licensed marriage and family therapist; 5, licensed marriage and family therapist intern; 6, licensed masters social worker; 7, licensed professional counselor intern; 8, licensed psychologist; 9, licensed psychologist associate; 10, post doc therapist; 11, practicum/internship graduate student; 12, other.

Descriptive Statistics. Descriptive statistics provided by SPSS were used to describe the participants regarding gender, ethnicity, license type, institution classification, institution enrollment, caseload, tenure in mental health, tenure in higher education, and tenure at current institution. The descriptive statistics utilized included the measures of central tendency, variability, and skewness. In addition, Cronbach's alpha was utilized on the CCARS, SMBM, WAMI, and PWS to describe the internal reliability of the measures.

Research Question One. Is there a relationship between burnout and non-counseling duties when controlling for demographic variables? Does the number of years working as a mental health professional moderate the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout? Does the number of years working at the current institution moderate the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout? Is work overload a mediator between non-counseling duties and burnout? Does finding meaning in work moderate the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout?

Initial analysis. Frazier, Tix, and Barron (2004) recommended multiple regression analysis to test a correlational relationship with moderator variables. The primary predictor variable was non-counseling duties, as measured by the mean of the questions in the Other Activities section of the CCARS. Using the mean score provided an interval value for non-counseling duties. The criterion variable was burnout, as measured by Total Exhaustion score of the SMBM. Initially, a correlation matrix utilizing Pearson's correlation coefficient was developed to measure the correlations between the subscales of the SMBM, the overall score of the SMBM, the individual items in the non-counseling duties section, and the non-counseling duties mean score to look for significance amongst the burnout subscales and the non-counseling duties.

Testing assumptions. To move to the regression analysis, several assumptions needed to be checked to be able to generalize the model to the target population (Field, 2009). First, collinearity diagnostics were run. The variance inflation factor (VIF) was examined to ensure the largest was below 10 and the average was lower than 1. In addition, eigenvalues of the cross-products matrix, condition indexes, and variance proportions were evaluated to ensure variance was loaded across different dimensions. Next, the Durbin-Watson test was checked to determine whether residuals are independent. This also identified if linearity and heteroscedasticity were met. To determine whether the residuals met standards for normality, histograms were visually inspected. Finally, scatterplots of the residuals were reviewed to visually identify linearity, heteroscedasticity, and outliers in the data.

Data analysis. For each of these steps, data are reported in the Findings section. Specifically, R^2, degrees of freedom, standard error of the estimate, means square, *F*-statistics, and significance are reported for the correlation matrix. For the multiple regression analyses,

Frazier et al. (2004) recommended the use of the unstandardized (*B)* regression coefficients. Additionally, the df, *F*-statistics, significance, and *t*-statistics are also shared. A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted initially to test for statistical significance of the model. Finally, the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2017) was used to measure mediation effects through SPSS.

Research Question Two. Is it more common for college counselors at small institutions of higher education (< 5000 students at the specific campus) than college counselors at larger institutions of higher education to engage in non-counseling duties?

Initial analysis. To test this research question, an independent *t*-test was used to compare the non-counseling duties between two groups: those working at small institutions and all others. The two groups served as the independent variable while the non-counseling duties was the dependent variable. A dummy variable was created where 0 indicated a participant worked at a small institution and 1 indicated the participant worked at a medium or large institution. Descriptive statistics were reviewed and assumptions for parametric data were tested (Field, 2009). This included normality of the distributed data, homogeneity of variance, use of interval data, and independence of data.

Testing assumptions. After the dummy variable was assigned, data was analyzed through SPSS utilizing an independent samples *t*-test. The statistics are provided in the Results section of this study. The results include the *F*-statistics, significance, degrees of freedom, confidence interval, mean, and effect size.

Human Subject Review and Ethical Considerations

Potential risk to human subjects in this study was deemed to be low. Because the study was retrospective in nature, no new stimuli were being introduced to the participant. There was a

potential risk of participant reaction to insight about current burnout level while completing the SMBM. Information about strategies for self-care and burnout prevention was provided at the end of the survey to address wellness practices for counselors.

To confirm the low ethical risk, the study did not commence until approval was obtained from the Kansas State University Institutional Review Board (IRB). This process required the researcher to be certified in ethical research practices. In addition, the IRB reviewed the survey to ensure there was little risk of harm to participants. As a part of this process, an informed consent was attached to the beginning of the survey (see Appendix L) in accordance with Section G.2.a of the ACA Code of Ethics (ACA, 2014). Also, participant identification remained confidential to comply with Section G.2.d and Section G.4.d.

Another important ethical consideration was the recognition of researcher bias. The inspiration for this topic came from professional experiences in the researcher's career. While working at a community college, the researcher balanced many counseling and non-counseling duties. This has helped to shape the direction of the hypotheses as well. However, in keeping with Sections G.4.a and G.4.b of the ACA Code of Ethics, the researcher employed measures to ensure the results of the study were accurate and reported as such, even if they did not confirm the hypotheses.

Chapter 4 - Results

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of the statistical analyses and findings of the research study. College counselors have been tasked with providing more services and resources on tighter budgets (CCMH, 2017). Of particular concern have been the job responsibilities that are non-counseling in nature. According to COR, college counselors who have lost resources or whose resources have been threatened are more likely to experience job stress and burnout (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). In order to test these assumptions, six hypotheses were devised to explore the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout with various moderators and mediators. A sixth hypothesis addressed the assertion that college counselors at smaller institutions of higher education are more likely to engage in non-counseling duties (Sharkin, 2012). A correlational field study was designed using the CCARS, SMBM, WAMI, PWS, and a demographic questionnaire as instruments. Because the CCARS was a new instrument, an expert panel and a pilot study were performed, along with the final study. The results of the final stage of data collection were used to address the six hypotheses.

Data Filtering and the Testing of Assumptions

Upon transferring the data to SPSS, 127 cases were examined for missing values. Twenty cases had more than five missing values across the responses and were excluded from the statistical analyses. Missing values in the remaining 107 cases where coded as '999' to register as a missing value. An exception to this was the question, "What is the total enrollment of your institution" since some institutions were larger than 999. Missing values for this question were coded as '1.' All of the values was visually checked to ensure accuracy and that the variables were recorded as continuous values. Reverse scored variables were created for the final two questions of the PWS and mean scores were calculated for each subsection of the CCARS,

SMBM, and PWS. The WAMI was scored according to the procedures that accompanied the scale. This produced three subscores and one total score. A higher score indicated the participant viewed work as being more meaningful.

To test the assumptions for the first research question, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was run to obtain the unstandardized predicted value, studentized residual, studentized deleted residual, Cook's distance, and the centered leverage value. The criterion variable was Total Exhaustion while Other Activities was entered as a predictor value in the first block and Total Perceived Workload, Meaningful Work, Years at Current Institution, and Years as a Mental Health Professional were entered in the second block. These residual values are necessary in testing the assumptions of the model.

The Durbin-Watson statistic was 2.029, which indicated independence of residuals. A scatterplot of the studentized residuals and the unstandardized predicted values was used to visually confirm linearity collectively amongst the variables and to confirm homoscedasticity. In addition, partial regression plots of each predictor variable with the criterion variable were visually inspected for linearity. To confirm the assumption that multicollinearity did not exist, the Tolerance values were checked and none were less than 0.1, ranging from 0.455 to 0.968, meaning that the predictor variables were not too highly correlated. Next, the multiple regression analysis was coded to include a casewise diagnostic for any cases ±3. None of the cases were reported in this diagnostic. Checking data points for outliers, high leverage points, and influential points was the next step. One case was identified as a potential outlier and a different case was identified as a high leverage point. However, neither of these cases met criteria as an influential point, based upon their Cook's distance values. According to Field (2009), data should only be removed if it meets several criteria as an outlier, higher leverage point, or influential point.

Visual inspection of the standardized residuals histogram and P-P plot both confirmed normality of the data.

Assumptions were tested for the second research question to determine the appropriateness of utilizing an independent samples t-test. First, box plots were examined to identify outliers. There were no outliers as assessed by inspection of the box plots. Second, Other Activities scores were normally distributed for both small institutions of higher education and larger institutions of higher education, as assessed by visual inspection of Normal Q-Q Plots. This met the condition for normality of data. Finally, Levene's test for equality of variances was examined to confirm homogeneity of variances. There was homogeneity of variances, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances (p = .600).

Reliability

Cronbach's alpha was computed for the four instruments: CCARS (α = .353); SMBM (α = .943); WAMI (α = .789); PWS (α = .812). When the final question of the CCARS was removed from analysis, the Cronbach's alpha reliability of the CCARS rose (α = .899), which is considered an acceptable value for psychosocial constructs (Field, 2009).

Discriminant Validity Test

A point-biserial correlation analysis was run to show that there was no relationship between the CCARS and the participants' gender to provide a discriminant validity test of the CCARS. Only the Other Activities section of the CCARS was analyzed since that is the only section being utilized in this study. While testing the assumptions, it was found that the data failed Levene's Test of Equality of Variances (p < .05). Because of this, Spearman's rho was used instead of the point-biserial correlation. The result supported the discriminant validity of the

CCARS in that gender was not statistically significantly related to the Other Activities (r_s = -.149, p = .131).

Demographics

The frequency tables for the demographic survey are included in Appendix K. Of particular note for the study at hand, 60.7% of the participants worked at a campus of 5000 students or less while 39.1% worked at a campus with more than 5000 students. The majority of respondents (96.3%) were full time employees with 33.6% working at community colleges/two-year institutions, 60.7% working at four-year institutions, and 5.6% working at professional schools.

Research Question One

It was hypothesized that performing non-counseling duties would predict burnout in college counselors. To address this hypothesis, a hierarchical multiple regression model was performed (see Table 1).

Table 1

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Model Predicting Burnout from Other Activities, Tenure in the Profession, Tenure at the Institution, Perceived Workload, and Meaningful Work

Model Summary[c]

Model	R	R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					Durbin-Watson
				R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.143[a]	0.020	1.09980	0.020	2.133	1	102	0.147	
2	.668[b]	0.446	0.84386	0.425	18.814	4	98	0.000	2.110

a. Predictors: (Constant), Other Activities

b. Predictors: (Constant), Other Activities, Meaningful Work, Total Perceived Workload, Years as a Mental Health Professional, Years at Current Institution

c. Dependent Variable: Total Exhaustion

Other Activities was entered in the first block while Perceived Workload, Meaningful Work, Number of Years as a Mental Health Professional, and Years at Current Institution were all entered in the second block. The result of the first model was not statistically significant (p = .147) and had a weak effect (R^2 = .02).

Even though the first model was not statistically significant, the second model did show statistically significant F change and contained variables that were statistically significant (see Table 2). The coefficient statistics of the second model were examined for potential interpretations and implications. Of the five variables, only Perceived Workload ($p < .0001$) and Meaningful Work ($p = .028$) were statistically significant in the second model. The resulting regression equation with the statistically significant predictor variables was $\hat{Y} = 2.552 + 0.6$ (*Perceived Workload*) – 0.17 (*Meaningful Work).*

Table 2

Coefficients of the Hierarchical Model Predicting Burnout

Model and Variables		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	β	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.696	0.340		7.927	0.000	2.021	3.370
	Other Activities	0.177	0.121	0.143	1.460	0.147	-0.064	0.418
2	(Constant)	2.552	0.904		2.822	0.006	0.757	4.347
	Other Activities	0.129	0.101	0.104	1.281	0.203	-0.071	0.330
	Meaningful Work	-0.041	0.018	-0.170	-2.230	0.028	-0.078	-0.005
	Perceived Workload	0.508	0.066	0.600	7.694	0.000	0.377	0.639
	Years as a Mental Health Professional	-0.005	0.012	-0.049	-0.447	0.656	-0.029	0.019
	Years at Current Institution	-0.020	0.013	-0.169	-1.516	0.133	-0.045	0.006

a. Dependent Variable: Total Exhaustion

Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2003) argued that statistical significance is not as important in multiple regression models as it is in ANOVA models. Instead, researchers should

have examined the effect sizes, confidence intervals, and power in combination with the statistical significance to determine whether to retain or reject the null hypothesis. The power for the hierarchical multiple regression analysis was 0.502. This was barely above the minimum power of 0.50 and substantially far from the acceptable and recommended levels, 0.80 and 0.90 respectively (Murphy, Myors, & Wolach, 2014). In addition, the confidence interval was -0.064 to 0.418. Due to this, non-counseling duties was not interpreted as a predictor of burnout and the null hypothesis was retained.

Table 3

Total, Direct, and Indirect Effects of Other Activities on Total Exhaustion when Mediated by Perceived Workload

Total effect of Other Activities on Total Exhaustion					
Effect	SE	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
.2029	.1189	1.7058	.0910	-.0329	.4387
Direct effect of Other Activities on Total Exhaustion					
Effect	SE	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
.0615	.0972	.6325	.5285	-.1313	.2542
Indirect effect(s) of Other Activities on Total Exhaustion					
		Effect	BootSE	BootLLCI	BootULCI
Perceived Workload		.1414	.0745	-.0002	.3027
Partially standardized indirect effect(s) of Other Activities on Total Exhaustion					
		Effect	BootSE	BootLLCI	BootULCI
Perceived Workload		.1266	.0655	-.0002	.2636
Completely standardized indirect effect(s) of Other Activities on Total Exhaustion					
		Effect	BootSE	BootLLCI	BootULCI
Perceived Workload		.1145	.0579	-.0002	.2345

However, Hayes and Rockwood (2017) argued that mediation may still occur, even when a predictor variable does not directly predict a criterion variable. They suggested a test of mediation be used to look for indirect effects. The important aspect of this test was to see if the bootstrap confidence interval did not contain zero. If the interval did not contain zero, then the indirect effects could have been said to be statistically significant. The fourth hypothesis required

this procedure, so the test was run utilizing Perceived Workload as the mediating variable, with Other Activities as the predictor variable and Total Exhaustion as the criterion variable.

The resulting bootstrap confidence interval of this test contained zero for every effect test of Other Activities and Total Exhaustion (see Table 3). Because of this, and the other previously mentioned hypothesis tests, the first null hypothesis was retained. In addition, this test led to the fourth null hypothesis being retained.

To further confirm the retaining of the first five null hypotheses, moderation tests were run through the PROCESS syntax to test moderation effects of Meaningful Work, Number of Years at Current Institution and Number of Years as a Mental Health Professional. The results of these tests showed high alpha levels and confidence intervals that included zero. Based upon all of the hypothesis tests, each of the null hypotheses for research question one was retained.

Table 4

Correlations among Model Variables

		Other Activities	Total Exhaustion	Meaningful Work	Perceived Workload	Years as a Mental Health Professional	Years at Current Institution
Other Activities	Correlation	1.000	0.143	0.047	0.172	.283**	.368**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.141	0.635	0.077	0.003	0.000
Total Exhaustion	Correlation	0.143	1.000	-.238*	.620**	-0.044	-0.073
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.141		0.014	0.000	0.657	0.456
Meaningful Work	Correlation	0.047	-.238*	1.000	-0.136	0.109	0.077
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.635	0.014		0.166	0.273	0.436
Perceived Workload	Correlation	0.172	.620**	-0.136	1.000	0.130	0.145
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.077	0.000	0.166		0.186	0.136
Years as a Mental Health Professional	Correlation	.283**	-0.044	0.109	0.130	1.000	.762**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.003	0.657	0.273	0.186		0.000
Years at Current Institution	Correlation	.368**	-0.073	0.077	0.145	.762**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.456	0.436	0.136	0.000	

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In order to do a thorough investigation of the research collected, a Spearman's rho correlation was performed between each of the variables from the multiple regression model (see Table 4). Spearman's rho was chosen because not every variable was parametric when examined but all were sufficiently large (Field, 2009).

Table 5

Correlations of Other Activities Items with Other Variables

		Total Exhaustion	Meaningful Work	Total Perceived Workload	Years as a Mental Health Professional	Years at Current Institution
Create departmental budgets, annual reports, and strategic plans	Correlation	.194*	-0.034	.213*	0.068	.312**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.045	0.726	0.028	0.484	0.001
Evaluate counseling center professionals and paraprofessionals	Correlation	0.171	0.038	.219*	0.066	.269**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.079	0.701	0.023	0.501	0.005
Develop and/or revise departmental policies and procedures	Correlation	.200*	-0.069	0.175	-0.007	.247*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.039	0.479	0.073	0.941	0.011
Participate on committees and task forces outside of the counseling center	Correlation	0.004	0.132	0.072	0.126	.344**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.964	0.178	0.459	0.196	0.000
Measure and report to administration the impact of counseling on the institution's retention efforts	Correlation	.220*	0.175	0.149	0.069	0.186
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.023	0.073	0.126	0.477	0.056
Teach classes at your institution (as part of your counselor job description)	Correlation	-0.026	-0.011	-0.008	-0.071	0.067
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.787	0.909	0.938	0.465	0.492
Evaluate documentation to approve disability services for students	Correlation	-0.065	0.036	-0.022	-0.085	0.027
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.503	0.711	0.821	0.386	0.780
Oversee the provision of disability services on campus	Correlation	0.049	-0.038	0.119	-0.039	-0.057
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.619	0.699	0.225	0.691	0.565
Create and monitor behavioral plans for students with behavioral problems (e.g. students with autism spectrum disorders)	Correlation	0.013	-0.030	-0.040	-0.082	0.033
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.892	0.759	0.683	0.399	0.732
Coordinate the testing center	Correlation	0.084	-0.113	0.034	-0.058	-0.107
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.393	0.252	0.726	0.553	0.274
Advise and schedule students for classes	Correlation	0.023	0.130	0.075	0.091	.233*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.813	0.185	0.445	0.353	0.016

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Of note, Perceived Workload was statistically significantly correlated to Total Exhaustion (r_s = .614, p < .001). This confirmed Moore (2000), Ahuja et al. (2007), and Tabassum et al.'s (2017) findings that perceived workload positively correlated to work exhaustion. In addition, Meaningful Work was statistically significantly negatively correlated to Total Exhaustion (r_s = -.269, p < .01). This finding confirmed Grant and Campbell's (2007) previous research that perceived prosocial impact was negatively correlated to burnout. In addition, both Years as a Mental Health Professional (r_s = .239, p < .05) and Years at Current Institution (r_s = .319, p < .001) were statistically significantly correlated to Other Activities.

A Spearman's rho correlation was also performed for each item of the Other Activities section of the CCARS and Total Exhaustion, Meaningful Work, Total Perceived Workload, Years as a Mental Health Professional, and Years at Current Institution (see Table 5). There were three questions that correlated with Total Exhaustion: "Create departmental budgets, annual reports, and strategic plan" (r = .194, p = .045); "Develop and/or revise departmental policies and procedures" (r = .20, p = .039); and "Measure and report to administration the impact of counseling on the institution's retention efforts" (r = .220, p = .023). While it is not enough to confirm the hypotheses of this study, this did provide implications for future research.

Research Question Two

For research question two, it was hypothesized that there would be a statistically significant difference between the Other Activities reported by the CCARS based upon the size of the institution of higher education, separated into small and large institution size groups. To address this hypothesis, an independent samples t-test was performed with Other Activities as the dependent variable and the dummy grouped Total Enrollment as the independent variable (see Table 6).

Table 6

Independent Samples Test of Other Activities Based on Institution Enrollment Size

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Institution Enrollment	≤ 5000	61	2.7156	0.87594	0.11215
	>5000	42	2.6645	0.92785	0.14317

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Other Activities	Equal variances assumed	0.276	0.600	0.284	101	0.777	0.05115	0.17993	-0.30579	0.40808
	Equal variances not assumed			0.281	84.909	0.779	0.05115	0.18187	-0.31046	0.41275

The two groups contained 61 small institutions and 42 large institutions. The small institution Other Activities score (M = 2.72, SD = 0.88) was higher than large institution Other Activities score (M = 2.66, SD = 0.93) but was not significantly significant (M = 0.05, 95% CI [-.31, 41], $t(101) = .284$, $p = .777$, $d = .06$). Based upon these results, the null hypothesis was also retained.

Chapter 5 - Discussion

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the key findings and conclusions, implications, and suggestions for future research. The purpose of the current study was to examine the relationship between non-counseling duties, as measured by the newly developed CCARS, and burnout, as measured by the SMBM. The concern was that college counselors are asked to do more types of work with less resources (CCMH, 2017), leading to a greater potential of burnout (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001). In order, to test this hypothesis, a hierarchical regression analysis was run to examine the relationship between non-counseling duties, Other Activities from the CCARS, and burnout, Total Exhaustion from the SMBM. Additional variables tested for mediation and moderation effects were Meaningful Work as measured by the WAMI, Total Perceived Workload as measured by the PWS, and Years as a Mental Health Professional and Years at Current Institution, as measured by a demographic survey. Based upon the results of the analyses, all six null hypotheses were retained.

Key Findings

The results of the current study were unable to provide statistical significance with power in order to reject any of the six null hypotheses. As such, no determination could be made about the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout for college counselors. In addition, the assertion that smaller colleges and universities were more likely to engage in non-counseling duties was not confirmed.

Upon further analysis, it was discovered that perceived workload was statistically significantly correlated to burnout with a strong positive effect. This conclusion confirmed the prior research in regard to the importance of measuring workload while exploring burnout factors (Schaufeli, 2017; Van den Broeck et al., 2017). In addition, there was a statistically

significantly negative relationship between meaningful work and burnout and confirmed the previous research regarding how a positive interpretation of one's work counteracts burnout (Allan, Owens, & Douglass, 2017). Additional research regarding burnout should continue to account for these important factors before making conclusions about predictors of burnout.

Another key finding comes from the second set of correlational relationships examined. There were three questions from the Other Activities section that all positively correlated to burnout in a statistically significant way. These three questions, along with one other, could be subdivided from Other Activities into Administrative Duties. This raises possibilities for the direction of future research in the field of college counseling, especially for counseling center directors.

Finally, there was no statistically significant difference in the size of the institution and the frequency of Other Activities performed. Assertions that those working at smaller institutions will have a wider range of work activities that go beyond the usual counseling duties need to be reassessed. This also holds implications for the shared experience that can be found for college counselors across different sizes of institutions. There may be more in common than what some may believe.

Implications

There are four main implications from this research. First, there is no evidence from this study that engaging in non-counseling activities will increase the likelihood that college counselors will become burned out. So why were the hypotheses not confirmed, even though the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout has been identified in previous research (Bardhoshi, 2012; Bardhoshi et al., 2014; Falls, 2009; Smith, 2009; Wells, 2009)? It is important to recognize one aspect of the research by Bardhoshi et al. (2014) that non-counseling duties

were positively correlated with exhaustion and incompetence when the school counselor had a high caseload. It may be that the caseload was measuring the workload of the counselor, which was confirmed to have a strong positive relationship to burnout in this current study. As such, the type of work activity may not matter as much as the amount of work. In addition, the counselor's perception of the non-counseling duties may impact the perceived risk to resources. The perception of non-counseling duties might be negative because they are considered extraneous work responsibilities that are above and beyond the other work in which the counselor wants or expects to perform. Alternatively, the non-counseling duties may provide a change of pace, recommended by Skovholt and Trotter-Mathison (2007) as beneficial against burnout, or be meaningful for the counselor, which this study confirmed had a negative relationship with burnout. This possibility of multiple perceptions explains why the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout could not be identified as positive or negatively correlated in this current study. Whatever the case may be, this study suggested that the non-counseling duties in and of themselves are not a concern for burnout.

Perceived workload is a more pertinent concern as this study showed a strong relationship between perceived workload and burnout. According to CCMH (2017), the number of students receiving services, particularly for crisis intervention, continues to increase. This was confirmed by Xiao et al. (2017) when they explored counseling center trends and noticed that anxiety and depression diagnoses were increasing, as well as self-harm and suicidality. Crisis intervention has been viewed as the least favorable activity for college counselors (Coulter et al., 2003) and requires more resources and services (CCMH, 2017). If this threat to resources is not managed through the hiring of additional staff and/or implementing creative resource solutions, the perception of heavier workloads for today's college counseling center staff may continue.

Given the correlational nature of this study, it is impossible to determine whether having a higher perceived workload leads to burnout or whether being burned out leads to a perception of having a higher workload. However, with the relationship between the two aspects, decreasing one's perception of work overload would also accompany a decrease in the level of burnout. One way to address a negative perception of work overload is through the promotion of healthy living behaviors in the workplace (Basinska-Zych & Springer, 2017). For administrators and supervisors, finding ways to promote, encourage, and reward healthy behaviors of college counselors has been shown to deter work overload. These behaviors include amount of sleep, exercise, sensible diet, limitations on alcohol and tobacco consumption, and routinely scheduling preventative health examinations. As noted by de Beer, Pienaar, and Rothmann (2016), a consequence of work overload and burnout was health impairment, thus creating a reciprocal nature between healthy living and burnout. Engaging in healthy lifestyle habits will help deter a negative outlook on workload and, consequently, burnout. In addition to promoting healthy lifestyle choices, Skovholt and Trotter-Mathison (2011) recommended developing enriching peer relationships and engaging in multiple job roles.

Second, with the negative relationship between meaningful work and burnout, college counselors would do well to work on developing a sense of meaningfulness in their work. As Dik et al. (2009) discussed, there are concrete ways in which people add meaning to the work they perform. The first is to infuse work with a divine sense of purpose. Because this is often associated with religious and spiritual connection of the purpose to work, it may not apply to all college counselors. However, for those who do see their work as a calling, reflecting on the service to students as a spiritual act is a way to increase a sense of meaningfulness in the work that is performed.

Another concrete application is to evaluate current meaningfulness and adjust it (Dik et al., 2009). Some tasks, such as planning of annual budgets or participating on institutional committees, may seem to deter the college counselor from working with students. However, these tasks can have important consequences in the future functioning of the college counseling center and connected with other departments across the institution. By reframing these activities as a part of the mission of the counseling center and a benefit, more positive perceptions of the work being performed occur.

Finally, promoting prosocial values, is the third concrete action for promoting the meaningfulness of work (Dik et al., 2009). This concept examines the positive social impact of the work performed by the college counselor. While examining client outcomes in individual and group counseling is one way to measure the societal impact, performing satisfaction surveys, program review, and retention contributions all assist in this endeavor. When creating this information for accreditation and administrative uses, directors can also share the information with other counseling center staff to convey the importance of the work that is being performed. By continuously infusing the work college counselors perform with meaning, burnout is likely to remain at a lower level.

The third implication lies in the additional analysis between the individual items of the Other Activities section of the CCARS and burnout. Here, three questions all related to administrative duties were significantly related to burnout. It is important that administrators, often referred to as directors, take steps to identify and minimize the effects of burnout. Otherwise, job dissatisfaction and job turnover are likely results (Mullen, Malone, Denney, & Santa Dietz, 2018). Two recommendations in a study conducted by Grayson and Meilman (2013) address this. First, be sure to manage up and down. To manage down, directors must learn

how to delegate tasks so that there is a shared workload among all counseling center staff. In order to manage up, directors must build strong relationships with the administrators who the director reports to and find ways to support the mission of the university as a whole as opposed to the needs of the counseling center only. Secondly, directors need to take time for self-care, including healthy boundaries. When it is time to go home, directors must go home to maintain balance in their whole life experience. Directors must also make time to be a part of professional organizations in order to connect with other directors, learn new strategies for successful workplaces, and step out of the university environment for new perspectives, as a form of self-care. Any future research exploring administrative duties and burnout would benefit from examining the mediating effects of perceived workload. In particular, Laurence, Fried, and Raub (2016) found statistical evidence distinguishing a difference between work overload imposed by an employer versus what an individual self-imposes. This can be particularly relevant as directors often determine how much work they delegate and how much they rely on themselves to complete the tasks. Workload is a more complex variable that is important to examine in regard to the administrative duties performed by college counseling center directors.

Finally, there is an implication that institutions may not vary as much as previously thought. Because of this, it is important for colleges and universities of all sizes to meet together and share experiences to learn and grow from one another. This may be facilitated through professional organizations, such as ACCA and AUCCCD, or a gathering of local area college counselors from technical schools, community colleges, private institutions, and public institutions. Whatever the case may be, college counselors are encouraged to reach across demographic lines and focus upon the common ground underlying the work that they perform.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of this study was the lack of an instrument to study non-counseling duties in college counselors. Though the purpose of the SCARS (Scarborough, 2005) is to measure non-counseling duties and counseling duties; it is focused on those counseling duties and non-counseling duties traditionally performed by school counselors. Because of the uniqueness of college counseling (Sharkin, 2012), there are substantial differences between the two professions that necessitated development of a new instrument for college counselors. With the creation of the instrument, there were threats to validity to the instrument and the study. A follow-up study providing the full validation study is needed to reinforce the use of the CCARS in future research with college counselors.

Another limitation was the self-report nature of the study with the participant being the source of information for all measures. As discussed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff (2003), this can contribute to measurement error because of consistency motifs, implicit theories, social desirability, acquiescence, affect, and mood. In addition, the work activities were estimated by the participant over the course of a year. As such, these measurements were likely biased by the participants' memory as opposed to being accounted through time logs or other forms of record-keeping.

A third limitation was the cross-sectional nature of the study. This is related to Podsakoff et al.'s (2003) discussion, particularly regarding the mood of the participant when completing the instruments. Because the data only considers how the participant felt at a single point in time, it may not accurately portray the level of burnout because of the gradual and developmental nature of burnout (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001).

The sample frame was another potential limitation. The American College Counseling Association's (ACCA) membership roster was chosen because it does not limit its membership and represents a diverse range of college counselors (ACCA, 2015). However, those who participate in professional organizations and research may be more likely to engage with other professionals and prevent themselves from becoming isolated, a predictor of burnout (Bardhoshi et al., 2014). Because the sample was not randomly drawn from any college counselor across the United States, the results may be more applicable to the membership of ACCA rather than the profession as a whole.

Future Research

While the current study was unable to make definitive claims regarding the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout, there are four suggestions for future research to consider. First, for the CCARS to be a vital tool in the research of college counselors, it needs to complete the last stage of instrument development, a validation study (Dimitrov, 2012). Because of the large number of items on the CCARS, a larger population size is recommended. Field (2009) recommends approximately 300 participants to perform a factor analysis, taking into account that more variables would necessitate more participants. On average, 10-15 participants per variable is recommended until 300 is reached, and then the more the better. In addition to a factor analysis, it may be beneficial to replicate the expert panel and field study portions to add further validity and reliability data to the instrument.

Next, even though this study did not identify a clear relationship between burnout and non-counseling duties, there were three items that did have a relationship to burnout. These three items all revolved around the responsibilities of counseling center directors. Further research into the activities of directors and the relationship with burnout will be important for exploring this

area of research. In addition, further testing of the relationship between burnout and variety of activities is warranted to confirm the assertions by Skovholt and Trotter-Mathison (2011) that multiple roles serve as a protective factor against burnout.

The third recommendation for future research is directed towards researchers examining burnout in school counselors. While reviewing the literature, only Hurt (2014) identified workload as a predictor variable for burnout. Several of the other research articles, such as Bardhoshi et al. (2014), discussed the workload of school counselors as being a significant concern, but none attempted to measure and/or control for the workload when measuring the effects of non-counseling duties on school counselors. Bardhoshi et al. (2014) did utilize caseload as a part of the study and did find that larger caseloads led to stronger relationships between non-counseling duties and burnout. However, caseload is one aspect of the overall workload of school counselor and a full view of the perceived workload of school counselors may do more to mediate the relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout. To add to the strength of the available literature, future studies can identify workload as a covariate and control for it or study its mediating effects.

Finally, Sharkin (2012) discusses the likelihood that college counselors at smaller institutions will be more likely to engage in non-counseling duties. Though this was not confirmed for this study, one other demographic that Sharkin mentions being a potential difference is community colleges versus four-year institutions. Future research should examine whether either of these demographics show a substantial difference in the amount of non-counseling duties performed. It may be that college counselors at differing sizes and types of institutions of higher education share more in common than expected.

Summary

Though this study was unable to confirm the hypotheses regarding a relationship between non-counseling duties and burnout, there were several key findings, implications, and recommendations for future research that were produced. Perceived workload and administrative activities were positively correlated with burnout but finding meaning in one's work was negatively correlated. In addition, institution size did not statistically significantly impact the assignment of non-counseling duties a college counselor performed. College counseling remains a vibrant field and an important part of the greater college community. As such, continued research into the vocational stressors contributing to burnout will be important to guide college counselors to long, healthy careers in service to college students.

References

Acker, G. M. (2003). Role conflict and ambiguity: Do they predict burnout among mental health service providers? *Social Work in Mental Health, 1*, 63-80. doi:10.1300/J200v1n03_05

Ackerly, G. D., Burnell J., Holder, D. C., & Kurdek, L. A. (1988). Burnout among licensed psychologists. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 19 (6),* 624-631. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.19.6.624

Ahuja, M. K., Chudoba, K. M., Kacmar, C. J., McKnight, D. H., & George, J. F. (2007). IT road warriors: Balancing work-family conflict, job autonomy, and work overload to mitigate turnover intentions. *MIS Quarterly, 31*, 1-17. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/25148778

Allan, B. A., Owens, R. L., & Douglass, R. P. (2017). Character strengths in counselors: Relations with meaningful work and burnout. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 1-16. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/1069072717748666

American College Counseling Association (n.d.) *Join Now!* Retrieved from http://collegecounseling.org/Join-Now!

American College Counseling Association. (2015). *Who we are*. Retrieved from http://www.collegecounseling.org/who-we-are.

American College Counseling Association. (2016). *Policy and procedures handbook*. Indianapolis, IN: Author.

American Counseling Association. (2014). *ACA code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

American Psychological Association (2010). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct.* Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index.aspx

Armon, G., Melamed, S., Shirom, A., & Shapira, I. (2010). Elevated burnout predicts the onset of musculoskeletal pain among apparently healthy employees. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 15,* 399-408. doi:10.1037/a0020726

Arricale, F. (2001). *A study of burnout of counselors in college counseling centers* (Order No. 9998251). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304738374).

Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., Shantz, A., & Soane, E. (2017). The mismanaged soul: Existential labor and the erosion of meaningful work. *Human Resource Management Review, 27,* 416-430. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2016.11.001

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Euwema, M. C. (2005). Job resources buffer the impact of job demands on burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10,* 170-180. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.10.2.170

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the Job Demands-Resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management, 43,* 83-104. doi:10.1002/hrm.20004

Balkin, R. S. & Kleist, D. M. (2017). *Counseling research: A practitioner-scholar approach.* Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Bardhoshi, G. (2012). *The relationship between assignment of non-counseling duties and burnout among professional school counselors* (Order No. 3490361). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (917223211).

Bardhoshi, G., Schweinle, A., & Duncan, K. (2014). Understanding the impact of school factors on school counselor burnout: A mixed-methods study. *The Professional Counselor, 4,* 426-443. doi:10.15241/gb.4.5.426

Barkhuizen, N., Rothmann, S., & van der Vijver, F. J. R. (2014). Burnout and work engagement of academics in higher education institutions: Effects of dispositional optimism. *Stress & Health, 30,* 322-332. doi:10.1002/smi.2520

Basinska-Zych, A. & Springer, A. (2017). The concept of preventing negative consequences of work overload based on positive interactions between work and life, and promotion of workers' healthy behaviors. *Central European Review of Economics and Management, 1,* 45-75. doi:10.29015/cerem.408

Ben-Itzhak, S., Dvash, J., Maor, M., Rosenberg, N., & Halpern, P. (2015). Sense of meaning as a predictor of burnout in emergency physicians in Israel: A national survey. *Clinical and Experimental Medicine, 2,* 217-225. doi:10.15441/ceem.15.074

Bishop, J. B. (2006). College and university counseling centers: Questions in search of answers. *Journal of College Counseling, 9,* 6-19. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1882.2006.tb00088.x

Bishop, J. B. (2016). A wish list for the advancement of university and college counseling centers. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 30,* 15-22. doi:10.1080/87568225.2016.1105651

Bishop, J. B., Gallagher, R. P., & Cohen D. (2000). College students' problems: Status, trends, and research. In D. C. Davis & K. M. Humphrey (Eds.), *College counseling: Issues and strategies for a new millennium* (pp. 89-110). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

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

Breuer, K., Goldner, F. M., Jager, B., Werfel, T., & Schmid-Ott, G. (2015). Chronic stress experience and burnout syndrome have appreciable influence on health-related quality of

life in patients with psoriasis. *Journal of the European Academy of Dermatology and Venereology, 29,* 1898-1904. doi:10.1111/jdv.12999

Brunner, J. L., Wallace, D. L., Reymann, L. S., Sellers, J-J., McCabe, A.G. (2014). College counseling today: Contemporary students and how counseling centers meet their needs. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 28,* 257-324. doi:10.1080/87568225.2014.948770

Burke, J. M. (1985). *The relationship between type A behavior, role stress, job enrichment, and burnout among college counselors* (Order No. 8528307). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (303440691).

Burnham, J. J., & Jackson, C. M. (2000). School counselor roles: Discrepancies between actual practice and existing models. *Professional School Counseling, 4,* 41-49.

Butler, S. K., & Constantine, M. G. (2005). Collective self-esteem and burnout in professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 9,* 55-62.

Campbell, D. T. & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Carter, G. C. & Winseman, J. F. (2003). Increasing numbers of students arrive on college campuses on psychiatric medications: Are they mentally ill? *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 18,* 3-10. doi:10.1300/J035v18n01_02

Cate, P. & Miller, M. A. (2015). Academic advising within the academy: History, mission, and role. In P. Folsom, F. Yoder, & J. E. Joslin (Eds.), *The new advisor guidebook: Mastering the art of academic advising* (pp. 39-53). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Center for Collegiate Mental Health. (n.d.). *About us.* Retrieved from http://ccmh.psu.edu/about-us/

Center for Collegiate Mental Health. (2017). *Center for Collegiate Mental Health 2017 annual report.* University Park, PA: Author. Retrieved from https://sites.psu.edu/ccmh/files/2018/02/2017_CCMH_Report-1r4m88x.pdf

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Coll, K. M., Kovach, T., Cutler, M. M., & Smith, M. (2007). Exploring wellness and the rural mental health counselor. *Journal of Rural Community Psychology, E10*(2). Retrieved from http://www.marshall.edu/jrcp/ARCHIVES/V10%20N2/coll.pdf

Coulter, L. P., Offult, C. A., and Mascher, J. (2003). Counseling center management of after-hour crises: Practice and problems. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 18,* 11-34. doi:10.1300/J035v18n01_03

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education. (2014). *Standards and guidelines*. Retrieved from http://standards.cas.edu/getpdf.cfm?PDF=E8699C37-0C59-178D-55317F65F4B1036C

Crano, W. D., Brewer, M. B., & Lac, A. (2015). *Principles and methods of social research* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cummings, O. W. & Nall, R. L. (1982). Counselor burnout and school leadership style: A connection. *The School Counselor, 29,* 190-195. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23900630

Davis, R. W., IV. (2013). *The juggling act: Perceptions of role conflict among community college counselors* (Order No. 3574916). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1449375360).

de Beer, L. T., Pienaar, J., & Rothmann, S., Jr. (2016). Work overload, burnout, and psychological ill-health symptoms: A three-wave mediation model of the employee health impairment process. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping, 29*, 387-399. doi:10.1080/10615806.2015.1061123

Dean, L. A. (2011). *What does "excellence" look like? Program evaluation and criterions assessment in college counseling.* Retrieved from http://counselingoutfitters.com /vistas/vistas11/Article_14.pdf

Dik, B. J., Duffy, R. D., & Eldridge, B. M. (2009). Calling and vocation in career counseling: Recommendations for promoting meaningful work. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40,* 625-632. doi:10.1037/a0015547

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design model.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Dimitrov, D. M. (2012). *Statistical methods for validation of assessment scale data in counseling and related fields.* Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Dorrian, J., Grant, C., & Banks, S. (2017). An industry case study of 'stand-up' and 'sleepover' night shifts in disability support: Residential support worker perspectives. *Applied Ergonomics, 58,* 110-118. doi:10.1016/j.apergo.2016.05.016

Dreison, K. C., Luther, L., Bonfils, K. A., Sliter, M. T., McGrew, J. H., & Salyers, M. P. (2018). Job burnout in mental health providers: A meta-analysis of 35 years of intervention research. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 23,* 18-30. doi:10.1037/ocp0000047

Drum, D. J., Brownson, C., Denmark, A. B., & Smith, S. E. (2009). New data on the nature of suicidal crises in college students: Shifting the paradigm. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40,* 213-222. doi:10.1037/a0014465

Espinoza, S. (2012, April 28). At Central Valley School, counselors forced to do more with less. *New America Media*. Retrieved from http://www.newamericamedia.org.

Falls, L. (2009). *The relationship between assignment of non-counseling duties and job stress and burnout among school counselors in Texas* (Order No. 3361996). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (305063712).

Farber, B. A. (1988, August). *Burnout in psychotherapists: Incidence, types, and trends.* Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED303741.pdf

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Frazier, P. A., Tix, A. P., & Barron, K. E. (2004). Testing moderator and mediator effects in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*, 115-134. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.51.1.115

Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burn-out. *Journal of Social Issues, 30* (1), 159-165.

Friend, J. G., Judy, B., & Reilly V. (2005). *The ADA coordinator's guide to campus compliance*. Danvers, MA: LRP Publications.

Gallavan, D. B. & Newman, J. L. (2013). Predictors of burnout among correctional mental health professionals. *Psychological Sciences, 10,* 155-122. doi:10.1037/a0031341

Ghetie, D. (2007). The debate over time-limited treatment in college counseling centers. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 22,* 41-61. doi:10.1300/J035v22n01_04

Gilboa, S., Shirom, A., Fried, Y., & Cooper, C. (2008). A meta-analysis of work demand stressors and job performance: Examining main and moderating effects. *Personnel Psychology, 61,* 227-271. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2008.00113.x

Grayson, P. & Meilman, P. (2013). Longevity speaks: Observations from long-serving counseling center directors. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 27,* 185-199. doi:10.1080/87568225.2013.798219

Haas, A., Koestner, B., Rosenberg, J., Moore, D., Garlow, S. J., Sedway, J. … Nemeroff, C. B. (2008). An interactive web-based method of outreach to college students at risk for suicide. *Journal of American College Health, 57,* 15-22 doi:10.3200/JACH.57.1.15-22

Halbesleben, J. R. B. & Demerouti, E. (2005). The construct validity of an alternate measure of burnout: Investigating the English translation of the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory. *Work & Stress, 19,* 208-220. doi:10.1080/02678370500340728

Harris, Jr. R. S. (2002). Dual relationships in university counseling centers. In A. A. Lazarus & O. Zur (Eds.), *Dual relationships and psychotherapy* (pp. 337-378). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.

Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Hayes, A. F. & Rockwood, N. J. (2017). Regression-based statistical mediation and moderation analysis in clinical research: Observations, recommendations, and implementation. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 98,* 39-57. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2016.11.00

Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: Advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50,* 337-421. doi:10.1111/1464-0597.00062

Hobfoll, S. E. & Shirom, A. (2001). Conservation of resources theory: Applications to stress and management in the workplace. In R. T. Golembiewski (Ed.). *Handbook of Organizational Behavior* (2nd ed., revised and expanded, pp. 57-80). New York, NY: Marcel Dekker.

Hodges, S. J. (2017a). Career and academic counseling and auxiliary services. In S. J. Hodges, K. Shelton, M. M. K. Lyn (Eds.). *The College and University Counseling Manual* (pp. 65-87). New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.

Hodges, S. J. (2017b). College counseling: Past, present, and future. In S. J. Hodges, K. Shelton, M. M. K. Lyn (Eds.). *The college and university counseling manual* (pp. 1-12). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.

Hodges, S. J. (2017c). Complex mental health issues on the college campus. In S. J. Hodges, K. Shelton, M. M. K. Lyn (Eds.). *The college and university counseling manual* (pp. 179-201). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.

Hodges, S. J. (2017d). Crisis and trauma counseling. In S. J. Hodges, K. Shelton, M. M. K. Lyn (Eds.). *The college and university counseling manual* (pp. 203-226). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.

Humphrey, K. M., Kitchens, H., & Patrick, J. (2000). Trends in college counseling for the 21st century. In D. C. Davis & K. M. Humphrey (Eds.), *College counseling: Issues and strategies for a new millennium.* (pp. 289-305). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Hurt, J. (2014). *A phenomenological study of urban middle school counselors and directors of guidance and counseling: Collaborating to understand counselor stress and prevent burnout.* Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/945/

International Association of Counseling Services, Inc. (2016, October 22). *Standards for University and Counseling Services.* Retrieved from http://0201.nccdn.net/4_2/000/000/057/fca/IACS-STANDARDS-amended-10-22-2016.pdf

Jackson, A. D. (2004). *A survey of the occupational stress, psychological strain, and coping resources of licensed professional counselors in Virginia: A replication study.* Retrieved from https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/handle/10919/30206

Kadambi, M., Audet, C. T., & Knish S. (2010). Counseling higher education students: Counselors' positive experiences. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 24,* 213-232. doi:10.1080/87568225.2010.486296

Kesler, K. D. (1990). Burnout: A multimodal approach to assessment and resolution. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 24,* 303-311. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/42869116

Kim, J. (1993). *A study of the relationship between role congruence and burnout among high school counselors* (Order No. 9402698). Available from Dissertations & Theses @ Kansas State University; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304067921).

Kim, N. & Lambie, G. (2018). Burnout and implications for professional school counselors. *The Professional Counselor, 8,* 277-294. doi: 10.15241/nk.8.3.277

Kirmeyer, S. L. & Dougherty, T. W. (1988). Work load, tension and coping: Moderating effects of supervisor support. *Personnel Psychology, 41,* 125-139. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1988.tb00635.x

Kirchner, G. L. & Setchfield, M. S. (2005). School counselors' and school principals' perceptions of the school counselor's role. *Education, 126,* 10-16.

Kirk-Brown, A. & Wallace, D. (2004). Predicting burnout and job satisfaction in workplace counselors: The influence of role stressors, job challenge, and organizational knowledge. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 41* (1), 29-37.

Kitzrow, M. A. (2003). The mental health needs of today's college students: Challenges and Recommendations. *NASPA Journal, 41*, 167-181.

Kirmeyer, S. L. & Dougherty, T. W. (1988). Work load, tension, and coping: Moderating effects of supervisor support. *Personnel Psychology, 41*, 125-139.

Kraus S. W. & Stein C. H. (2013). Recovery-oriented services for individuals with mental illness and case managers' experience of professional burnout. *Community Mental Health Journal, 49,* 7-13. doi:10.1007/s10597-012-9505-2

Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K. B. (2005). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work & Stress*, *19,* 192-207. doi:10.1080/02678370500297720

Krok, D. (2016). Can meaning buffer work pressure? An exploratory study on styles of meaning in life and burnout in firefighters. *Archives of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, 1*, 31-42. doi:10.12740/APP/62154

Krosnick, J. A. & Presser, S. (2010). Question and questionnaire design. In P. V. Marsden & J. D. Wright (Eds.), *Handbook of survey research* (2nd ed., pp. 263-313). Bingley, England: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Kruger, L. J., Bernstein, G., & Botman, H. (1995). The relationship between team friendships and burnout among residential counselors. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *135,* 191-201.

Lacour, M. A. M. & Carter, E. F. (2002). Challenges of referral decisions in college counseling. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 17,* 39-52.

LaFollette, A. M. (2009). The evolution of university counseling: From educational guidance to multicultural competence, severe mental illnesses, and Crisis Planning. *Graduate Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1*(2), 1-8. Available at: http://epublications.marquette.edu/gjcp/vol1/iss2/11

Lambie, G. W. (2006). Burnout prevention: A humanistic perspective and structured group supervision activity. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education, and Development, 45,* 32-44. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1939.2006.tb00003.x

Lambie, G. W. (2007). The contribution of ego development level to burnout in school counselors: Implications for professional school counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 85,* 82-88. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2007.tb00447.x

Laurence, G. A., Fried, Y., & Raub, S. (2016). Evidence for the need to distinguish between self-initiated and organizationally imposed overload in studies of work stress. *Work & Stress, 30,* 337-355. doi:10.1080/02678373.2016.1253045

Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology, 28,* 563-575. Retrieved from http://www.bwgriffin.com/gsu/courses/edur9131/content/Lawshe_content_valdity.pdf

Lee, S. M., Baker, C. R., Cho, S. H., Heckathorn, D. E., Holland, M. W., Newgent, R. A., … Yu, K. (2007). Development and initial psychometrics of the Counselor Burnout Inventory. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 40,* 142-154.

Lee, S. M., Cho, S. H., Kissinger, D., & Ogle, N. T. (2010). A typology of burnout in professional counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 88,* 131-138.

Leiter, M. P., Bakker, A. B., & Maslach, C. (2014). The contemporary context of job burnout. In M. P. Leiter, A. B. Bakker, & C. Maslach (Eds.), *Burnout at work* (pp. 1-9). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Lent, J. & Schwartz, R. C. (2012). The impact of work setting, demographic characteristics, and personality factors related to burnout among professional counselors. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 34,* 355-372.

Lent, R. W. & Brown, S. D. (2013). Understanding and facilitating career development in the 21st century. In R. W. Lent & S. D. Brown (Eds.), *Career development and counseling* (pp. 1-26). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Lewis, W. S. (2015, October). *2015 ACCA conference opening general session.* Keynote session at the meeting of the American College Counseling Association, Louisville, KY.

Lyn, M. M. K. (2017a). Essential services in college counseling. In S. J. Hodges, K. Shelton, & M. M. K. Lyn (Eds.), *The college and university counseling manual* (pp. 41-64). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.

Lyn, M. M. K. (2017b). Integrating the counseling center into the broader campus. In S. J. Hodges, K. Shelton, & M. M. K. Lyn (Eds.), *The college and university counseling manual* (pp. 289-303). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.

Lyn, M. M. K. (2017c). Professional issues in college counseling center staffing. In S. J. Hodges, K. Shelton, & M. M. K. Lyn (Eds.), *The college and university counseling manual* (pp. 89-107). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.

Magnuson, S., Norem, K, & Wilcoxon, S. A. (2002). Counseling leaders' strategies for stimulating professional development and avoiding burnout. *Texas Counseling Association Journal, 30,* 17-25.

Maples, M. F. (2000). Professional preparation for college counseling: Quality assurance. In D. C. Davis & K. M. Humphrey (Eds.), *College counseling: Issues and strategies for a new millennium.* (pp. 57-70). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Marks, L. I. & McLaughlin, R. H. (2005). Outreach by college counselors: Increasing student attendance at presentations. *Journal of College Counseling, 8,* 86-96. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1882.2005.tb00075.x

Maslach, C. (1982). *Burnout, the cost of caring.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Maslach, C. & Florian, V. (1988). Burnout, job setting, and self-evaluation among rehabilitation counselors. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 33*(2), 85-93. doi:10.1037/h0091691

Maslach, C. & Leiter, M. P. (2016, June). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry, 15,* 103-111. doi:10.1002/wps.20311

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52,* 391-422.

Meadows, M. E. (2000). The evolution of college counseling. In D. C. Davis & K. M. Humphrey (Eds.), *College counseling: Issues and strategies for a new millennium* (pp. 15-40). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Melamed, S. (n.d.). *Notice to potential users.* Retrieved from http://www.shirom.org/arie/index.html#

Melamed, S., Shirom, A., Toker, S., & Shapira, I. (2006). Burnout and risk of type 2 diabetes: A prospective study of apparently healthy employed persons. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 68,* 863-869. doi:10.1097/01.psy.0000242860.24009.f0

Mesidor, J. K. & Sly, K. F. (2014). Mental health help-seeking intentions among international and African American college students: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of International Students, 4,* 137-149. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1054822.pdf

Meyer, D., & Ponton, R. (2006). The healthy tree: A metaphorical perspective of counselor well-being. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 28,* 189-201.

Mier, S., Boone, M., & Shropshire, S. (2009). Community consultation and intervention: Supporting students who do not access counseling services. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 23,* 16-29. doi:10.1080/87568220802367602

Miller, G. D., Iverson, K. M., Kemmelmeier, M., MacLane, C., Pistorello, J., Fruzzetti, A. E., … Crenshaw, K. Y. (2011). A preliminary examination of burnout among counselor trainees treating clients with recent suicidal ideation and borderline traits. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 50,* 344-359.

Miner, A. M. (2010). *Burnout in mental health professionals as related to self-care*. Retrieved from http://common.pacificu.edu/spp/129.

Moore, A. L. (2011). *The process of burnout in community mental health counselors* (Order No. 3466531). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (885226214).

Moore, J. E. (2000). One road to turnover: An examination of work exhaustion in technology professionals. *MIS Quarterly, 24,* 141-168. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3250982

Moyer, M. (2011). Effects of non-guidance activities, supervision, and student-to-counselor ratios on school counselor burnout. *Journal of School Counseling, 9,* 1-31. Retrieved from http://jsc.montana.edu/articles/

Much, K., Wagener, A. M., & Hellenbrand, M. (2010). Practicing in the 21st century college counseling center. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 24,* 32-38. doi:10.1080/87568220903400138

Much, K. & Swanson A. L. (2010). The debate about increasing college student psychopathology: Are college students really getting "sicker?". *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 24,* 86-97. doi:10.1080/87568220903558570

Mullen, P. R., Malone, A., Denney, A., Santa Dietz, S. (2018). Job stress, burnout, job satisfaction, and turnover intention among student affairs professionals. *College Student Affairs Journal, 36,* 94-108. doi:4510.1353/csj.2018.0006

Mullin, C. M. (2010, September). *Doing more with less: The inequitable funding of community colleges* (Policy Brief 2010-03PBL). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Murphy, K. R., Myors, B., & Wolach, A. (2014). *Statistical power analysis: A simple and general model for traditional and modern hypothesis tests* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

National Behavioral Intervention Team Association. (2017). *Behavioral intervention teams*. Retrieved from https://nabita.org/behavioral-intervention-teams/.

National Board of Certified Counselors. (2014). *Why become a professional counselor?* Retrieved from http://www.cacrep.org/home/why-become-a-professional-counselor/

Nelson, J. A., Robles-Pina, R., & Nichter, M. (2008). An analysis of Texas high school counselors' role: Actual and preferred counseling activities. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory, and Research, 36,* 30-47.

O'Connor, K., Neff, D. M., Pitman, S. (2018). Burnout in mental health professionals: A systemic review and meta-analysis of prevalence and determinants. *European Psychiatry, 53,* 74-99. doi:10.1016/j.eurpsy.2018.06.003

Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. (2010). *The program manager's guide to evaluation* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/opre/program_managers_guide_to_eval2010.pdf

Owen, J., Devdas, L., & Rodolfa, E. (2007). University counseling center off-campus referrals: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 22,* 13-29. doi:10.1300/J035v22n02_03

Pines, A. M. (1993). Burnout. In L. Goldberger & S. Breznitz (Eds.), *Handbook of stress: Theoretical and clinical aspects* (2nd ed.; pp. 386 - 402). New York, NY: The Free Press.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 879-903. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Prescott, H. M. (2008). College mental health since the early twentieth century. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry, 16,* 258-266. doi:10.1080/10673220802277771

Qiao, H., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2011). The convergent validity of four burnout measures in a Chinese sample: A confirmatory factor-analytic approach. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 60,* 87-111. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2010.00428.x

Rasmussen, V., Turnell, A., Butow, P., Juraskova, I., Kirsten, L., Wiener, L., … Grassi, L. (2016). Burnout among psychosocial oncologists: An application and extension of the effort-reward imbalance model. *Psycho-Oncology, 25,* 194-202. doi:10.1002/pon.3902

Reetz, D. R., Bershad, C., LeViness, P., & Whitlock, M. (n.d.). *The Association for University and College Counseling Center Directors Annual Survey: Reporting period: September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016.* Retrieved from http://www.aucccd.org/assets/documents/aucccd%202016%20monograph%20-%20public.pdf

Ross, R. R., Altmaier, E. M., & Russell, D. W. (1989). Job stress, social support, and burnout among counseling center staff. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36,* 464-470. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.36.4.464

Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 30,* 91-127. doi:10.1016/j.riob.2010.09.001

Ryan, R. K. (1996). *A survey of occupational stress, psychological strain, and coping resources in licensed professional counselors in Virginia* (Order No. 9709071). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304319211).

Scarborough, J. L. (2005). The School Counselor Activity Rating Scale: An instrument for gathering process data. *Professional School Counseling,* 8, 274-283.

Schaufeli, W. B. (2017). Applying the Job Demands-Resources model: A 'how to' guide to measuring and tackling work engagement and burnout. *Organizational Dynamics, 46,* 120-132. doi:10.1016/j.orgdyn.2017.04.008

Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2009). Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. *Career Development International, 14,* 204-220. doi:10.1108/13620430910966406

Schaufeli, W. B. & Salanova, M. (2014). Burnout, boredom, and engagement in the workplace. In M.C.W. Peeters, J. de Jonge, & T. W. Taris (Eds.), *An introduction to contemporary work psychology* (pp. 293-320). West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Schonfeld, I. S., & Bianchi, R. (2016). Burnout and depression: Two Entities or One? *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 72,* 22-37. doi:10.1002/jclp.22229

Schwartz, A. (2015). Is student pathology really increasing? Seven measures of the acuity of counseling center clients, 1992-2007. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 29,* 257-270. doi:10.1080/87568225.2015.1074017

Schwartz, V., Nissel, C., Eisenberg, D., Kay, J., & Brown, J. T. (2012). Increasing counseling center utilization: Yeshiva University's experience. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 26,* 50-60. doi:10.1080/87568225.2012.633047

Shanafelt, T. D. (2009). Enhancing meaning in work: A prescription for preventing physician burnout and promoting patient-centered care. *The Journal of the American Medical Association, 302,* 1338-1340. doi:10.1001/jama.2009.1385

Sharkin, B. S. (2012). *Being a college counselor on today's campus: Roles, contributions, and special challenges.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Shead, J., Scott, H., & Rose, J. (2016). Investigating predictors and moderators of burnout in staff working in services for people with intellectual disabilities: The role of emotional intelligence, exposure to violence, and self-efficacy. *International Journal of Developmental Disabilities, 62,* 224-233. doi:10.1179/2047387715Y.0000000009

Shelton, K. (2017). Specific populations. In S. J. Hodges, K. Shelton, M. M. K. Lyn (Eds.). *The college and university counseling manual* (pp. 243-288). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.

Shelton, K & Hunter, E. (2017). Graduate practicum and internships in college and university counseling centers. In S. J. Hodges, K. Shelton, M. M. K. Lyn (Eds.). *The college and university counseling manual* (pp. 305-338). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.

Shih, T.-H. & Fan, X. (2008). Comparing response rates from web and mail surveys: A meta-analysis. *Field Methods, 20,* 249-271. doi:10.1177/1525822X08317085

Shirom, A. (2012). Job-related burnout: A review of major research foci and challenges. In J. C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *Handbook of occupational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 223-241). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Shirom, A. & Melamed, S. (2005). *Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure* [Measurement instrument]. Retrieved from http://www.shirom.org/arie/publications/BurnoutAndVigorScales/smbm-eng.doc

Shirom, A. & Melamed, S. (2006). A comparison of the construct validity of two burnout measures in two groups of professionals. *International Journal of Stress Management, 13,* 176-200. doi:10.1037/1072-5245.13.2.176

Skovholt, T.M., Grier, T.L., & Hanson, M.R. (2001). Career counseling for longevity: Self-care and burnout prevention strategies for counselor resilience. *Journal of Career Development, 27,* 167-176. doi:10.1023/A:1007830908587

Skovholt, T. M. & Trotter-Mathison, M. (2011). *The resilient practitioner: Burnout prevention and self-care strategies for counselors, therapists, teachers, and health professionals* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Smith, B. B. (2009). *North Carolina school counselors' perceptions of non-counseling duties.* Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAI3342226)

Smith, T. B., Dean, B., Floyd, S., Silva, C., Yamashita, M., Durtschi, J., & Heaps, R. A. (2007). Pressing issues in college counseling: A survey of American College Counseling Association members. *Journal of College Counseling, 10,* 64-78.

Spooner, S. E. (2000). The college counseling environment. In D. C. Davis & K. M. Humphrey (Eds.), *College counseling: Issues and strategies for a new millennium* (pp. 3-14). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Stamm, B. H. (2009). *Professional Quality of Life Scale* [Measurement instrument]. Retrieved from http://www.proqol.org/uploads/ProQOL_5_English_Self-Score_3-2012.pdf

Stapleton, L. M. (2010). Survey sampling, administration, and analysis. In G. R. Hancock & R. O. Mueller (Eds.), *The reviewer's guide to quantitative methods in the social sciences* (pp. 397-411). New York, NY: Routledge.

Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2012). Measuring meaningful work: The Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI). *Journal of Career Assessment, 20,* 1-16. doi:10.1177/1069072711436160

Stephan, J. B. (2005). *School environment and coping resources: A predictive model of school counselor burnout* (Order No. 3186006). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (305419804).

Tabassum, H., Farooq, Z., & Fatima, I. (2017). Work family conflict, perceived work overload, and work exhaustion in employees of banking sector. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences, 11,* 439-451.

Taris, T. W., Le Blanc, P. M., Schaufeli, W. B., & Schreurs, P. J. G. (2005). Are there causal relationships between the dimensions of the Maslach Burnout Inventory? A review and two longitudinal tests. *Work & Stress,* 19, 238-255. doi:10.1080/02678370500270453

Tastan, S. B. (2016). Predicting job strain with psychological hardiness, organizational support, job control, and work overload: An evaluation of Karasek's DCS model. *Postmodern Openings, 7,* 107-130. doi:10.18662/po/2016.0701.07

Toker, S., Shirom, A., Shapira, I., Berliner, S., & Melamed, S. (2005). The association between burnout, depression, anxiety, and inflammation biomarkers: C-reactive protein and fibrinogen in men and women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10,* 344-362. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.344

United States Department of Education. (2015, October 15). *Disability discrimination: Overview of the laws.* Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/policy/rights/guid/ocr/disabilityoverview.html

The University of Alabama. (2017). *Frequently asked questions.* Retrieved from http://threatassessment.ua.edu/?page_id=73.

Van den Broeck, A., Vander Elst, T., Baillien, E., Sercu, M., Schouteden, M., De Witte, H., & Godderis, L. (2017). Job demands, job resources, burnout, work engagement, and their relationships: An analysis across sectors. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 59,* 369-376. doi:10.1097/JOM.000000000000096

Wachter, C. A., Clemens, E. V., & Lewis, T. F. (2008). Exploring school counselor burnout and school counselor involvement of parents and administrators through an Adlerian theoretical framework. *Journal of Individual Psychology, 64,* 432-449. Retrieved from http://libres.uncg.edu/ir/uncg/f/C_Morris_Exploring_2008.pdf

Warnath, C.F. & Shelton, J.L. (1976). The ultimate disappointment: The burned-out counselor. *Personnel & Guidance Journal, 55,* 172-175.

Watkins, C.E., Jr. (1983). Burnout in counseling practice: Some potential professional and personal hazards of becoming a counselor. *Personnel & Guidance Journal, 61,* 304-308.

Watkins, D. C., Hunt, J. B., & Eisenberg, D. (2012). Increased demand for mental health services on college campuses: Perspectives from administrators. *Qualitative Social Work, 11,* 319-337. doi:10.1177/1473325011401468

Watson, J. C. (2013). Rethinking the provision of counseling services: A paradigm shift for college counselors. *Journal of College Counseling, 16,* 3-5. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1882.2013.00022.x

Weigl, M., Stab, N., Herms, I., Angerer, P., Hacker, W., & Glaser J. (2016). The associations of supervisor support and work overload with burnout and depression: A cross-sectional study in two nursing settings. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 72,* 1774-1788. doi:10.1111/jan.12948.

Wilkerson, K. (2009). An examination of burnout among school counselors guided by stress-strain-coping theory. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 87,* 428-437.

Wilkerson, K. & Bellini, J. (2006). Intrapersonal and organizational factors associated with burnout among school counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 84,* 440-450. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2006.tb00428.x

Willingham, W. E. (2009). *Factors affecting role stress and burnout among school counselors* (Order No. 3400180). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304929311).

Wolfe, E. W., & Smith, E. V., Jr. (2007). Instrument development tools and activities for measure validation using Rasch models: Part I – Instrument development tools. *Journal of Applied Measurement, 8,* 97-123.

Woods, K. E. (2009). *Self-efficacy as mediator in the relationship between non-counseling roles and wellness in school counselors.* Retrieved from http://www.tdl.org/repositories/.

Wright, D. J. (2000). College counseling and the needs of multicultural students. In D. C. Davis & K. M. Humphrey (Eds.), *College counseling: Issues and strategies for a new millennium* (pp.153-168). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2008). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 74,* 235-244. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2008.11.003

Yildirim, I. (2008). Relationship between burnout, sources of social support, and sociodemographic variables. *Social Behavior and Personality, 36,* 603-616. doi:10.2224/sbp.2008.36.5.603

Appendix A - College Counselor Activity Rating Scale

For each of the activities listed, please indicate how frequently you perform the activity.

Rating scale: 1 = I never or almost never do this
2 = I very infrequently do this
3 = I quite infrequently do this
4 = I sometimes do this
5 = I quite frequently do this
6 = I very frequently do this
7 = I always or almost always do this

A. Individual and Group Counseling Activities

1. Provide individual counseling regarding psychopathological and developmental concerns
2. Provide individual counseling regarding maladaptive behavior at the institution (e.g. drug and alcohol use, anger episodes, violating institutional policies)
3. Provide individual counseling regarding relationships (e.g., family, friends, romantic, roommate)
4. Provide individual counseling regarding academic issues
5. Provide individual counseling regarding substance abuse issues
6. Provide individual career counseling
7. Provide couples counseling including at least one student
8. Provide family counseling including student as client of record
9. Provide small group counseling addressing relationship/social skills
10. Provide small group counseling for academic issues
11. Conduct small groups regarding family/personal issues (e.g., divorce, death)
12. Conduct small group counseling for students regarding substance abuse issues (own use or family/friend use)
13. Administer psychological testing or diagnostic assessments

14. Follow-up on individual and group counseling participants

B. Crisis Intervention and Emergency Services Activities

1. Provide individual counseling regarding crisis/emergency issues
2. Coordinate institution-wide response for crisis management and postvention
3. Refer students for voluntary or involuntary hospitalization
4. Coordinate student's return to campus after inpatient treatment off-campus

C. Outreach Activities

1. Conduct psychoeducation sessions addressing career development and the world of work
2. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on various personal and/or social traits (e.g., responsibility, respect, etc.)
3. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on relating to others (family, friends)
4. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on personal growth and development issues
5. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on conflict resolution
6. Conduct psychoeducation sessions regarding substance abuse
7. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on stress management and other wellness issues
8. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on career exploration and career acquisition skills
9. Coordinate special events and programs for your institution around academic, career, or personal/social issues (e.g., career day, drug awareness week, test prep)
10. Coordinate orientation process / activities for students

D. Consultation Activities

1. Consult with faculty concerning student behavior

2. Consult with community agencies and other institution departments concerning individual students
3. Consult with parents regarding developmental issues
4. Provide consultation for administrators (regarding institution policy, programs, staff and/or students)
5. Participate in behavioral intervention team (BIT)/threat assessment team (TAT) meetings
6. Inform faculty, staff, and administrators about the role, training, program, and interventions of a college counselor within the context of your institution
7. Conduct or coordinate training programs for faculty and staff regarding addressing student mental health needs in the college environment

E. Referral Activities

1. Coordinate referrals for students and/or families to community or education professionals (e.g., mental health, speech pathology, medical assessment)
2. Coordinate referrals for students to other departments and services provided by the institution

F. Research Activities

1. Conduct needs assessments and counseling program evaluations
2. Formally evaluate student progress as a result of participation in individual/group counseling

G. Program Evaluation Activities

1. Coordinate and maintain a comprehensive program evaluation system
2. Keep track of how time is being spent on the functions that you perform
3. Coordinate with an advisory team to analyze and respond to counseling center needs

H. Professional Development Activities

1. Attend professional development activities (e.g., state conferences, local in-services)
2. Conduct professional development activities (e.g., present at a conference, provide in-service training)

I. Training Activities

1. Recruit graduate interns, post-doc professionals, and paraprofessional staff
2. Train graduate interns, post-doc professionals, and paraprofessional staff
3. Supervise graduate interns, post-doc professionals, and paraprofessional staff

J. Other Activities

1. Create departmental budgets, annual reports, and strategic plans
2. Evaluate counseling center professionals and paraprofessionals
3. Develop and/or revise departmental policies and procedures
4. Participate on committees and task forces outside of the counseling center
5. Organize service learning activities
6. Connect with students as part of the institution's retention efforts
7. Teach classes at your institution (as part of your counselor job description)
8. Evaluate documentation to approve disability services for students
9. Oversee the provision of disability services on campus
10. Coordinate the testing center
11. Advise and schedule students for classes
12. Enroll students in and/or withdraw students from institution
13. Adjudicate discipline of students

14. Create and monitor behavioral plans for students with behavioral problems (e.g. students with autism spectrum disorders)
15. Chair the Behavioral Intervention Team/Threat Assessment Team

K. Time Spent on Activities

1. Please estimate the percentage of time you spend in each of the given areas over the course of an academic year. Values must equal 100%

Appendix B - Results of expert panel

Each question will be listed with its CVR value and any comments left by the expert panel. According to Lawshe (1975), an expert panel of 8 panelists needs a CVR greater than or equal to 0.75 to be included for consideration, but items below the minimum CVR may be retained according to other item analysis procedures.

1. Provide individual counseling regarding psychopathological and developmental concerns

   CVR = 0.75

   "I rarely see the word psychopathology (psychopathological) used anymore, I think it focuses on a specific type of mental health issue and may not be broad enough for the spirit of this question."

   ".....psychopathology and/or developmental concerns. Suggested change. The phrasing joins the two and they can be separate concerns. Developmental concerns may fall into the realm of college disability services."

2. Provide individual counseling regarding maladaptive behavior at the institution (e.g. drug and alcohol use, anger episodes, violating institutional policies)

   CVR = 0.75

   "I'm aware that most institutions would rather refer students off campus especially for substance use; however I feel that a holistic approach would be more helpful to a student."

   "This is appropriate as long as therapy is NOT mandated."

3. Provide individual counseling regarding relationships (e.g., family, friends, romantic, roommate)

   CVR = 1

   "One caveat is long-term issues such as childhood sexual abuse may be difficult to do in a brief therapy context. "

4. Provide individual counseling regarding academic issues

   CVR = 0.75

   "It would always be better to collaborate with the academic services to provide support to the student."

"help determining if adhd or another learning disability might be present, supporting the process of a student seeking assistance through disability office for academic accommodations; ways to reduce test anxiety"

5. Provide individual counseling regarding substance abuse issues

CVR = 0.5

"It depends on the level of expertise in the counseling center. I feel such services should be provided; however it should be counselors who have training and expertise or train current counselors to provide such a service. We know that substance can be a long term issue but being able to address at the college level would be beneficial to students before such choices and habits become worse."

"Would this include referrals to treatment since this may be out of the scope of college counseling. "

6. Provide individual career counseling

CVR = 0.25

"This should be in collaboration with career counseling. Students often come in about anxiety related to choosing a major or finding a job so it's appropriate to address these issues in counseling."

"This seems to be defined differently at various campuses if they have a specific career center. "

7. Provide couples counseling including at least one student

CVR = 1.00

"Students often come in about relationship distress so couples counseling should be an option, and again by counselors who have such skills and expertise or counselors willing to be trained and certified. "

"I believe this is appropriate work, but treating a non student may not be possible for many centers because of lack of resources. We will offer 3 couples consultations, but don't do full couples work, unless both members are students."

8. Provide family counseling including student as client of record

CVR = 0.25

"This gets kind of tricky because confidentiality issues, liability and insurance. Certainly there are graduate students and other non-traditional undergrads who have families and need mental health support."

"this is very rare in our center, though we technically do offer it. "

"Family therapy is outside the scope of practice for college counselors."

9. Provide small group counseling addressing relationship/social skills

   CVR = 1.00

10. Provide small group counseling for academic issues

    CVR = 0.25

"Is this advising or academic support such as stress or time management?"

11. Conduct small groups regarding family/personal issues (e.g., divorce, death)

    CVR = 1.00

12. Conduct small group counseling for students regarding substance abuse issues (own use or family/friend use)

    CVR = 0.75

13. Administer psychological testing or diagnostic assessments

    CVR = 1.00

"if with in the scope and training of the staff performing the assessments, it would be inappropriate for several members of my staff (for example)."

"As long as the counselors are trained and certified to administer and interpret test results. "

14. Follow-up on individual and group counseling participants

    CVR = 0.50

"The wording for this one seems a little off to me. I believe this could be worded for more clarity. Maybe define what 'follow-up' means."

"I think most centers would say they do not do this. But those who have a position called "case manager" are probably more likely to do this."

15. Provide individual counseling regarding crisis/emergency issues

CVR = 1.00

16. Coordinate institution-wide response for crisis management and postvention

CVR = 0.75

"This sounds more like campus safety and security. Are you trying to see what role the counselors may have with this question?"

17. Refer students for voluntary or involuntary hospitalization

CVR = 0.75

18. Coordinate student's return to campus after inpatient treatment off-campus

CVR = 0.75

19. Conduct psychoeducation sessions addressing career development and the world of work

CVR = 0.25

"In collaboration with Career Counseling office"

"If you have a career center on campus, that's the office to do this sort of work. Counseling center employees may do career assessments and career counseling, but the other career pieces usually go to the career center."

"This is an appropriate activity for counselors, we would not do it however, because there are career counselors in the career center."

20. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on various personal and/or social traits (e.g., responsibility, respect, etc.)

CVR = 0.75

"communication skills, relationship skills, yes."

21. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on relating to others (family, friends)

CVR = 0.5

"communication skills, relationship skills, yes."

22. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on personal growth and development issues

CVR = 1.00

23. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on conflict resolution

CVR = 0.5

"If the counselor is trained in conflict resolution, which is not part of traditional counselor training."

24. Conduct psychoeducation sessions regarding substance abuse

CVR = 0.75

"sessions would more address coping skills deficits that lead up to student using substances to cope. not psychoeducation about the substances themselves per se."

25. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on stress management and other wellness issues

CVR = 0.75

26. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on career exploration and career acquisition skills

CVR = -0.25

"In collaboration with the career counseling office"

"career assessments and counseling related to that, yes. Career aquisition skills would be more the expertise of the career center and would be referred there."

"Again, if this is within the center's scope. We do not do this on our campus because there are career counselors."

27. Coordinate special events and programs for your institution around academic, career, or personal/social issues (e.g., career day, drug awareness week, test prep)

CVR = 0.25

"yes to coordinate alcohol awareness events, sexual assault prevention, etc. No to coordinating events for test prep & career day. Those events are handled by testing center and career center respectively."

"If it is within the center's scope of practice."

28. Coordinate orientation process / activities for students

CVR = -0.50

"I would not use the word coordinate. I would say collaborate or participate in the orientation process for students."

"This is a tough one. Students are already so overwhelmed and inundated with information during orientation. Hard to know what counseling services can do to stand out or provide support. Then again, too many students say they don't know about counseling services even when given information. It's definitely an on-going process to remind students counseling is here."

"Some of the counseling offices may participate but not coordinate."

"we might be asked to speak very briefly during orientation about our services, or have an info table there; but the counseling center would not coordinate orientation. That's something Advising and enrollment management coordinates."

29. Consult with faculty concerning student behavior

CVR = 0.75

"Direction matters. faculty/staff can consult with counseling center staff about concerns they may have about a student. Us consulting with faculty is much more of a BIT/TAT team function rather than counseling center specific function."

30. Consult with community agencies and other institution departments concerning individual students

CVR = 0.50

"this item sounds like more of a BIT/TAT team function the way it is worded. counseling center staff do need to be knowledgeable about community agencies and other institutional depts though so that we can refer students to them as appropriate."

"With student's permission."

31. Consult with parents regarding developmental issues

CVR = 0.00

"this is very case specific and typically the answer will be 'not without consent' but it is worth asking how often this is actually happening."

"It depends and needs student's written consent."

"FERPA doesn't allow unless specific written permission is in place."

"Again, I am thinking about direction (who initiates the consult). Parents can contact counseling center for a (generic) consult at any time. We would maintain confidentiality of the student unless we had their consent to speak with parents. Counseling center contacting parents would most likely occur in situations re: safety to self or others (suicidal/homicidal intent). Anything else would need to happen with student's consent. "

"With release"

32. Provide consultation for administrators (regarding institution policy, programs, staff and/or students)

CVR = 1.00

"With release, or in cases of harm to self or others."

33. Participate in behavioral intervention team (BIT)/threat assessment team (TAT) meetings

CVR = 1.00

"as a consultant only."

34. Inform faculty, staff, and administrators about the role, training, program, and interventions of a college counselor within the context of your institution

CVR = 0.75

35. Conduct or coordinate training programs for faculty and staff regarding addressing student mental health needs in the college environment

CVR = 0.75

36. Coordinate referrals for students and/or families to community or education professionals (e.g., mental health, speech pathology, medical assessment)

CVR = 0.5

"'Make referrals' rather than coordinate for some counseling departments."

37. Coordinate referrals for students to other departments and services provided by the institution

CVR = 1.00

38. Conduct needs assessments and counseling program evaluations

CVR = 1.00

39. Formally evaluate student progress as a result of participation in individual/group counseling

CVR = 1.00

"we use criterions measurement tool, yes. Not sure if "formally evaluate" means something else."

40. Coordinate and maintain a comprehensive program evaluation system

CVR = 0.50

"I'd see this as a director function rather than college counselor function."

41. Keep track of how time is being spent on the functions that you perform

CVR = 1.00

42. Coordinate with an advisory team to analyze and respond to counseling center needs

CVR = 0.50

43. Attend professional development activities (e.g., state conferences, local in-services)

CVR = 1.00

44. Conduct professional development activities (e.g., present at a conference, provide in-service training)

CVR = 1.00

45. Recruit graduate interns, post-doc professionals, and paraprofessional staff

CVR = 0.25

"more of a director/training director function rather than college counselor function"

46. Train graduate interns, post-doc professionals, and paraprofessional staff

CVR = 0.75

"depends on the center (staff size, etc), but this can be more of a director/training director role rather than college counselor role"

47. Supervise graduate interns, post-doc professionals, and paraprofessional staff

CVR = 0.75

"depends on the center (staff size, etc), but this can be more of a director/training director role rather than college counselor role"

48. Create departmental budgets, annual reports, and strategic plans

CVR = 0.00

"May be at a higher level and then only feedback is provided."

"usually a director role rather than college counselor role"

"This is the role of the Counseling Center director."

49. Evaluate counseling center professionals and paraprofessionals

CVR = 0.50

"usually a director role rather than college counselor role"

"Again, a role for leadership, not for counselors."

50. Develop and/or revise departmental policies and procedures

CVR = 0.50

"usually a director role rather than college counselor role"

"This is the director's role, although counselors may be asked for feedback."

51. Participate on committees and task forces outside of the counseling center

CVR = 0.75

52. Organize service learning activities

CVR = -1.00

53. Connect with students as part of the institution's retention efforts

CVR = 0.25

"May not be part of overall retention plan because of confidentiality."

"Not sure about the wording of this one. The work a college counseling center does with students is in itself a retention function. Do you mean something else specifically?"

54. Teach classes at your institution (as part of your counselor job description)

CVR = -0.50

"universities where counseling center staff are considered faculty/tenure track positions, this is probably more likely. Universities where counseling staff are considered staff, teaching a class usually wouldn't be in the job description. But you might decided to teach a class, separate from your counseling center job."

"While some of my staff teach it is in addition to their job responsibilities."

55. Evaluate documentation to approve disability services for students

CVR = -0.25

"College counselors in a counseling center would provide documentation for the disability office, but it would be the disability office that would evaluate the documentation and approve disability services for students."

"With clear boundaries in place."

56. Oversee the provision of disability services on campus

CVR = -0.75

"a college counselor could do this, but providing documentation for disability services, and evaluating that documentation to determine accomodations are two different functions."

"We do this in our counseling center, but we have to be careful about how we interact with students about this, and keep the DS and counseling functions separate."

57. Coordinate the testing center

CVR = -0.75

"Concerns about confidentiality here and multiple hats. Not sure if this would be allowed if your job was counselor specific."

"I'm thinking of testing center in the traditional sense... as in testing for GRE, PRAXIS, ACT, etc. Technically a college counselor would probably meet education requirements to do this job, though it would not really be in line with their training as a mental health professional."

58. Advise and schedule students for classes

CVR = -0.75

"this is an advising function. advising is seperate from college mental health counseling."

59. Enroll students in and/or withdraw students from institution

CVR = -1.00

"Again could conflict with counseling duties."
"these are enrollment management, registrars office functions."

60. Adjudicate discipline of students

CVR = -1.00

"Counselors may participate on BIT, but probably would not carry out sanctions. Goes against ethical standards."

"this is a dean of students/student code of conduct officer function"

61. Create and monitor behavioral plans for students with behavioral problems (e.g. students with autism spectrum disorders)

CVR = -0.50

"Disability specific counselor?"

"If the student was coming to counseling to work on certain behaviors, then we might create a treatment plan that included appropriate goals/tasks related to that."

62. Chair the Behavioral Intervention Team/Threat Assessment Team

CVR = -0.50

"This is definitely happening on some campuses."

"To my knowledge it is generally considered inappropriate for counseling center staff to chair the BIT/TAT team. Though on some campuses, based on the staff that exist, there may be some instances where that makes the most sense."

63. Please estimate the percentage of time you spend in each of the given areas over the course of an academic year. Values must equal 100%

Individual and Group Activities

Crisis Intervention and Emergency Services Activities

Outreach Activities

Consultation Activities

Referral Activities

Research Activities

Program Evaluation Activities

Professional Development Activities

Training Activities

Other Activities

CVR = 1.00

"Do you want information on campus involvement? If so would you want "committees" as part of the question?"

"centers who have electronic systems such as Titanium are able to do this pretty easily by running reports every year/semester."

Overall feedback

"Are you looking for percentage of time spent in each activity or just the Likert scale that can be quantified."

"The instrument looks strong, but will be answered differently depending on the size of campus and counseling department."

"some of the items are not functions of college mental health counselors. Unfortunately I imagine that there are quite a bit of Community College counselors who do multiple functions (career center functions, advising functions, etc) in addition to their mental health counselor functions. I believe it is important to separate these functions for clarity of role, and also because the different functions have different regulations governing those records/practices (e.g. advising records are governed by FERPA whereas mental health counseling records are ultimately governed by state licensure laws and mental health laws)."

Appendix C - Decisions about revising the CCARS

Question	CVR ≥ .75	Decision to edit?	Rationale
1	Yes	Change "psychopathological" to "psychological"	Feedback from EP
5	No	Retain the question as is	Sharkin, pp. 22-24
6	No	Retain the question as is	Sharkin, pp. 26-27
8	No	Retain the question as is	Sharkin, pp. 21-22
10	No	Retain the question as is	Sharkin, pp. 24-26
14	No	Retain the question as is	Feedback from EP
19	No	Retain the question as is	Sharkin, pp. 26-27
21	No	Remove	Covered by Question 20
23	No	Remove	Covered by Question 20
26	No	Combine with question 19	Feedback from EP
27	No	Remove "test prep"	Feedback from EP
28	No	Change "Coordinate" to "Participate"	Feedback from EP
30	No	Add "with student's written consent"	Feedback from EP
31	No	Add "with student's written consent"	Feedback from EP
36	No	Change "Coordinate" to "Provide"	Feedback from EP
40	No	Remove	Covered by Question 38
42	No	Remove	Feedback from EP
45	No	Retain the question as is	IACS II.I.1.; Sharkin, pp. 45-48
48	No	Retain the question as is	Sharkin, pp. 48-49
49	No	Retain the question as is	Sharkin, pp. 48-49
50	No	Retain the question as is	Sharkin, pp. 48-49
52	No	Remove	Feedback from EP
53	No	Change to "Measure and report to administration the impact of counseling on the institution's retention efforts" and move to program evaluation section	Sharkin, pp. 56
54	No	Retain the question as is	Sharkin, pp. 68-69
55	No	Retain the question as is	Sharkin, pp. 52
56	No	Retain the question as is	Sharkin, pp. 52
57	No	Retain the question as is	Sharkin, pp. 52
58	No	Retain the question as is	Sharkin, pp. 51-52
59	No	Remove	Feedback from EP
60	No	Change to "Provide mandatory counseling as a part of disciplinary processes" and move to counseling section	Feedback from EP
61	No	Retain the question as is	Sharkin, pp. 54-55
62	No	Retain the question as is and move to consultation section	Feedback from EP

Appendix D - Revised College Counselor Activity Rating Scale

For each of the activities listed, please indicate how frequently you perform the activity.

Rating scale: 1 = I never or almost never do this
2 = I very infrequently do this
3 = I quite infrequently do this
4 = I sometimes do this
5 = I quite frequently do this
6 = I very frequently do this
7 = I always or almost always do this

L. Individual and Group Counseling Activities

1. Provide individual counseling regarding psychological and developmental concerns
2. Provide individual counseling regarding maladaptive behavior at the institution (e.g. drug and alcohol use, anger episodes, violating institutional policies)
3. Provide individual counseling regarding relationships (e.g., family, friends, romantic, roommate)
4. Provide individual counseling regarding academic issues
5. Provide individual counseling regarding substance abuse issues
6. Provide individual career counseling
7. Provide couples counseling including at least one student
8. Provide family counseling including student as client of record
9. Provide small group counseling addressing relationship/social skills
10. Provide small group counseling for academic issues
11. Conduct small groups regarding family/personal issues (e.g., divorce, death)
12. Conduct small group counseling for students regarding substance abuse issues (own use or family/friend use)
13. Provide mandatory counseling as a part of disciplinary processes

14. Administer psychological testing or diagnostic assessments
15. Follow-up on individual and group counseling participants

M. Crisis Intervention and Emergency Services Activities

1. Provide individual counseling regarding crisis/emergency issues
2. Coordinate institution-wide response for crisis management and postvention
3. Refer students for voluntary or involuntary hospitalization
4. Coordinate student's return to campus after inpatient treatment off-campus

N. Outreach Activities

1. Conduct psychoeducation sessions addressing career development, career acquisition skills, and the world of work
2. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on various personal and/or social traits (e.g., responsibility, respect, etc.)
3. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on personal growth and development issues
4. Conduct psychoeducation sessions regarding substance abuse
5. Conduct psychoeducation sessions on stress management and other wellness issues
6. Coordinate special events and programs for your institution around academic, career, or personal/social issues (e.g., mental health awareness month, career day, drug awareness week, etc)
7. Participate in orientation process / activities for students

O. Consultation Activities

1. Consult with faculty concerning student behavior

2. Consult with community agencies and other institution departments concerning individual students with the student's written consent
3. Consult with parents regarding developmental issues with the student's written consent
4. Provide consultation for administrators (regarding institution policy, programs, staff and/or students)
5. Participate in behavioral intervention team (BIT)/threat assessment team (TAT) meetings
6. Chair the Behavioral Intervention Team/Threat Assessment Team
7. Inform faculty, staff, and administrators about the role, training, program, and interventions of a college counselor within the context of your institution
8. Conduct or coordinate training programs for faculty and staff regarding addressing student mental health needs in the college environment

P. Referral Activities

1. Provide referrals for students and/or families to community or education professionals (e.g., mental health, speech pathology, medical assessment)
2. Coordinate referrals for students to other departments and services provided by the institution

Q. Research Activities

1. Formally evaluate student progress as a result of participation in individual/group counseling
2. Conduct scholarly research to be published or presented.

R. Program Evaluation Activities

1. Coordinate needs assessments and/or a comprehensive counseling program evaluation system

2. Keep track of how time is being spent on the functions that you perform

S. Professional Development Activities

1. Attend professional development activities (e.g., state conferences, local in-services)
2. Conduct professional development activities (e.g., present at a conference, provide in-service training)

T. Training Activities

1. Recruit graduate interns, post-doc professionals, and paraprofessional staff
2. Train graduate interns, post-doc professionals, and paraprofessional staff
3. Supervise graduate interns, post-doc professionals, and paraprofessional staff

U. Other Activities

1. Create departmental budgets, annual reports, and strategic plans
2. Evaluate counseling center professionals and paraprofessionals
3. Develop and/or revise departmental policies and procedures
4. Participate on committees and task forces outside of the counseling center
5. Measure and report to administration the impact of counseling on the institution's retention efforts
6. Teach classes at your institution (as part of your counselor job description)
7. Evaluate documentation to approve disability services for students
8. Oversee the provision of disability services on campus
9. Create and monitor behavioral plans for students with behavioral problems (e.g. students with autism spectrum disorders)
10. Coordinate the testing center
11. Advise and schedule students for classes

V. Time Spent on Activities

1. Please estimate the percentage of time you spend in each of the given areas over the course of an academic year. Values must equal 100%

Appendix E - Shirom – Melamed Burnout Measure

How Do You Feel at Work?

Below are a number of statements that describe different feelings that you may feel at work. Please indicate how often, in the past 30 workdays, you have felt each of the following feelings:

How often have you felt this way at work?

		Never or almost never	Very infrequently	Quite infrequently	Sometimes	Quite frequently	Very frequently	Always or almost always
P	1. I feel tired	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P	2. I have no energy for going to work in the morning	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P	3. I feel physically drained	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P	4. I feel fed up	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P	5. I feel like my "batteries" are "dead"	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P	6. I feel burned out	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C	7. My thinking process is slow	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C	8. I have difficulty concentrating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C	9. I feel I'm not thinking clearly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C	10. I feel I'm not focused in my thinking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
C	11. I have difficulty	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	thinking about complex things							
E	12. I feel I am unable to be sensitive to the needs of coworkers and customers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E	13. I feel I am not capable of investing emotionally in coworkers and customers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
E	14. I feel I am not capable of being sympathetic to co-workers and customers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Note. The letters before each item represent the three subscales of the Shirom-Melamed Burnout Measure (SMBM). The three subscales are: P = physical fatigue; E= emotional exhaustion; and C= cognitive weariness.

Ver 2. july 2005

Appendix F - The Work and Meaning Inventory

The Work and Meaning Inventory. Work can mean a lot of different things to different people. The following items ask about how you see the role of work in your own life. Please honestly indicate how true each statement is for you and your work.

	Absolutely Untrue	Mostly Untrue	Neither True nor Untrue	Mostly True	Absolutely True
1. I have found a meaningful career.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I view my work as contributing to my personal growth.	1	2	3	4	5
3. My work really makes no difference to the world.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I understand how my work contributes to my life's meaning.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I have a good sense of what makes my job meaningful.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I know my work makes a positive difference in the world.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My work helps me better understand myself.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I have discovered work that has a satisfying purpose.	1	2	3	4	5
9. My work helps me make sense of the world around me.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The work I do serves a greater purpose.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix G - The Perceived Workload Scale

For questions 1 and 2 (1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Slightly disagree; 4 = Neutral; 5 = Slightly agree; 6 = Agree; 7 = Strongly agree)

1. I feel that the number of requests, problems, or complaints I deal with is more than expected.
2. I feel that the amount of work I do interferes with how well it is done.

For questions 3 and 4 (1 = Daily; 2 = Almost every day; 3 = About once a week; 4 = Two or three times a month; 5 = About once a month; 6 = A few times a year; 7 = Once a year or less) (Reverse scored)

3. I feel busy or rushed.
4. I feel pressured.

Appendix H - Demographic Questionnaire

What is the total enrollment of the campus(es) at which you provide services?

What is your current caseload?

What is the main classification of your institution?

- Two-year technical school/ community college
- Four-year college/university
- Professional school (Medical school, law school, etc.)

What is your current employment status?

- Full-time
- Part-time
- Contract

How many years have you worked as a mental health professional?

How many years have you worked in higher education?

How many years have you worked at your current institution?

What is your identified gender?

- Male
- Female
- Other
- Rather not say

What is your identified ethnicity? Please choose all that apply.

- Asian American
- Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American
- East Asian American

- Latino/a or Hispanic American
- Middle Eastern or Arab American
- Native American or Alaskan Native
- Non-Hispanic White or Euro-American
- Pacific Islander or Hawaiian Native
- South Asian American
- Other
- Rather not say

Under which license do you practice? If more than one, please choose the one with which you must closely identify.

- Independent Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC, LCPC, LPCC, LCMHC, etc.)
- Licensed Chemical Dependency Counselor (LCDC, LCDP, LADAC, etc.)
- Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW, LICSW, LCSW-C, etc.)
- Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist (LMFT, LIMFT, etc.)
- Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist Intern
- Licensed Master Social Worker (LMSW, etc.)
- Licensed Professional Counselor Intern (LPC-I, LAC, LPC)
- Licensed Psychologist (LP, LCP, etc.)
- Licensed Psychological Associate (LPA)
- Post Doc Therapist
- Other

Appendix I - Permissions

The SMBM is a free instrument to use for educational purposes. The following permissions was obtained from Dr. Shirom's web page,

http://www.shirom.org/arie/publications/BurnoutAndVigorScales/notice%20for%20users.doc.

Notice to Potential Users

SMBM and SMVM Sharing of Results

You are welcomed to use the SMBM and the SMVM provided that you agree to the following two conditions:

1. The use is for noncommercial educational or research purposes only. This means no one is charging anyone a fee.
2. You agree to share some of your results, detailed below, with the authors. We will use these results only for the purpose of updating the norms and bibliography.

Results that we would like to kindly request that you send us include:

1. We would like to receive, for each of your samples, the mean score, SD, and coefficient alpha of each subscale and the total score of the measure(s) that you have used.

2. For each sample, a brief description of sample size, occupation(s) covered, language and country wherein the measures were administered.

Simply send an email including these details: smelamed@post.tau.ac.il
Please also email: galitarmon@psy.haifa.ac.il; tokersha@post.tau.ac.il

Professor Samuel Melamed
Sackler Faculty of Medicine
Tel Aviv University
P.O.B. 39040
Tel Aviv 69978 Israel

The WAMI includes a statement of educational use as a part of the instrument. Please see Appendix F for this statement.

Appendix J - Email correspondence

Expert Panel Invitation

Dear ${e://Field/Title} ${m://LastName},

As a part of my dissertation research, I am working on the development of an instrument measuring the work responsibilities of college counselors. Since you are a member of the Executive Council of the American College Counseling Association, I am asking you to serve as a part of the expert panel to review the instrument.

The expert panel will be asked to read each statement and determine whether it is appropriate, inappropriate, or neither appropriate or inappropriate for the proposed instrument. In the context of this instrument, you will determine whether each statement is a work responsibility asked of college counselors and should be included on the instrument. To clarify, you are not being asked whether you think it is appropriate or inappropriate for college counselors to perform the work responsibility, only whether it is a work responsibility that may be assigned to college counselors.

There will be a space for you to provide feedback about the use or wording of each statement. In addition, there will be a space at the end of the instrument to provide any additional feedback about the instrument in general or any areas that were missed. It is estimated that this process will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. If you are unable to participate, please let me know so that I can fill your spot on the expert panel. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter.
Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}
Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Sincerely,

Gregory Bohner, MA, LPC-MHSP
Doctoral Candidate
Kansas State University
bohnerg@ksu.edu

Under the research supervision of:
Dr. Judy Hughey, NCC
Associate Professor
Kansas State University
jhughey@ksu.edu

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

Expert Panel Reminder

Dear ${e://Field/Title} ${m://LastName},

Just a quick reminder that you still have time to participate on the expert panel to review the College Counselor Activity Rating Scale. I am hoping to get the last few responses in this week so I can move to phase two of the research model. Your participation is voluntary; so please let me know if you are unable to participate and I will find a replacement for you on the panel. Thank you in advance for your participation.
Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}
Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Sincerely,

Gregory Bohner, MA, LPC-MHSP
Doctoral Candidate
Kansas State University
bohnerg@ksu.edu

Under the research supervision of:
Dr. Judy Hughey, NCC
Associate Professor
Kansas State University
jhughey@ksu.edu

Pilot Study Invitation #1

Dear ${e://Field/Title} ${m://LastName},

As a part of my dissertation research, I am working on the development of an instrument measuring the work responsibilities of college counselors. There is currently no instrument that measures the work specifically completed by college counselors. So, your participation will help provide our profession a needed research tool.

At this stage of the research, I am seeking 20-25 college counselors to complete a quick survey so we can test the statistical validity and reliability of the new instrument. Since I live and work in western Tennessee, I am targeting college counselors in this area for the pilot study. As a way of saying "Thank you", each person who participates will receive a $10 Amazon gift card. Please note, you must use a valid institutional email address to qualify (i.e. ends in .edu).

The survey is estimated to take 10 minutes to complete and will ask questions regarding the work you complete as part of your duties as a college counselor. Please answer about the activities you actually complete and not what you would prefer to do or is done by others at your institution.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter.

Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Sincerely,

Gregory Bohner, MA, LPC-MHSP
Doctoral Candidate
Kansas State University
bohnerg@ksu.edu

Under the research supervision of:

Dr. Judy Hughey, NCC
Associate Professor
Kansas State University
jhughey@ksu.edu

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

Pilot Study #1 Reminder

Dear ${e://Field/Title} ${m://LastName},

There is still time to participate in the pilot study to develop a new college counseling instrument. We have about 1/2 the responses we need, so please consider filling out the survey today. As a reminder, each participant will receive a $10 Amazon gift card. Please note, you must use a valid institutional email address to qualify (i.e. ends in .edu). Next week, we will have to broaden our search for participants. So don't miss out on your opportunity to contribute.

The survey is estimated to take 10 minutes to complete and will ask questions regarding the work you complete as part of your duties as a college counselor. Please answer about the activities you actually complete and not what you would prefer to do or is done by others at your institution.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter.

Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Sincerely,

Gregory Bohner, MA, LPC-MHSP
Doctoral Candidate
Kansas State University
bohnerg@ksu.edu

Under the research supervision of:

Dr. Judy Hughey, NCC
Associate Professor
Kansas State University
jhughey@ksu.edu

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

Pilot Study #2 Invitation

Dear ${e://Field/Title} ${m://LastName},

As a part of my dissertation research, I am working on the development of an instrument measuring the work responsibilities of college counselors. There is currently no instrument that measures the work specifically completed by college counselors. So, your participation will help provide our profession a needed research tool.

At this stage of the research, I am seeking 20-25 college counselors to complete a quick survey so we can test the statistical validity and reliability of the new instrument. Since I used to study and work at UMHB, I am targeting you for inclusion in this pilot study. As a way of saying "Thank you", each person who participates will receive a $10 Amazon gift card. Please note, you must use a valid institutional email address to qualify (i.e. ends in .edu).

The survey is estimated to take 10 minutes to complete and will ask questions regarding the work you complete as part of your duties as a college counselor. Please answer about the activities you actually complete and not what you would prefer to do or is done by others at your institution.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter.

Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Sincerely,

Gregory Bohner, MA, LPC-MHSP
Doctoral Candidate
Kansas State University
bohnerg@ksu.edu

Under the research supervision of:

Dr. Judy Hughey, NCC
Associate Professor
Kansas State University
jhughey@ksu.edu

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

Pilot Study #3 Invitation

Dear ${e://Field/Title} ${m://LastName},

As a part of my dissertation research, I am working on the development of an instrument measuring the work responsibilities of college counselors. There is currently no instrument that measures the work specifically completed by college counselors. So, your participation will help provide our profession a needed research tool.

At this stage of the research, I am seeking 20-25 college counselors to complete a quick survey so we can test the statistical validity and reliability of the new instrument. Since I live and work in Tennessee, I am targeting college counselors in this state for the pilot study. As a way of saying "Thank you", each person who participates will receive a $10 Amazon gift card. Please note, you must use a valid institutional email address to qualify (i.e. ends in .edu).

The survey is estimated to take 10 minutes to complete and will ask questions regarding the work you complete as part of your duties as a college counselor. Please answer about the activities you actually complete and not what you would prefer to do or is done by others at your institution.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter.

Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Sincerely,

Gregory Bohner, MA, LPC-MHSP
Doctoral Candidate
Kansas State University
bohnerg@ksu.edu

Under the research supervision of:

Dr. Judy Hughey, NCC
Associate Professor
Kansas State University
jhughey@ksu.edu

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

Pilot Study #3 Reminder

Dear ${e://Field/Title} ${m://LastName},

There is still time to participate in the pilot study to develop a new college counseling instrument. We only need about five more responses, so please consider filling out the survey today. As a reminder, each participant will receive a $10 Amazon gift card. Please note, you must use a valid institutional email address to qualify (i.e. ends in .edu). Next week, we will have to broaden our search for participants. So don't miss out on your opportunity to contribute.

The survey is estimated to take 10 minutes to complete and will ask questions regarding the work you complete as part of your duties as a college counselor. Please answer about the activities you actually complete and not what you would prefer to do or is done by others at your institution.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter.

Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Sincerely,

Gregory Bohner, MA, LPC-MHSP
Doctoral Candidate
Kansas State University
bohnerg@ksu.edu

Under the research supervision of:

Dr. Judy Hughey, NCC
Associate Professor
Kansas State University
jhughey@ksu.edu

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

Pilot Study #4 Invitation

Dear ${e://Field/Title} ${m://LastName},

As a part of my dissertation research, I am working on the development of an instrument measuring the work responsibilities of college counselors. There is currently no instrument that measures the work specifically completed by college counselors. So, your participation will help provide our profession a needed research tool.

At this stage of the research, I am seeking 20-25 college counselors to complete a quick survey so we can test the statistical validity and reliability of the new instrument. Since I live and work in Tennessee, I am targeting college counselors in this state for the pilot study. As a way of saying "Thank you", each person who participates will receive a $10 Amazon gift card. Please note, you must use a valid institutional email address to qualify (i.e. ends in .edu).

The survey is estimated to take 10 minutes to complete and will ask questions regarding the work you complete as part of your duties as a college counselor. Please answer about the activities you actually complete and not what you would prefer to do or is done by others at your institution.

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Thank you in advance for your assistance in this matter.

Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Sincerely,

Gregory Bohner, MA, LPC-MHSP
Doctoral Candidate
Kansas State University
bohnerg@ksu.edu

Under the research supervision of:

Dr. Judy Hughey, NCC
Associate Professor
Kansas State University
jhughey@ksu.edu

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

Final Project Invitation

Hello ${m://FirstName}${m://LastName},

I am currently working on research regarding work responsibilities and burnout in college counselors to fulfill the requirements for my dissertation. You have been randomly selected from the membership of the American College Counseling Association to participate in this study. The recruitment will not be through any listservs or email chains. We are only using those randomly selected. So your voice is important as a part of this research.

The purpose of this research is to better inform college counselors about the relationship between the work we perform and its relationship to burnout. Would you please consider taking time to fill out an online survey? It has been estimated that the survey will take 20-30 minutes to complete. In addition, for every 50 participants who complete the survey, a winner will be randomly chosen to receive their choice of a book related to college counseling.

Follow this link to the Survey:

${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Email reminders will be sent every few days to those who have not yet had an opportunity to complete the survey. This study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, there is in an Opt Out link at the bottom of this email. The survey will remain open through May 4th, 2018. Again, I thank you in advance for your participation and I look forward to sharing this important research with the college counseling community in the near future.

Sincerely,

Gregory Bohner, MA, LPC-MHSP
Doctoral Candidate
Kansas State University

Judith Hughey, PhD
Dissertation Chair
Kansas State University

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

Final Project Reminder #1

Dear ${m://FirstName} ${m://LastName}:

It has been a week since the survey about college counseling work responsibilities and burnout opened and there have been many responses to the survey. However, we have only received 15% of the responses needed for the data to be generalizable to the population. And we aren't blasting the research request to listservs and convenience samples. You have been specifically targeted for this study. So, it is important that your voice is heard!

Would you please consider taking a few moments to complete the survey by following the link provided? On average, participants have finished the survey in 15 minutes. And don't forget that we will be giving away a college counseling book of your choice for every 50 participants in the study.

Follow this link to the Survey:

${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Again, we thank you for your time and look forward to receiving your response soon.

Sincerely,

Gregory Bohner, MA, LPC-MHSP
Doctoral Candidate
Kansas State University

Judith Hughey, PhD
Dissertation Chair
Kansas State University

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

Final Project Reminder #2

Dear ${m://FirstName} ${m://LastName}:

We are two weeks into our data collection window for the survey measuring college counseling work responsibilities and burnout. While we have received a good number of responses so far, we are still quite a ways from being able to generalize our results. That is where you come in. You have been specifically selected for this survey; we aren't blasting the research request to listservs and convenience samples. So, please consider taking a few moments to complete the survey by following the link provided? On average, participants have finished the survey in 15 minutes. And don't forget that we will be giving away a college counseling book of your choice for every 50 participants in the study.

Follow this link to the Survey:

${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Again, we thank you for your time and look forward to receiving your response soon.

Sincerely,

Gregory Bohner, MA, LPC-MHSP
Doctoral Candidate
Kansas State University

Judith Hughey, PhD
Dissertation Chair
Kansas State University

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

Final Project Reminder #3

Dear ${m://FirstName} ${m://LastName}:

We are at the final week of data collection for the survey measuring college counseling work responsibilities and burnout. We have received a great response so far, but we still need about 20 responses to meet our statistical goals. That is where you come in. You have been specifically selected for this survey; we aren't blasting the research request to listservs and convenience samples. So, please consider taking a few moments to complete the survey by following the link provided? On average, participants have finished the survey in 15 minutes. And don't forget that we will be giving away a college counseling book of your choice for every 50 participants in the study. You will receive one more reminder next Thursday before we close the survey on May 4th. Again, we thank you for your time and look forward to receiving your response soon.

Follow this link to the Survey:

${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Sincerely,

Gregory Bohner, MA, LPC-MHSP
Doctoral Candidate
Kansas State University

Judith Hughey, PhD
Dissertation Chair
Kansas State University

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

Final Project Reminder #4

Dear ${m://FirstName} ${m://LastName},

We have come to the end of the survey researching the relationship between burnout and college counselor work responsibilities. I had someone approach me at the ACA conference in Atlanta last week and say "I'm glad to see you are a real person sending those research requests." Yes, we are real people and this is really the last time we are asking you to complete the survey for us. Again, we specifically identified you to help us with this research. And we would like to have an additional 10 responses to round out our statistical needs. Would you consider taking about 15 minutes to complete the survey? It will close tomorrow night, so there is not much time left. But there is enough time left to complete the survey and be entered into the drawing for the college counseling book of your choice. Thank you in advance for completing the research.

Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Sincerely,

Gregory Bohner, MA, LPC-MHSP
Doctoral Candidate
Kansas State University

Judith Hughey, PhD
Dissertation Chair
Kansas State University

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

Appendix K - Demographic frequencies

Table K1
What is the total enrollment of the campus(es) at which you provide services?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	≤5000	65	60.7	60.7	60.7
	>5000	42	39.3	39.3	100.0
	Total	107	100.0	100.0	

Table K2
What is your current caseload?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	3	1	0.9	1.0	1.0
	5	2	1.9	2.0	3.1
	6	1	0.9	1.0	4.1
	10	2	1.9	2.0	6.1
	12	2	1.9	2.0	8.2
	14	1	0.9	1.0	9.2
	15	4	3.7	4.1	13.3
	20	10	9.3	10.2	23.5
	22	1	0.9	1.0	24.5
	23	3	2.8	3.1	27.6
	25	10	9.3	10.2	37.8
	26	1	0.9	1.0	38.8
	27	2	1.9	2.0	40.8
	28	4	3.7	4.1	44.9
	30	9	8.4	9.2	54.1
	35	4	3.7	4.1	58.2
	36	1	0.9	1.0	59.2
	40	1	0.9	1.0	60.2
	44	1	0.9	1.0	61.2
	45	1	0.9	1.0	62.2
	49	1	0.9	1.0	63.3
	50	6	5.6	6.1	69.4
	54	1	0.9	1.0	70.4
	55	1	0.9	1.0	71.4

	60	1	0.9	1.0	72.4
	65	1	0.9	1.0	73.5
	75	2	1.9	2.0	75.5
	78	1	0.9	1.0	76.5
	80	2	1.9	2.0	78.6
	100	3	2.8	3.1	81.6
	110	1	0.9	1.0	82.7
	130	1	0.9	1.0	83.7
	140	2	1.9	2.0	85.7
	150	2	1.9	2.0	87.8
	180	1	0.9	1.0	88.8
	200	2	1.9	2.0	90.8
	233	1	0.9	1.0	91.8
	300	1	0.9	1.0	92.9
	400	1	0.9	1.0	93.9
	450	1	0.9	1.0	94.9
	500	1	0.9	1.0	95.9
	700	1	0.9	1.0	96.9
	800	1	0.9	1.0	98.0
	1300	1	0.9	1.0	99.0
	2600	1	0.9	1.0	100.0
	Total	98	91.6	100.0	
Missing	9999	9	8.4		
Total		107	100.0		

Table K3
What is the main classification of your institution?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Two year technical/ community college	36	33.6	33.6	33.6
	Four year college/ university	65	60.7	60.7	94.4
	Professional school (e.g. medical, law)	6	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	107	100.0	100.0	

Table K4
What is your current employment status?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Full time	103	96.3	96.3	96.3
	Part time	2	1.9	1.9	98.1
	Contract	2	1.9	1.9	100.0
	Total	107	100.0	100.0	

Table K5
How many years have you worked as a mental health professional?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	3	2.8	2.9	2.9
	2	1	0.9	1.0	3.8
	3	2	1.9	1.9	5.7
	4	1	0.9	1.0	6.7
	4	4	3.7	3.8	10.5
	5	8	7.5	7.6	18.1
	6	5	4.7	4.8	22.9
	7	3	2.8	2.9	25.7
	8	2	1.9	1.9	27.6
	10	6	5.6	5.7	33.3
	11	7	6.5	6.7	40.0
	12	8	7.5	7.6	47.6
	13	1	0.9	1.0	48.6
	14	2	1.9	1.9	50.5
	15	3	2.8	2.9	53.3
	16	2	1.9	1.9	55.2
	17	2	1.9	1.9	57.1
	18	5	4.7	4.8	61.9
	19	3	2.8	2.9	64.8
	20	9	8.4	8.6	73.3
	21	1	0.9	1.0	74.3
	22	4	3.7	3.8	78.1
	23	1	0.9	1.0	79.0
	24	1	0.9	1.0	80.0
	25	2	1.9	1.9	81.9

	26	1	0.9	1.0	82.9
	27	5	4.7	4.8	87.6
	29	1	0.9	1.0	88.6
	30	3	2.8	2.9	91.4
	33	2	1.9	1.9	93.3
	35	2	1.9	1.9	95.2
	37	2	1.9	1.9	97.1
	38	1	0.9	1.0	98.1
	39	1	0.9	1.0	99.0
	43	1	0.9	1.0	100.0
	Total	105	98.1	100.0	

Table K6

How many years have you worked in higher education?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	7	6.5	6.5	6.5
	2	8	7.5	7.5	14.0
	3	5	4.6	4.6	18.7
	4	3	2.8	2.8	21.5
	5	10	9.3	9.3	30.8
	6	5	4.7	4.7	35.5
	7	7	6.5	6.5	42.1
	8	3	2.8	2.8	44.9
	9	1	0.9	0.9	45.8
	10	3	2.8	2.8	48.6
	11	2	1.9	1.9	50.5
	12	5	4.7	4.7	55.1
	13	3	2.8	2.8	57.9
	14	3	2.8	2.8	60.7
	15	8	7.5	7.5	68.2
	16	1	0.9	0.9	69.2
	17	1	0.9	0.9	70.1
	18	5	4.7	4.7	74.8
	19	2	1.9	1.9	76.6
	20	3	2.8	2.8	79.4
	21	2	1.9	1.9	81.3

22	1	0.9	0.9	82.2
23	3	2.8	2.8	85.0
24	1	0.9	0.9	86.0
25	2	1.9	1.9	87.9
26	1	0.9	0.9	88.8
27	2	1.9	1.9	90.7
28	1	0.9	0.9	91.6
29	2	1.9	1.9	93.5
33	2	1.9	1.9	95.3
35	2	1.9	1.9	97.2
36	1	0.9	0.9	98.1
37	1	0.9	0.9	99.1
38	1	0.9	0.9	100.0
Total	107	100.0	100.0	

Table K7
How many years have you worked at your current institution?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	0.9	0.9	0.9
	1	12	11.2	11.2	12.1
	2	11	10.3	10.3	22.4
	3	4	3.8	3.8	24.3
	4	6	5.6	5.6	28.0
	5	7	6.5	6.5	38.3
	6	9	8.4	8.4	46.7
	7	3	2.8	2.8	49.5
	8	2	1.9	1.9	51.4
	10	2	1.9	1.9	53.3
	11	5	4.7	4.7	57.9
	12	3	2.8	2.8	60.7
	13	4	3.7	3.7	64.5
	14	3	2.8	2.8	67.3
	15	4	3.7	3.7	71.0
	16	1	0.9	0.9	72.0
	17	1	0.9	0.9	72.9

	18	6	5.6	5.6	78.5
	19	2	1.9	1.9	80.4
	20	1	0.9	0.9	81.3
	21	1	0.9	0.9	82.2
	22	5	4.7	4.7	86.9
	23	3	2.8	2.8	89.7
	24	1	0.9	0.9	90.7
	25	1	0.9	0.9	91.6
	27	1	0.9	0.9	92.5
	28	1	0.9	0.9	93.5
	29	2	1.9	1.9	95.3
	30	1	0.9	0.9	96.3
	33	1	0.9	0.9	97.2
	35	1	0.9	0.9	98.1
	37	1	0.9	0.9	99.1
	38	1	0.9	0.9	100.0
	Total	107	100.0	100.0	

Table K8
What is your identified gender?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	20	18.7	19.0	19.0
	Female	85	79.4	81.0	100.0
	Other/	0	0	0	100.0
	Rather Not Say	0	0	0	100.0
	Total	105	98.1	100.0	
Missing	999	2	1.9		
Total		107	100.0		

Table K9
What is your identified ethnicity?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African-American	6	5.6	5.6	5.6

East Asian American	1	0.9	0.9	6.5
Latino/a or Hispanic American	6	5.6	5.6	12.1
Non-Hispanic White or Euro-American	86	80.4	80.4	92.5
Pacific Islander or Hawaiian Native	1	0.9	0.9	93.5
South Asian American	1	0.9	0.9	94.4
Other	4	3.7	3.7	98.1
Rather Not Say	2	1.9	1.9	100.0
Total	107	100.0	100.0	

Table K10

Under which license do you practice? If more than one, please choose the one with which you must closely identify.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Independent Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC, LCPC, LPCC, LCMHC, etc.)	52	48.6	48.6	48.6
	Licensed Chemical Dependency Counselor (LCDC, LCDP, LADAC, etc.)	2	1.9	1.9	50.5
	Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW, LICSW, LCSW-C, etc.)	6	5.6	5.6	56.1
	Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist (LMFT, LIMFT, etc.)	6	5.6	5.6	61.7
	Licensed Master Social Worker (LMSW, etc.)	2	1.9	1.9	63.6

Licensed Professional Counselor Intern (LPC-I, LAC, LPC)	7	6.5	6.5	70.1
Licensed Psychologist (LP, LCP, etc.)	8	7.5	7.5	77.6
Licensed Psychological Associate (LPA)	1	0.9	0.9	78.5
Other	14	13.1	13.1	91.6
None	9	8.4	8.4	100.0
Total	107	100.0	100.0	

Appendix L - Informed consent

Kansas State University
Informed Consent

PROJECT TITLE: The relationship between college counselor work responsibilities and burnout

APPROVAL DATE OF PROJECT: January 4th, 2018
EXPIRATION DATE OF PROJECT: January 4th, 2019

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dr. Judy Hughey, Associate Professor, Kansas State University

CO-INVESTIGATOR(S): Gregory L. Bohner, MA

CONTACT NAME AND PHONE FOR ANY PROBLEMS/QUESTIONS: Dr. Judy Hughey, 785-532-5527, jhughey@ksu.edu; Gregory Bohner, 254-654-3245, bohnerg@ksu.edu

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH: This survey will utilize several instruments to measure work responsibilities, meaningfulness of work, perceived work load, burnout, and the relationships between these variables within the college counselor population.

PROCEDURES OR METHODS TO BE USED: The study will be conducted through this online survey. Participants are asked to answer each question as accurately and honestly as possible.

LENGTH OF STUDY: The survey is estimated to take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete.

RISKS OR DISCOMFORTS ANTICIPATED: No risks or discomforts are anticipated.

BENEFITS ANTICIPATED: This research will help college counselors better understand the relationship between work responsibilities and burnout.

EXTENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY: This survey is confidential. Email addresses are maintained in order to send participation invitations and reminders but will be disconnected from responses once the data collection deadline has passed. All data will be collected and stored on the Kansas State University Qualtrics servers and on encrypted data drives after data collection has ended.

TERMS OF PARTICIPATION: I understand this project is research, and that my participation is completely voluntary. I also understand that if I decide to participate in this study, I may withdraw my consent at any time, and stop participating at any time without explanation, penalty, or loss of benefits, or academic standing to which I may otherwise be entitled.

I verify by proceeding with this survey that I have read and understand this consent form, and willingly agree to participate in this study under the terms described.

The study has been approved, IRB #9026, Kansas State University, Heath Ritter, Compliance Officer.