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Abstract

WORK-LIFE FACTORS THAT IMPACT JOB BURNOUT AND TURNOVER INTENTION AMONG ATHLETIC ACADEMIC SUPPORT PROFESSIONALS

By Jennifer L. Gellock

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2019

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Brendan Dwyer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, The Center for Sport Leadership

The purpose of the current study was to investigate factors in the work environment that impact job burnout among academic support professionals who work with college student-athletes. Specifically, the factors of job control match, fairness match, rewards match, and workload match were explored. Additionally, the extent to which emotional exhaustion and depersonalization had an effect on turnover intention was explored. Job burnout has been found to have negative impacts on professionals in human services professions. The sample consisted of academic advisors and learning specialists affiliated with National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I programs. Results suggest academic support professionals experience a high level of emotional exhaustion related to a mismatch in perceived job control, rewards, and workload. Additionally, higher levels of emotional exhaustion were found to significantly impact turnover intention. Practical solutions that address job mismatches are discussed along with theoretical implications for the person-environment fit framework applied in the context of the sport industry.
Chapter One: Introduction

Often referred to as a team’s “academic coach,” athletic academic support professionals play an instrumental role in the off-court and off-field successes of student-athletes. Their job is to provide support in three key areas: (a) academic guidance, (b) athletic eligibility, and (c) life skills development (Rubin, 2017). Hence, they are instrumental resources that help student-athletes navigate his or her dual roles on campus.

For these reasons, it is concerning that in a recent study, Rubin (2017) found 91% of student-athlete academic support professionals in college athletics reported they have noticed colleagues in the profession experience job burnout, while an additional 60% reported they have considered leaving the profession themselves. Though simple descriptive statistics, these findings are alarming due to the fact that most professionals who enter helping professions do so because of their passion to serve (Schaufeli, Leiter, & Maslach, 2009). However, what happens when the spark that first ignited this passion slowly begins to burn out?

Lisa Rubin and Maria Moreno-Pardo (2018) are two pioneers who have recently breached the topic of job burnout among athletic academic support professionals. In the authors’ study they interviewed student-athlete support services personnel about job burnout among their profession. One interview participant stated,

I came to a point where I didn’t know if I could do it anymore. I sometimes would come home and start crying. Sometimes I would break down in the middle of the day, and I didn’t even really know why. It would just be a sense of exhaustion, overwhelmed. Just pressure when you’re working with high-profile teams and high-profile sports (p. 11).
While outcomes of job burnout have been investigated among similar human services professions (Leiter & Maslach, 2003), college athletics provides a unique occupational lens to examine the phenomenon of job burnout. College athletic staff members experience a high workload due to athletic preparation and schedules. For example, academic support professionals often dedicate themselves to working long hours during the work week, often work weekends, and are always on call at the expense of student-athletes and coaches. Additionally, there is a round-the-clock work culture to “win” and provide student-athletes with a world-class athletic and academic experience. This culture often permeates throughout the whole athletic department (Macintosh & Burton, 2019). Therefore, professionals have a hard time creating work-life boundaries that result in negative health outcomes (Rubin & Moreno-Pardo, 2018).

To demonstrate this idea more in-depth, a second participant in Rubin and Moreno-Pardo’s (2018) study stated, “I saw a co-worker pass out in a meeting with the entire football staff and football team, and we had to call the ambulance because he just hadn’t [eaten] or slept in two days. It was the first week of fall” (p. 11). Physical exhaustion, emotional stress, depression, and anxiety due to work schedules was one theme that arose in Rubin and Moreno-Pardo’s study. The current study sought to further explore how workload directly impacts job burnout and the health and well-being of academic support professionals.

Lack of social recognition and compensation has also been found to impact job burnout (Leiter & Maslach, 2003). Efforts by academic support professionals can often go unnoticed. Individuals in these positions have demonstrated often feeling overlooked and undervalued for the amount of work dedicated to his or her jobs (Rubin & Moreno-Pardo, 2018). The lack of both tangible and intangible rewards for job performance has been found to impact job burnout (Leiter & Maslach, 2003). For instance, coaches often receive financial rewards or public recognition
for student-athletes’ on- and off-field successes, while academic support professionals do not. Another participant in Rubin and Moreno-Pardo’s study (2018) stated:

And then the coach that gets the $50,000 bonus because his APR is amazing at no point looks back at his advisor or learning specialist or whomever and says, ‘You know what, I would like to share this with you’, or, ‘Can I take you out to dinner,’ or ‘Can I get you a gift card’ or…We don’t get anything like that. All we get is a ‘thank you’ at the banquet, if we’re even invited (p. 14).

Not only do employees in these positions feel undervalued but have also reported feeling as if they are the first to blame for student-athletes’ lack of academic performance (Rubin, 2017).

At the NCAA Division I level, academic support professionals are bounded to advise student-athletes according to NCAA and institutional academic policies. In order to remain eligible on the field or court, student-athletes must maintain certain standards in the classroom (NCAA, 2017). Therefore, advisors and learning specialists have a lack of control over their advising efforts in comparison to academic support staff who advise non-student-athletes. Additionally, student-athletes may be advised in order to attend all practices and games, certain majors and coursework may be more flexible compared to others. For these reasons, academic support professionals may feel a lack of autonomy to do what is in the best interest for student-athletes academically.

Many NCAA Division I athletic programs have invested millions of dollars to build state of the art academic centers (Hoffer, Humphreys, Lacombe, & Ruseski, 2015). While these facilities are meant to develop student-athletes holistically, research is at odds with the direct benefits provided (Huml, Hancock, & Bergman, 2014; Rubin & Moses, 2017). Academic support professionals have direct access to working with student-athletes, which has been found
to develop a culture of isolation that can have negative impacts on not only student-athletes (Huml et al., 2014) but possibly those who work with them. Further, while resources at larger institutions and conferences can flourish, there is often a lack of resources at smaller institutions. This lack of resources can have negative repercussions that ultimately impact job burnout (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). Therefore, further investigation to pinpoint areas where additional resources are needed is warranted.

Rubin and Moreno-Pardo’s (2018) study is the tipping point for research on the topic of job burnout and turnover among academic support professionals in college athletics. Academic support professionals are crucial components of athletic departments and play an instrumental role in athletic teams’ academic success. However, the work culture and environment of college athletics is taking its toll on professionals in these positions. In order for athletic departments to retain these dedicated employees in the profession, further investigation of the factors in the work environment that impact job burnout and turnover is warranted.

**Rationale for the Current Study**

Chronic workplace stress has had an immense impact on the labor force across the globe. So much so, the World Health Organization has identified stress as the “Health Epidemic of the 21st Century” (Fink, 2016, p. 3). Today more than ever, fast-paced work environments and increased work demands have been taking its toll on today’s employees. Evolution in societal norms, economic impacts, political workplace expectations, and technological advances are just a few of the factors that have contributed to stress in the modern-day workplace (Bliese, Edwards, & Sonnentag, 2017; Mellner, 2016). Chronic stress as a result of work should be taken seriously by managers since it has been found to have negative impacts on employees. Emotional exhaustion, fatigue, decreased health, decreased work performance, and decreased job
satisfaction are all negative health outcomes that have been to a result of stress and occupational burnout (Bliese et al., 2017).

Human services professionals have been heavily investigated on the topic of job burnout. Individuals in these professions have been found to enter the workforce with a high amount of passion and idealist beliefs to impact the lives of others (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Nevertheless, their passion to serve, met with certain work conditions such as increased job demands and lack of job resources, have been found to lead to chronic work stress and ultimately job burnout (Demerouti et al., 2001).

Chronic stress in the workplace that leads to job burnout not only negatively impacts employee well-being but also can have a negative impact on overall organizational success. Negative organizational outcomes can result in employee absenteeism, decreased work production, and higher rates of employee turnover (Maslach et al., 2001). Ultimately, these factors cost organizations a large amount of money as a result of the costs it takes to hire, train, and retain employees. Hence, scholars have been investigating job burnout as a workplace phenomenon since the turn of the 20th century (Morgeson, Aguinis, & Ashford, 2017).

In the context of sport, and the realm of college athletics, the work environment can provide for stressful work conditions. Athletic administers, trainers, and coaches have all reported while their jobs are rewarding, they can be equally as stressful (Barrett, Eason, Lazar, & Mazerolle, 2016; Copeland & Kirsch, 1995; Schaffran, Altfeld, & Kellmann, 2016). Employees in college sport work long hours which has been found to result in work-life and family conflict (Graham & Dixon, 2017). Both individual and organizational influences have been found to contribute to the stressors that impact a college athletic employee to burnout (Dixon & Bruening, 2007). For example, long work hours at the organizational level impact work-family conflict on
the individual level (Taylor, Huml, & Dixon, 2019). While chronic work stress has been associated with working in college athletics, how work stress impacts job burnout and turnover has been underexplored.

Maslach and Leiter (2006) state, “to fix burnout, individuals and organizations must first identify the areas which their mismatches lie, and tailor the solutions to improve the fit within each area” (p. 44). The mismatches Maslach and Leiter (2006) refer to are directly related to the work demands (e.g., workload) and the lack of job resources (e.g., social support) employees encounter. When an employee feels that his or her work environment has too many demands and not enough resources to meet those demands, a mismatch occurs. Ultimately, this results in an increase in work stress and eventually job burnout and turnover. In sport, job burnout research in sport management has been limited to mostly coaches (Schaffran et al., 2016), athletic trainers (DeFreese & Mihalik, 2016), and athletes (Bicalho & da Costa, 2018). Aside from the work of Rubin (2017) and Rubin and Moreno-Pardo (2018), little research exists on job burnout among academic support professionals in college athletics.

**Statement of Purpose**

As a result of these important issues, the purpose of the current study was twofold. First, this study explored the impact work factors of job control match, fairness match, rewards match, and workload match have on job burnout outcomes of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Second, this study examined the impact emotional exhaustion and depersonalization had on academic support professionals’ intention to leave his or her current position. See Figure 1 for the proposed model that was developed to investigate the proposed hypotheses. The following research questions and corresponding hypotheses were developed to guide the current study:
Research Questions:

RQ1) To what extent do environmental job factors impact emotional exhaustion of academic support professionals after controlling for age, gender, and number of years in the profession?

H1a: A greater perceived job control match will be negatively related to emotional exhaustion.

H1b: A greater perceived job fairness match will be negatively related to emotional exhaustion.

H1c: A greater perceived job rewards match will be negatively related to emotional exhaustion.
H1d: A greater perceived job workload match will be negatively related to emotional exhaustion.

RQ2) To what extent do environmental job factors impact depersonalization of academic support professionals after controlling for age, gender, and number of years in the profession?

H2a: A greater perceived job control match will be negatively related to depersonalization.

H2b: A greater perceived job fairness match will be negatively related to depersonalization.

H2c: A greater perceived job rewards match will be negatively related to depersonalization.

H2d: A greater perceived job workload match will be negatively related to depersonalization.

RQ3) To what extent do the outcomes of job burnout impact academic support professionals’ intention to leave his or her current role after controlling for age, gender, number of years in the profession, job content plateau, and hierarchical career plateau?

H3a: Higher levels of emotional exhaustion will be positively related to turnover intention.

H3b: Higher levels of depersonalization will be positively related to turnover intention.

**Delimitations**

The scope of this study was to investigate how factors in the work environment impact job burnout among athletic academic support professions. Additionally, this study analyzed which dimensions of job burnout impact turnover intention. While the researcher sought to systematically measure important factors based on previous literature, there are some factors due
to the scope of this study that had to be excluded. For example, role conflict is one construct that has been demonstrated in the literature to impact job burnout (Demerouti et al., 2001) which was not measured in the current study.

**Limitations**

The current study utilized a self-administered survey-based instrument. While the researcher took careful consideration into the survey design for participant comprehension, lack of comprehension or failure to answer truthfully was a possibility. Purely quantitative data was also a limitation of the current study. Qualitative data would possibly have been able to contribute to the depth of data on the behavioral construct for the work-life factors, outcome of job burnout, and intentions to leave the profession. Error due to non-respondents was also a limitation of the current study, as those who completed the web-based survey could differ from those who did not take the survey. Lastly, measurement error and social desirability were potential limitations of the current study given respondents were asked to answer questions on job burnout which could have been considered a sensitive topic for some respondents.

**Definitions of Terms**

**Academic Support Professionals.** Employees at higher education institutions whom work with the student-athlete population to provide areas of support in three dimensions: (a) academic guidance, (b) athletic eligibility, and (c) life-skills development (Rubin, 2017).

**Areas of Work-life.** Situational and individual job factors of community, control, fairness, rewards, values, and workload that have been found to have an impact on job burnout when there is a perceived job mismatch in these areas (Leiter & Maslach, 2003).

**Job Burnout.** A syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and low personal accomplishment that that can result from chronic stress in the workplace (Maslach et al., 2001).
**Person-Environment Fit**: A theoretical framework that conceptualizes the compatibility between an individual and their work environment that occurs when their characteristics are well matched (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005).

**Turnover Intention**. An employee’s intention to leave their current organization (Abrams, Ando, & Hinkle, 1998).

**Work Engagement**. A term used to describe the opposite of job burnout that describes an employee who has high energy, strong work involvement, and professional efficacy (Leiter & Maslach, 2017).

**Study Implications**

Findings from this study have a direct impact on the discipline of sport management and organizational behavior in sport. Specifically, this study examined how the perceived mismatches in the conditions of the sport industry and specifically, college athletic departments, impact job burnout and turnover intention among athletic academic support professionals. The discipline of sport management has made unique calls to address specific variables within the context of sport to explore specific sport phenomena more in-depth (Zhang, 2015). Additionally, the application of organizational management theories in the context of sport have the potential to lead to unique results in the development of theory in the context of the sport environment (Chalip, 2006).

Athletic departments can use findings from the current study to contribute resources to increase job congruence in a mismatch of perceived job factors. Findings guided the researcher to make suggestions about how athletic departments can begin to make systematic changes to the work environment that can increase job satisfaction and overall well-being of employees within
athletics. In order to retain passionate employees, a decrease in chronic work stress that impacts job burnout is crucial for the longevity of athletic academic support professionals in their careers.

The next section of this manuscript will cover a review of relevant literature. The purpose of the review of literature is to summarize previous research and address areas where the current study fills a gap in scholarship. Organizational behavior, organizational psychology, job burnout, and a review of job stress and burnout among sport industry employees and athletic academic support professionals will be synthesized in the review.
Chapter Two: Review of Literature

The review of literature section was broken down into three components. First, an overview of organizational behavior and psychology literature was summarized. The review then narrows to an overview of organizational behavior and psychology in the context of the sport industry. This section was followed by an overview of person environment fit (PE fit) theoretical framework and the area of work-life model which were used to conceptually guide this study. The last section was broken down into three sub-sections. The first section addressed the importance of career and job satisfaction as key concepts for overall employee well-being and organizational success. The second section described the literature on job burnout and in particular, job burnout’s relationship with work engagement, the measurement of job burnout, antecedents of job burnout, and outcomes of job burnout. The last section introduced the target population and job burnout research in sport.

Organizational Behavior and Psychology

The discipline of organizational behavior empirically examines employees’ individual behavior, group, and organizational dynamics (Nelson, Quick, Armstrong, & Condie, 2015). Hence, research in the realm of organizational behavior is multi-level and often examined from a variety of perspectives. For instance, researchers may study individual level factors that motivate employees to do their job effectively, while others may examine how employee motivation effects group and organizational dynamics.

A sub-discipline within organizational behavior is organizational psychology which, according to Bass (1965) “is a behavioral science that attempts to understand the interaction between people operating in complex organizations” (p. 3). Scholars’ interested within this area skyrocketed due to the industrial period in the early 20th century (Bass, 1965). Approximately in
the last 100 years, organizational psychologists have used their research to solve organizational matters of workgroup behavior, employee development, supervisor behavior, intergroup relations, and management of organizational change (Bass, 1965). A multitude of metanalyses and theory advancement papers have been published establishing organizational psychology as an applied discipline that benefits both employees and the organizations in which they work (Morgeson et al., 2017; van Knippenberg, 2011).

**Organizational Behavior and Psychology in Sport.** Specifically, in the context of sport, organizational behavior and psychology provides an avenue for research within sport organizations and the field of sport management. Sport management is a fairly new area of scholarship and study compared to other established disciplines within higher education (Chalip, 2006). Therefore, scholars interested in organizational and management practices within the context of sport have mostly adopted theories and philosophies from a variety of business disciplines, such as organizational psychology, to understand workplace phenomenon. As the discipline of sport management continues to grow, theory development specific to the field of sport management will be important (Chalip, 2006).

The sport industry is a global billion-dollar business that employs millions of industry professionals world-wide (Hoye, Smith, Nicholson, & Stewart, 2015). Employees are often expected to work long hours and often times earn little pay in entry level positions. For this reason, working in sport is not like a traditional corporate business nine to five job (McCarthy, 2015). Scholars interested in organizational behavior and psychology in sport management have been interested in the work culture (MacIntosh & Doherty, 2010; Snyder, 1990), organizational support (Dixon & Sagas, 2007), work-family conflict (Dixon & Sagas, 2007), employee commitment (Dixon & Pastore, 2003), job satisfaction (Bopp, Wigley, & Eddosary, 2015; Dixon
& Warner, 2010; Lee & Chelladurai, 2018; MacIntosh & Doherty, 2010), life satisfaction (Bopp et al., 2015), and turnover intentions (Lee & Chelladurai, 2018) among sport industry professionals. How an individual “fit” within their respective career and job could be an important factor when considering these social factors related to work lives.

The next section of this manuscript will introduce PE fit as the current study’s theoretical framework. An overview of PE fit will be followed by its individual sub-dimensions and lastly will address how PE fit was used in combination with the areas of the work-life model to conceptualize and examine environmental work factors that contribute to job burnout and turnover intention among athletic academic support professionals.

**Theoretical Framework**

**PE Fit.** It is human nature and a basic psychological human need to want to “fit-in” with one’s environment (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Interactions individuals have within their environments can influence perception of fit beginning at an early age. For example, a child playing outside at recess who gets picked last for a game of kickball may have their first experience of how they “fit” within their social environment. A combination of the interaction between the child and his or her peers in that moment, and the personality or characteristics of that child, both shape the child’s perception of fit. Fit has also been referred to in literature as a person’s “match” or “congruence” within his or her environment. According to Spokane, Meir, and Catalano (2000), “congruence in psychology means that there is a good fit, or correspondence, between one’s needs, wishes, and preferences on the one hand and situation, rewards, and gratification on the other hand” (p. 137). Fit as a conceptual framework is often broadly applied to context-specific environments such as schools or teams.
The workplace is one context where fit is regularly investigated. Both environmental and individual work factors can shape a person’s fit within his or her job (Kalleberg, 2008). Workload and supervisor support are two examples of environmental work factors while personality and employee backgrounds would be examples of individual factors. Multiple frameworks and theories have been developed to understand the phenomenon of employees’ match with his or her job or career (Holland, 1997; Kristof-Brown, et al., 2005; Lewin, 1935; Parsons, 1909; Pervin, 1968).

PE fit is one theoretical framework that is used to describe fit as a workplace phenomenon. Some ambiguity and discussion revolve around how PE fit is best conceptualized and researched (Edwards, 1991). The current study uses Kristof-Brown et al.’s (2005) meta-analyses manuscript as a guide to conceptualize PE fit. In the authors’ review, PE fit is defined as, “... a compatibility between an individual and their work environment that occurs when their characteristics are well matched” (p. 281) and can be described as a framework that is comprised of multilevel constructs (Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Jansen and Kristof-Brown (2006) developed the Multidimensional Model of PE fit (MMPEF). The authors’ model is used to describe how individuals interact with their environment “simultaneously in multiple dimensions” (p. 193). According to Jansen and Kristof-Brown (2006) there are five dimensions that describe PE fit: Person-Vocation (PV), Person-Organization (PO), Person-Job (PJ), Person-Group (PG), and Person-Person (PP).

The five dimensions of PE fit have been found to be related to both positive and negative work outcomes (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). For example, lack of perceived fit in the PE dimensions have been found to be related to job stress (Chen, Sparrow, & Cooper, 2016), job anxiety (Xiao et al., 2014), lack of job motivation, and job burnout (Brandstatter, Job, & Schulze,
2016). On the contrary, greater perceived PE fit has been found to impact positive employees’ organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). The metanalyses conducted by Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) found PO fit to be most strongly associated with organizational commitment, PJ fit to be most strongly associated with job satisfaction, and PG fit to be most strongly associated with job satisfaction and supervisor satisfaction. The concept of PE fit first originated from the person-vocation dimension; thus, person-vocation fit is the first of the five dimensions to be discussed.

**PV fit.** This dimension is described as a match between people and their career interests. Individual attributes and traits are assessed in understanding this phenomenon. In 1909, the pioneer of vocational psychology, Frank Parsons, described the choices people make while deciding on a career in three steps:

1. a clear understanding of yourself, your aptitudes, abilities, interests, ambitions, resources, limitations, and knowledge of their causes;
2. a knowledge of the requirements, conditions of success, advantages and disadvantages, compensation, opportunities, and prospects in different lines of work;
3. true reasoning on the relations of these two groups of facts (p. 5).

Parsons’ work was instrumental in its contribution to the early understanding of how an individual chooses a career path, develops efficacy within their work, and ultimately achieves success by finding the right fit. Since Parson’s work on PV fit, multiple theorists have sought to continue to explain how individuals develop and fit within their careers and chosen vocations.

In 1935, Kurt Lewin developed the PE interaction theory to explain how individuals interact within their vocational environments. Lewin’s theory describes how human behavior is a product of one’s environment with which they interact. His work was an early understanding of
taking both the person and situational factors into account during career development as opposed to just understanding individual factors such as personality. His work has continued to influence the vocational psychology field in its understanding of PE fit from a more holistic lens (Chatman, 1989; Kristof, 1996; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

Decades later, John Holland (1997) sought to further explain PE interaction theory. His theory of vocational choice posits that an individual’s personality has a large influence on determining the type of occupation in which an individual best fits. For this reason, the interaction between an individual and his or her environment can shape vocational decision-making. Holland’s theory conceptualizes how individual personalities can best determine the type of work environment an individual may match best. He broke his theory down into six categories: Realistic (R), Investigative (I), Artistic (A), Social (S), Enterprising (E), and Conventional (C) (RIASEC).

Holland’s theory has been applied in empirical research more than any other career development theory (Spokane & Cruza-Guet, 2005). The early scholarship of Parsons, Lewin, and Holland on PV as a dimension of PE fit has been instrumental to the field of vocational psychology. The authors’ early work has also contributed to the evolution of the remaining dimensions of PE fit (Su, Murdock & Rounds, 2015; Schneider, 2001).

**PO fit.** PO fit is the match between a person and his or her entire organization. Jennifer Chatman (1989) was one of the first scholars to conceptualize PO fit and defined it as, “the congruence between the norms and values of organizations and the values of persons” (p. 339). For this reason, PO fit is often measured and operationalized as individuals’ values and goals and how well they match-up to that of the organization’s values and goals. One example of PO fit is when employees value being their authentic selves in the workplace and the organization who
they work for reciprocates employees to be his or her authentic selves at work (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Scholars have additionally alluded to the importance of PO fit in the employee selection process (Sekiguchi, 2004). Throughout the hiring process, both organization and potential employees use similarities in values and goals in their perceived PO fit.

**PJ fit.** PJ fit is the match between individuals’ abilities and desires with a job’s demands and attributes (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Edwards (1991) originally conceptualized PJ fit in two ways: (a) the match between an employee’s knowledge, skills, and abilities to the required work of the job, and (b) the match between an employee’s needs, desires, or preferences to the job. A good example of PJ fit is when an individual feels he or she has the appropriate knowledge and training to perform the required work. However, if the workload is perceived as unrealistic due to the employee’s limited current knowledge, this should be a factor in influencing that employee’s PJ fit. For these reasons, PJ fit is the dimension of PE fit that matches a supply-demand understanding within an organization (Sekiguchi, 2004).

**PG fit.** Werbel and Gilliland (1999) were some of the first scholars to conceptualize PG fit. The authors describe it as the match between a new employee and the immediate group of employees with whom they work. Interpersonal relationships and interactions with co-workers and supervisors within the work environment can shape individuals’ PG fit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). For example, a new employee may have a positive attitude about working with new people. However, if the current employees have negative attitudes towards welcoming new employee into their work group, PG fit has the potential to be impacted.

**PP fit.** The last dimension of the PE fit framework is PP fit which describes the fit of interpersonal relationships in the work environment. The most researched interpersonal relationship in the workplace examined is person-supervisor fit (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). The
relationship between a leader and their followers is important for organizational effectiveness. One example would be if an employee does not agree with the values or mission of his or her supervisor, PP fit within the work environment could be impacted. PP fit is the only dimension of PE fit not taken into consideration based off the areas of worklife conceptual model.

Scholars have used multiple approaches to analyze and measure PE fit and its dimensions. For example, Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) describe PE fit to be measured in three different ways: (a) perceived fit, (b) subjective fit, and (c) objective fit. For the current study, perceived fit will be measured. Perceived fit is distinguished when an individual personally assesses fit between themselves and the environment (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) state, “perceived fit allows the greatest level of cognitive manipulation because the assessment is all done in the head of the respondents, allowing them to apply their own weighting scheme to various aspects of the environment” (p. 291).

Another way to conceptualize PE fit is by describing it as supplementary or complementary. Supplementary fit is when an employee possesses job characteristics that are similar to employees who are already in place within a work environment (Sekiguchi, 2004). Whereas, complementary fit refers to an employee fitting what is needed by the organization and contributing to “what is missing” (Sekiguchi, 2004, p. 180). The current study took both supplementary and complementary fit into account, conceptualized by the areas of work-life model, to analyze the factors in the work environment that contribute to athletic academic support professionals’ job burnout and intention to leave the profession.

**PE Fit Theory Applied in Sport Management.** It can be concluded after an extensive review of literature that very few studies in sport management have used PE fit as a theoretical framework to examine sport industry professionals and their fit within their work environment.
The limited literature will be discussed. Studies have examined PE fit among volunteer coaches (Kim, Chelladurai, & Trail, 2007) full-time coaches (Fletcher & Scott, 2010), and college athletic directors (Ryska, 2002). However, there is room to apply PE fit to more populations who work in the sport industry because of the unique work context. Working in sport can be often described by words such as fast-paced, competitive, and long hours. This type of work environment can lead to both joyful and stressful responses from employees given their work conditions and personal characteristics (Copeland & Kirsch, 1995; Hatfield & Johnson, 2013).

For example, in Fletcher and Scott’s (2010) review on the psychological stress of coaches, the authors’ proposed a model for how stress arises from an incongruence coaches have within their work environment. They concluded stress occurs when coaches perceive a mismatch and do not fit in within their work environment. Additionally, Kim et al., (2007) examined youth sport volunteer coaches with the PO fit dimension. The authors surveyed participants to respond to how their own personal values fit those of the organization's values for which they volunteer. The authors found that congruence in values was mediated by empowerment on participant’s intent to continue to volunteer. This means the more that volunteer coaches matched the organizations, the more empowered they felt. This in-turn meant participants were more likely to continue to volunteer in the future. The next section of this review will discuss PE fit through the lens of the areas of work-life model was used to examine how environmental work factors that impact job burnout.

Areas of Work-life Model. The areas of work-life model was developed to examine potential job stressors that cause a misfit between an individual and his or her work environment (Maslach, et al., 2001). Maslach et al. (2001) concluded, “...the challenge is to extend the job-person paradigm to a broader and more complex conceptualization of the person situated in the
job context” (p. 101). The model consists of measuring the fit of an employee’s perceived job community, control, fairness, rewards, values, and workload. While not explicitly stated by the authors who created the areas of work-life model, it was interpreted by the researcher that the factors of control, fairness, rewards, and workload were derived from the PJ fit dimension. The areas of work-life model and its constructs have been found to be associated with both positive and negative employee outcomes in relation to work engagement, life satisfaction, workplace stress, job burnout, and intentions to leave a profession (Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011; Graham, Shier, & Nicholas, 2015).

The model and its constructs of job control match, fairness match, rewards match, and workload match will be reviewed in-depth in the job burnout section of the literature review. Figure 2 was developed to describe the intersection of PE fit theory’s dimensions and the areas of work-life model. It can be concluded that PE fit is a theoretical framework that provides a valuable lens to continue to examine employees’ fit within the sport industry and their perceived fit within their place of work. The next section in the review of literature will address career satisfaction, job satisfaction, and job burnout.
Figure 2. Conceptual model developed by applying PE fit theory and areas of work-life model.

Career Satisfaction

Williamson, Pemberton and Lounsbury (2005) conceptualized career satisfaction as a broader construct that encompasses all of the jobs an employee has worked. The Life Insurance Market Association (2015) suggests Americans spend approximately 40 years “making a living” and will retire on average, between the ages of 61 and 65. This is a significant portion of a person’s life. Most career paths in the United States (U.S.) require additional training and the pursuit of a formal education. For this reason, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2017), 69.7% of high school graduates in the U.S. will enroll in college. While the mission and goal of higher education is often debated, one thing is for certain, it is a place where students will be educated and trained in a specified field of study and spend dedicated time deciding on an
appropriate career. The longevity of careers and the formal training received are important reasons why career satisfaction is crucial for lifelong success.

Through career exploration an individual begins to develop what is known as career anchors. In the literature, career anchors are also referred to as career orientations (Igbaria, Greenhaus, & Parasuraman, 1991). Schein (1987) describes career orientations as an individual’s values and needs that have shaped his or her career decision-making. Schein has further identified eight values and needs/career orientations: (a) security/stability, (b) autonomy/independence, (c) managerial competence, (d) technical or functional competence, (e) entrepreneurial creativity, (f) sense of service/dedication, (g) pure challenge, and (h) lifestyle integration (Schein, 1982). Studies show that these career orientations are related to numerous factors: proactive personalities, ambition, career self-management behaviors, mentoring relationships, and workplace attitude (Bravo, Seibert, Kraimer, Wayne, & Liden, 2017). When individuals’ career orientations match individuals’ jobs, they become more satisfied in their careers (Igbaria et al., 1991). For example, if a person values working independently and they have a job that allows them to do-so, this would positively impact his or her career satisfaction.

Career satisfaction’s impact on career longevity has peeked the interest of organizational and career psychologists. Careers that are high stress where an imbalance of career orientations are develop have been highly researched (Shanafelt et al., 2009). One high stress career scholars have been interested in is the medical profession. This is a result of stress and its impact on career satisfaction being linked together for decades (Bliese et al., 2017). Ultimately, greater levels of reported career satisfaction have been found to have an impact on both individual and organizational outcomes (Joo & Park, 2010). For instance, career satisfaction can have a positive
impact on employee well-being by reducing work stress while at the same time have a positive impact on organizations through employee retention and commitment.

The intersection of work-family dynamics and personal characteristics such as personality, health, race, and gender have all been found to impact career satisfaction (Armstrong-Stassen & Cameron, 2005; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990; Lounsbury et al., 2003; Martins, Eddleston, & Veiga, 2002). For example, Lounsbury et al. (2003) found amongst a variety of professions that employees who have personalities that are more conscientious, extraverted, and open, have a greater career satisfaction compared to other traits. Career satisfaction examines a broad overview of the lifespan of one’s jobs; job satisfaction takes a more focused approach to understanding satisfaction in an individual’s current occupation.

**Job Burnout**

Job burnout was first an observable workplace phenomenon. Over the last 40 years it has been examined in a more systematic and empirical way (Freudenberger, 1974; Leiter & Maslach, 2003, 2017). Dr. Herbert Freudenberger was the first researcher to coin the term job burnout. His work has been instrumental in the initiation of research on the topic. Dr. Christina Maslach and her colleagues followed in Freudenberger’s research. Her and her colleagues have become some of the top pioneers in job burnout research and have spent the last 40 years of their careers bridging the applied and theoretical understanding of job burnout in the workplace (Maslach et al., 2001). Job burnout is the result of chronic work stress which occurs over an extended period of time. Situational (e.g. work conditions, job demands, lack of resources) and individual (e.g., demographics, personality) factors at work have been found to contribute to chronic stress in the workplace (Maslach et al., 2001). Maslach and Jackson’s (1981) definition is the most widely recognized definition of job burnout. The authors define job burnout as, “a syndrome of
emotional exhaustion, depersonalization (a.k.a. cynicism), and low personal accomplishment (a.k.a. inefficacy) that can occur among individuals who do ‘people work’ of some kind’’ (p. 1). Leiter and Maslach (2016) posit that 30 years of job burnout research has validated that job burnout can be measured by the three-dimensional outcomes of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and low personal accomplishment. One construct that falls under the investigation of job burnout is work engagement. Figure 3 demonstrates the relationship between job burnout and work engagement.

![Figure 3. Job burnout/work engagement continuum (Leiter, Gascon, & Martinez-Jarreta, 2010).](image)

**Work Engagement.** Work engagement is a more recent term used in positive organizational psychology to describe job burnout. As described by Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000), “the aim of positive psychology is to begin to catalyze a change in the focus of psychology from preoccupation only with repairing the worst things in life to also building positive qualities” (p. 5). Work productivity in organizations stems from employees who are psychologically engaged in their work. When an employee is satisfied with his or her work, he or she becomes more engaged (Leiter & Maslach, 2003).
Yalabik, Rayton, and Rapti (2017) use three dimensions opposite to job burnout to measure and describe engagement in the workplace. These three dimensions are vigor, dedication, and absorption. Personnel who are highly engaged in their work have high energy, are strongly involved, and have a sense of professional work efficacy (Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011). When individuals experience a decreased level of work engagement as a result of chronic workplace stressors, job burnout can result.

Job burnout is the main focus of the current study and scholars have referred to it as the opposite of work engagement (see metanalysis by Cole, Walter, Bedeian, & O’Boyle, 2012). Therefore, when the current study investigated job burnout it also demonstrates how engaged employees are. This is reinforced by Bakker et al., (2011) whose findings suggest job burnout and work engagement do not have enough independence or discriminant validity to be conceptualized as two distinct constructs.

**Measurement Model of Job Burnout.** Maslach, Jackson, and Leiter (1996) developed the Maslach Burnout Inventory General Survey (MBI-GS) to measure the three distinct factors of emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy. The measure can be used for a range of professions. The authors additionally have developed more specific measurement tools such as the Maslach Burnout Inventory for Human Services Workers (MBI-HSS) to measure job burnout specifically among professionals who work in human services professions. The outcomes are very similar to the original MBI-GS; however, they are more distinct outcomes labeled by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and low personal accomplishment.

While most scholars accept and use Maslach and Jackson’s (1981) MBI-HSS three outcome framework of job burnout, some scholars have aggregated the three dimensions into an overall mean job burnout score (Karabatsos, Malousaris, & Apostolidis, 2006). Additionally,
scholars have proposed burnout as only a two-dimensional outcome where emotional exhaustion leads to depersonalization. In their proposed model of job burnout, Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, and Schaufeli (2001) posit that job burnout can be measured with two dimensions: emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. The authors exclude low personal accomplishment from their conceptualization. The authors also measured job burnout using Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI; Demerouti, 1999) instead of the MBI. However, for the current study Maslach et al. (1996) job burnout framework and the MBI-HSS was applied and only measured using Demerouti et al.’s (2001) recommendation to only measure outcomes of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization.

*Emotional Exhaustion.* Emotional exhaustion is one job burnout dimension measured by the MBI. This outcome occurs when employees feel all of their physical and emotional resources have been depleted. Over time, employees may feel they have “nothing left” to contribute to their job. Ultimately, they feel “drained” and unable to perform their work duties to an optimal level (Leiter & Maslach, 2003). According to Maslach et al. (2001), emotional exhaustion is the most widely reported dimension of job burnout, hence, has also been the most analyzed by researchers. It has been found to be most impacted by workload, lack of job control, and social conflicts (Aronsson et al., 2017; Leiter & Maslach, 2003).

*Depersonalization.* Depersonalization is a second way job burnout manifests itself. This outcome is a result of becoming withdrawn and detached from the recipients of service. Maslach et al., (2001) describe depersonalization as, “an attempt to put distance between oneself and service recipients by actively ignoring the qualities that make them unique and engaging people” (p. 403). Consequently, employees who work in human services and experience depersonalization can lose their personal work identity and begin to dehumanize their clients. For
example, counselors who develop the dimension of depersonalization may not be able to treat clients appropriately because they will begin to distance themselves from helping the clients work through their problems as professionals. Negative interpersonal relationships and social conflicts at work have been found to have the greatest impact on the dimensions of depersonalization (Aronsson et al., 2017; Leiter & Maslach, 2003).

**Antecedents of Job Burnout.** Job stressors that manifest into chronic workplace stress have been posited to be the major culprit that impact job burnout. Workplace stressors are defined as the conditions or events that happen at work that result in stress (Bliese et al., 2017). These stressors resonate when job demands exceed employees’ personal and organizational resources (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Stressors are often examined as a multilevel phenomenon. For instance, Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) discuss three distinct theoretical ways of arriving to job burnout: individual (i.e., the role of intrapersonal processes), interpersonal (i.e., the role of the disconnect between employees and those they serve), and organizational (i.e., the role of the wider organizational context). Three main models have been developed to examine the antecedents and outcomes of job burnout: (a) The Conservation of Resources Model (COR), (b) Job Demands-Resource (JD-R) Model, and (c) the Areas of Worklife Model.

**COR Model.** One of the earliest models applied to examine workplace stressors and their impact on job burnout is Hobfoll’s (1989, 2001) COR Model. Hobfoll’s (1989) model conceptualizes job resources and stress within the workplace. Hobfoll (1989) explains, “the model’s basic tenet is that people strive to retain, protect, and build resources and that what is threatening to them is the potential or actual loss of these valued resources” (p. 516). Hobfoll (2001) notes that resources can be objects, personal characteristics, conditions, or energies that are valued by an individual (Hobfoll, 2001). In a study on leadership, Kossek et al. (2018) used
the COR model to examine transformational leadership as a valued employee resource. Results from this study found workplace leadership style as a resource has a positive impact on employee health, work-family, and job outcomes.

Overall, Hobfoll’s (1989, 2001) model has led to significant research on job resources or lack thereof resources (Lee & Ashforth, 1996). Lack of resources impacts employees being unable to meet appropriate work demands. In their meta-analysis on antecedents’ impact on job burnout, Lee and Ashforth (1996) describe the major resources noted in the literature that employees need to meet work demands as: social support, job enhancement opportunities, participation in decision making, and reinforcement contingencies. Since Hobfoll’s COR model, scholars have continued to expand theoretical understanding of both job stress and burnout.

**JD-R Model.** Demerouti et al.’s, (2001) JD-R model extends the work of Hobfoll’s COR model. It considers job resources while additionally accounting for job demands. This model describes how all job-related work demands and job resources, or lack thereof, are job stressors that lead to workplace chronic stress and negative employee outcomes. Demerouti et al. (2001) describe job demands as, “those physical, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical or mental effort and are therefore associated with certain physiological and psychological costs” (p. 501).

The application of the JD-R model has shown that job demands and lack of resources lead to high employee burnout levels and intention to leave a profession (Kim & Stoner, 2008; Maslach et al., 2001; Mullen et al., 2018). Similar to the COR model, the JD-R model uses lack of job resources as factors that contribute to chronic work conditions. The JD-R model suggests the more resources the better. When employees have an abundance of resources to combat job demands, employees are ultimately more engaged and have lower levels of burnout. For
example, Kim and Stoner (2008) sampled 346 social workers and found that the more role stress caused by work demands and less job autonomy, the higher the level of job burnout reported.

Since both the COR and JD-R models have been influential in the study of stress and job burnout, some theorists have even sought to combine the two models. For instance, Akhtar and Lee (2010) worked to integrate the two into one conceptual and theoretical model. Below are examples of resources and job demands that have been highly researched with the application of the COR and JD-R models.

Job autonomy is one example of a workplace resource that has been examined in the literature. This resource allows an employee to work freely and do their work independently. In a study conducted with 935 medical physicians, Keeton, Fenner, Johnson, and Hayward (2007) found physicians who had more control over their work schedules and the number of hours they worked experienced lower levels of burnout. These results indicate that employees who feel they have control and say over their jobs feel independent and trusted to get the necessary work done.

A second resource often examined in job burnout research is social support. Social support can refer to coworkers and supervisor support as a resource in organizations. Social support as described by Cobb (1976) is,

information which convinces people that others love them and care for them (emotional support), that others respect them and value them (affirmative support), and that they are part of a network of communication and mutual support (network support) (p. 300).

Supportive peers in the workplace has been found to reduce the negative effects of job stress and likelihood of burnout (Kim & Stoner, 2008). As an example, Van Horn, Schaufeli, and Enzmann (1999) found that a lack of reciprocity among school teachers impacted teacher burnout. Social support can also result from the context of clientele served. For instance, teachers who have
students with discipline problems and low motivation have also been found to experience higher levels of job burnout (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2017).

One example of a job demand in job burnout research is role overload. Role overload is noted by having too much work to do and not enough time to do it. Coverman (1989) explains, “role overload leads to role conflict only when the demands of one of the multiple roles make it difficult to fulfill the demands of another role” (p. 968). Specifically, for human services professionals, the number of constituents one works with can contribute to an increased workload that impacts role overload. Another example would be when teachers’ student to teacher ratio becomes too high to meet all the demands of the students (DePaepe, French, & Lavay, 1985). Additionally, Skorupka and Agresti (1993) found that there is a similar phenomenon of potential job burnout for social workers. When social workers experience an increase in the number of respective constituents, they may feel they do not have enough time to appropriately serve them all.

Areas of Worklife Model. The areas of work-life model is similar to the JD-R model. It seeks to examine both jobs demands and lack of resources simultaneously. Additionally, the purpose of the model is to capture the perceived match of an employee’s perceived fit within six areas of work-life: workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and values. The greater the perceived match/congruence perceived by employees in these six areas of their jobs, the more satisfied they are. Conversely, the more mismatch/incongruence perceived in the six areas the greater the risk of increased job stress (Maslach, Leiter, & Schaufeli, 2008). Since it has been found work environments within the sport industry can sometimes be factors related to chronic work stress (McCarthy, 2015) the areas of work-life model was chosen to be the best model to be applied in the current study’s investigation of the factors that impact job burnout. Four of the six
areas of an employee’s work environment used in the areas of work-life model for the current study that align with the PJ fit dimension previously discussed. Figure 4 demonstrates the areas

![Figure 4. Antecedents and outcomes of job burnout.](image)

**Control.** Job control is an employee’s autonomy to participate in making their own work decisions. It is a crucial component of the areas of work-life model that has been found to relate to all other five factors (Leiter & Shaughnessy, 2006) and expands off research completed by Karasek and Theorell’s (1990) demand-control theory. The demand-control theory suggests workload mediates the relationship between control and burnout. Mediation is an underlying mechanism (workload) that explains the relationship between two variables (control and burnout). Hence, employees perceive less congruence in job control or autonomy to make decisions at work, work load levels may increase which can lead to increased levels of burnout.

Lack of control has also been found to result in role conflict and ultimately chronic role stress. Leiter et al., (2010) posit, “the more control employees exert at work, the more they can shape work demands to manageable levels” (p. 59). Leiter and Shaughnessy (2006) applied Leiter and Maslach’s (2000) model to explore the role of control. Results from this study
suggested not only does control have a direct relationship with the five other factors, but also an indirect relationship with outcomes of work value, burnout, and change.

*Fairness.* Fairness describes how individuals perceive their organization to be equitable in their policies and procedures for all employees. Leiter and Maslach (2003) explain, “unfairness can occur when there is inequity of workload or pay, or when there is cheating, or when evaluations and promotions are handled inappropriately” (p. 99). In a longitudinal study, Maslach, Leiter, and Schaufeli (2008) discovered that employees who reported a mismatch in the area of fairness moved towards higher levels of burnout over time. Additionally, in a study conducted with teachers, Mojza-Kaja et al., (2015) found incongruence among teacher's expectations of fairness in the workplace led to the burnout dimension of depersonalization. This finding demonstrates that the more teachers felt the work environment was unfair, the more they became detached from their work and the students they taught.

*Reward.* Reward is related to employees’ expectations of intrinsic and/or extrinsic recognition for work performed. Social recognition for work performed would be considered an intrinsic reward while a monetary bonus would be considered an extrinsic reward. Leiter and Maslach (2003) state, “when people feel neglected by the material and social reward system of an organization, they feel out of sync with its values” (p. 97). Therefore, if an employee is not being recognized for all of their efforts in either a tangible or intangible way, they could become less confident in the work they are doing.

*Workload.* Workload pertains to the physical work demands an employee is expected to meet. An increase in workload occurs when job demands exceed the limits of what an employee can accomplish given their time and resources (Leiter & Maslach, 2011). When workload limits are too much over an extended period of time, an individual’s emotional energy can become
depleted. For this reason, researchers consider workload to be the biggest factor that results in job burnout, especially in the dimension of emotional exhaustion (Jimenez & Dunkl, 2017; Linden, Salo, & Jansson, 2018; Mojsa-Kaja, Golonka, & Marek, 2015). Studies have also used workload to mediate the relationship among the remaining five work-life factors and job burnout. This means that a mismatch in the other five areas of work-life have been found to result in an increase in workload, which in-turn can lead to increased levels of reported burnout.

**Outcomes of Job Burnout.** Job burnout negatively impacts employee well-being and job performance. Maslach et al., (2001) in their annual review of burnout listed employee absenteeism, employee withdrawal, intention of an employee to leave their current role, increased turnover, and increased employee health and chronic stress as outcomes of job burnout. Swider and Zimmerman (2010) analyzed relationships among job burnout and the outcomes of absenteeism, turnover, and job performance from 115 empirical studies. The authors found job burnout had a direct positive relationship with all three outcomes. These negative employee outcomes are important for managers to realize since Bakker, LeBlanc and Schaufeli (2005) posit job burnout can be a contagious workplace phenomenon. Hence, the more that it occurs amongst employees in an organization the more it can spread.

Negative mental, physical, behavioral, and attitudinal changes have all been linked job burnout and professional fatigue (Maslach & Leiter, 2006; Schaufeli, Bakker, & Van Rhenen, 2009). For example, Schaufeli and Bakker, et al., (2009) found among a sample of 420 middle managers of a Dutch telecom company that job burnout positively predicted employees’ duration and frequency of future absenteeism. Employees learn how live and cope in the workplace in order to adjust to the effects of job burnout. For example, job stress coping mechanism from occupational burnout have been linked to stimulant use of caffeinated beverages or depressant
substances such as alcohol. As an example, Oreskovich et al., (2012) in a study on burnout among a sample of 7,197 found that surgeons who reported job burnout were more likely to have alcohol abuse or dependence. One debate among scholars is the distinction between the outcomes of job burnout and clinical depression as a result of work (Shirom, 2005). Maslach et al., (2001) suggest job burnout differs from clinical diagnoseable depression because job burnout is a specific repercussion of the work environment while depression permeates every area of a person’s life.

Job burnout also manifests itself at the organizational level where decreased productivity and work engagement can occur. In a review of burnout literature, Halbesleben and Buckley (2004) succinctly summarized the research of employee job burnout and its direct impacts on outcomes of lower employee job satisfaction, lower employee performance, decreased organizational commitment, higher employee turnover, and higher health care costs.

**Interpretation of Job Burnout.** Most researchers interpret job burnout according to Maslach and Jackson’s (1981) three outcome measures of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and low personal accomplishment, but some scholars have taken different approaches. For example, Mojsa-Kaja et al. (2015) broke down job burnout among a sample of teachers into three distinct groups using cluster analysis on a continuum from burnout to engagement. The authors categorized teachers who fell into the burnout group as high in the dimensions of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization and moderate in terms of personal accomplishment. Most recently, Leiter and Maslach (2016) used the three dimensions of burnout to develop five different latent burnout profiles: burnout, engagement, overextended, disengaged, and ineffective. The first two profiles: burnout (high on all three dimensions) and engagement (low on all three dimensions) represent the extremes of job burnout. The three other profiles:
disengaged (high depersonalization only), overextended (high exhaustion only), and ineffective (high inefficiency only) represent unique dimensions of the outcomes of job burnout. The aforementioned examples are a few ways researchers have used an applied and practical understanding of job burnout.

**Who Gets Burned Out?** Research on job burnout has largely focused on individuals who work in human services professions. Human services occupations are people-oriented professions, and therefore, often times do emotional work that requires employees to put others before themselves (Maslach & Schaufeli, 1993). Therefore, chronic stress can arise when the ideals and motivations employees once had to serve others begins to fade as a result of the work demands and lack of resources discussed in previous sections. However, Maslach and Schaufeli (1993) demonstrate that job burnout research has expanded to focus on other professions that may also face stressful work conditions, including police officers, correctional officers, librarians, etc.

The future of job burnout research will continue to grow. In Halbesleben and Buckley’s (2004) review on job burnout the authors highlight future directions of job burnout research. The authors demonstrate a need in future research for more causal models and intervention-based research to combat the workplace phenomenon. Schaufeli, et al., (2009) also highlight the future direction of job burnout research when the authors state, “the scientific challenge for the future will be to uncover how far different psychological processes are responsible for producing burnout and work engagement” (p. 216).

Action research using interventions in the workplace to further understand job burnout to support employees’ health and well-being is likely in the future. For example, Jimenez & Dunkl (2017) developed an instrument (Health-Promoting Leadership Conditions (HPLC)) based off of
Leiter and Maslach’s (2003) areas of work-life survey to provide leaders with feedback on six areas of health awareness: workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and value-fit. Managers and supervisors are able to use this instrument to get feedback and adjust their leadership accordingly to combat the everyday stressors their employees face that could impact job burnout. The next section will discuss job burnout research in the context of the sport industry.

Job Burnout in Sport

After a thorough review of literature, one can conclude that there is limited job burnout research on sport and among sport industry professionals. In sport, athletes were the first population examined among burnout researchers (Bicalho & da Costa, 2018). According to Gustafsson, Madigan, and Lundkvist (2017), one to two percent of elite athletes will experience chronic exhaustion from sport competition that leads to a withdraw from sport altogether. However, job burnout on professionals who work in the sport industry, for or with athletes, is still in its infancy.

Research on sport industry professionals has mostly focused on personnel who work in college athletics. Populations that have been examined in the college sport environment include coaches (Hardin, Zakrajsek, & Gaston, 2015; Lee & Chelladurai, 2018) and athletic trainers (Clapper & Harris, 2008). The college athletics environment has been referred to as a sometimes stressful and competitive work environment and for these reasons may impact stress and potential job burnout (McCarthy, 2015). The research on athletic trainers and coaches will be addressed in the following two sections.

Athletic Trainers. Athletic trainers (ATs) serve student-athletes for injury prevention and injury rehabilitation. AT’s workplace stress and outcomes of job burnout have been related
to workload, lack of social support, and personality type (Barrett et al., 2016; DeFreese & Mihalik, 2016). For example, DeFreese and Mihalik (2016) aggregated Maslach et al.’s (2001) MBI dimensions of burnout and found both stress and a mismatch in perceived workload positively impacted athletic trainer burnout. Additionally, the more social support an AT received the lower the levels of job burnout reported. Some scholars have developed their own measurement tools to examine job burnout among ATs. For instance, Clapper and Harris (2008) developed a measure comprised of four burnout constructs of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, administrative responsibility, time commitment, and organizational support. The authors reported a reliable measure that needs to be continued to be validated in future research.

Coaches. Coaches are the second population that have been of interest among scholars studying professional burnout in sport. In a study on coaches, Hardin et al., (2015) found that college coaches are prideful and derive a great deal of meaning from their work, however, this attachment to their occupation was found to also have a positive association with all three dimensions of job burnout as measured by Maslach et al.’s (2001) MBI-HSS. Additionally, Schaffran et al. (2016) review on burnout in coaches concluded that social support and appraisal from administration and personality (e.g., perfectionism) have been important contributors in research on job burnout. For instance, Tashman, Tenenbaum, and Eklund (2010) found that coaches who reported maladaptive (reactionary) perfectionism resulted in increased perceived work stress which in-turn impacted job burnout. The stressful competitive and winning expectations have provided a unique context to examine impacts of job burnout.

Work Stress in the Sport Industry. Work stress is one related construct that has been investigated among sport professionals that could expand to job burnout. Stressors such as role
stress (Copeland & Kirsch, 1995), work-family conflicts (Dabbs, Graham, & Dixon, 2016), and demographic variables such as gender (Taylor & Hardin, 2016) have been found to be related to sport industry professionals’ reported work stress. For example, Copeland and Kirsch (1995) found college athletic directors experience job stress at all three NCAA divisions. Specifically, they found that budget demands and the potential to be fired were rated the highest among job related stressors. Additionally, Taylor and Hardin (2016) found that female athletic directors often feel scrutinized or felt judged based on their qualifications compared to their male counterparts. This added pressure for females in these high-profile sport industry positions could contribute to chronic work stress in the long run.

One career in college athletics that has recently emerged in the research on work stress and job burnout are student-athlete academic support professionals (Rubin & Moreno-Pardo, 2018). Before turning to the limited literature on athletic academic support professionals, a reasoning by analogy was used to examine the literature on student affairs professionals in higher education and the stress and burnout they encounter in the profession.

**Student Affairs Professionals**

According to the website of Student Affairs Professionals in Higher Education (NASPA), one of the organization’s objectives is to “position student success as a core outcome of higher education and engage all institutional types to center student learning and success” (n.d., “Objectives,” para. 2). Career counselors, academic affairs professionals, etc. all fall under this category. An additional position in this area is academic advisors and academic support professionals. By investigating the literature on general student body academic support professionals, one is able to make a parallel connection to job burnout and the profession of academic support professionals in athletics.
Academic advisors and support professionals are human services professionals that work with the general student body population on academic success and provide guidance on degree paths and classes. One of the ways universities combat student attrition is by employing academic support professionals who work with students on a multitude of academic and personal matters (Drake, 2011). A paramount focus is placed on the success and retention of students given the current landscape of higher education. Student retention is one ranking and measurement tool to hold universities accountable as a measure of student success. This has made student retention and advising a concentrated focus for universities across the U.S. (Tinto, 2006).

Personnel in these roles are vital to both universities and students. According to Hunter and White (2004), “under the guidance of an academic advisor, students can clarify the purposes of their college attendance, achieve vital personal connections with mentors, plan for the future, determine their role and responsibilities in a democratic society, and come to understand how they can achieve their potential” (p. 21). The personal connection a student makes with an academic advisor can positively impact students’ holistic development and collegiate educational experience (Hunter & White, 2004).

For these reasons, academic advising within institutions of higher education can hardly be argued. However, the assessment and impact academic support and advising has on students is hard to measure because it is often based upon student satisfaction surveys (White, 2015). Few studies have shown the direct added benefits students gain by meeting with academic support professionals. In one study, Young-Jones, Burt, Dixon, and Hawthorne (2013) investigated the effects of academic advising in terms of student needs, expectations, and success, and found advising had a positive impact on student’s responsibility, self-efficacy, student study skills, and
perceived support. Additionally, Swecker, Fifolt, and Searby (2013) conducted a study on the retention of first-generation students found that for every meeting a student had with an academic advisor, the odds that a student would be retained increased by 13%. Budget restraints in higher education are a rising concern, and it may be difficult to justify advising positions because of these subjective and hard to measure impacts.

Positions of academic support professionals on campus can be stressful. One reason is that the climate of higher education is shifting to students being “consumers” of education. Additionally, the landscape of students entering college is more diverse than ever (White, 2015); thus, advising is complex and often contextually based upon individual student needs and backgrounds (Heisserer & Parette, 2002). For these reasons, some universities and colleges have turned to a model of “intrusive advising” practices. Intrusive advising is a term that is used to describe advising practices focused on meeting students’ individual needs (Heisserer & Parette, 2002). Therefore, students who are considered to be at academic risk benefit from intrusive advising (Heisserer & Parette, 2002; Vander Schee, 2007). These academic support techniques can take up additional time and a more concentrated effort to meet individual student needs.

While working in academic support services can be a rewarding career, professionals are leaving the profession at an alarming rate due to the sometimes-stressful work conditions of working in higher education and academic affairs. For instance, Marshall, Gardner, Hughes, and Lowery (2016) sampled student affairs professionals who left their careers and found 63.4% had left their career within the first 10 years of employment. Job stress and job burnout were the top reasons reported by participants as to why they left. Participants also reported leaving was due to having a non-competitive salary, attractive career alternatives, and the long hours and weekend responsibilities.
Due to the aforementioned reasons, there are many similarities that can be drawn between student affairs professionals and athletic academic support professionals. However, athletic academic support professionals’ jobs are unique due to the context of the work environment of college athletics, and the student population of student-athletes they serve and advise. The next sub-section will discuss athletic academic support professionals’ roles within athletics and their vulnerability to professional job burnout.

**Athletic Academic Support Professionals.** The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) was first formed in 1906 to regulate college athletics. Since its inception, the NCAA has had a big impact on the reform and educational standards required for athletic competition. In 1991, the NCAA mandated Division I institutions make available academic support and tutoring services to all student-athletes. Since, the NCAA has continued to make legislative changes and regulate academic standards within college athletics. Most recently, in 2003, the NCAA implemented major academic reforms instituting the Academic Progress Rate (APR) and Graduation Success Rate (GSR) (NCAA, 2017). These standards and regulated measures have continued to go through legislative changes ever since. According to the NCAA (2017), “the goals of the academic reforms that were initially implemented in 2003 were to “maximize graduation rates while minimizing adverse impact on low-income and minority student-athletes.”” (p. 33).

For these reasons, most NCAA Division I athletic departments employ academic and career development professionals. The national organization for these individuals is the National Association of Academic and Student-Athlete Development Professionals (N4A), which is an organization affiliated with the NCAA’s National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA). N4A’s vision according to their website (n.d.) is to be the “Global Leader
for academic support and student-athlete development in athletics.” Given the athletic and academic commitments of student-athletes, academic support professionals are crucial to help this vulnerable student population succeed on the playing court and field.

Parham (1993) provided a list of challenges academic support professionals assist student-athletes with:

- balancing athletic and academic endeavors, balancing social activities with the isolation of athletic pursuits; balancing athletic success or lack of success with maintenance of mental equilibrium; balancing physical health and injuries with the need to keep playing;
- balancing demands of various relationships, including coaches, parents, family, and friends; dealing with the termination of an athletic collegiate career (p. 412).

While there are challenges, the place for college athletics within higher education is often supported due to the educational and purposeful engagement athletics provides for the student-athlete experience (Gayles & Hu, 2009; Miller, 2003; Weight, Navarro, Smith-Ryan, & Huffman, 2016).

Aside from helping student-athletes navigate their dual roles, academic support professionals also work with student-athletes who are academically underprepared to be successful in college. Specifically, student-athletes who participate in football and men’s basketball are most vulnerable to be underprepared academically (Ridpath, 2010). Men’s basketball and football generate a large amount of revenue for their institutions and therefore are considered “priority sports.” For these reasons, the pressure to help students maintain their academic eligibility is a work demand that can be felt by the academic support professionals’ (Rubin & Moreno-Pardo, 2018).

Attending college to play sports can be seen as a “way out” for student-athletes to leave
hardship situations. It provides an opportunity for these athletes to exceed athletically as a means to one day provide for family members (Rubin & Moreno-Pardo, 2018). While research has found some rely on their academic support centers to succeed academically (Ridpath, 2002), others studies have found student-athletes prefer to seek academic and career advice outside of their athletic academic support centers (Huml et al., 2014). With the growing number of learning specialists and advisors at the elite athletic institutions, learning how to best serve these students in their academic success has been an ongoing task.

For some of the aforementioned reasons, students who fit this demographic have been found to be underprepared and uninterested in academics, which often lead to lower grade point averages, higher attrition rates, and a lower chance at graduating (Adler & Adler, 1985; Johnson, Wessel, & Pierce, 2013; Ridpath, 2010). While the NCAA reports student-athletes graduate at a higher rate compared to their non-athlete peers (NCAA, 2017), revenue generating sport athletes, especially those of minority status, do not always support this (Lapchick, 2018). According to Lapchick (2018) in a GSR report published on the NCAA Division I men’s basketball teams who participated in the 2018 men’s basketball tournament, white male basketball players had a GSR score of 92% compared to African American male basketball players with a GSR of 74%, for an 18% disparity between the two ethnicities. Due to the unique role in working with a vulnerable student population on campus who face unique challenges and need additional advisement, job stress and burnout has become a major concern among athletic academic support professionals.

**Job Burnout among Athletic Academic Support Professionals.** Rubin and Moreno-Pardo (2018) applied Leiter and Maslach’s (2003) job burnout framework in a qualitative study in which they interviewed 38 student-athlete services professionals (directors, assistant/associate directors, advisors, learning specialists, and student-athlete development professionals) about
their experiences with job burnout. The authors sought to investigate the reasons why professionals in these positions might consider leaving the profession. Overall, results suggested participants who reported job burnout oversaw a large number of student caseloads and experienced alleviated workloads outside of their designated job descriptions. The following themes also arose: not seeing a career path, health issues of physical and emotional exhaustion, time demands, low compensation for the amount of required work, and being in a thankless profession (Rubin & Moreno-Pardo, 2018).

The above reasons provide evidence on how certain job experiences lead to role stress and increased work demands. It takes a lot of emotional work to be in an academic support position and to meet the needs, well-being, and academic success of academically unmotivated and at-risk student-athletes. Work conditions that cause an increase in work stress leads to burnout and possible turnover (Leiter & Maslach, 2003). Specifically, in relation to Leiter and Maslach’s (2003) areas of work-life model, Rubin and Moreno-Pardo (2018) found evidence that individuals felt there was a mismatch between their values, workload, salary and compensation, and social recognition. Additionally, Vaughn and Smith (2018) found academic advisors take on an overwhelming amount of job roles that have potential to lead to increased work demands and job stress. These stressors and burnout levels experienced by academic support professionals require further empirical investigation.

One plausible rival hypothesis to why individuals in academic support professions are leaving the profession is due to job plateauing. Job plateauing is when professionals feel there is no more room to grow or learn in their current positions and therefore leave to find a new job. As an example, Marshall et al.’s (2016) study found 23% of student affairs professionals mentioned they left the profession because of a lack of challenge/loss of passion. Rubin and Moreno-Pardo
(2018) also found evidence that job plateauing may be a cause for specifically the athletic academic support professionals who are leaving the profession. One participant in the authors study stated, “There’s not really a lot of places to move up. And so you get to a point and then what’s the next step? You’ve got to move. And you’ve got to move a lot of times, like across the country, and so that gets exhausting, and it gets to the point where I’m like, ‘I don’t want to recreate my life again.’” (p. 8). Career plateauing has been found to be related to work outcomes of poor job satisfaction, decrease well-being, decreased organizational commitment, and increased turnover intentions (Yang, Niven, & Johnson, 2018). For this reason, the current study took into account job plateauing as a control variable(s) in the examination of how job burnout impacts turnover intention among the target population.
Chapter Three: Methodology

The purpose of the current study was twofold. First, this study investigated how environmental job factors impact burnout among athletic academic support professionals. Second, this study explored which dimensions of job burnout impact athletic academic support professionals’ intention to leave his or her current role. The following methodology section is broken down into five main sections: (a) study design, (b) research participants, (c) instrumentation, (d) procedures, and (e) analysis. The first section includes the study type and justification for the research design. The next section discusses the target population, sample design, power analysis, and justification for an appropriate sample size. The instrumentation section provides details on the variables and scales that were used to systematically measure each construct with additional scale reliability and validity information. The procedures section covers the process for data collection and storage. Lastly, the analysis section covers the statistical techniques used to answer each research question.

Study Design

The current study followed a predictive, nonexperimental, quantitative, survey-based research design. In social science research, it is important to examine relationships among variables because it draws evidence for causal relationships (McMillan, 2016). Additionally, relationships among behavioral variables are important to investigate because they help describe current and potential human behavior (McMillan, 2016). As suggested by Mitchell and Jolley (2013), “to describe how two variables are related, you need to get a representative sample of behavior, accurately measure both variables, and then objectively assess the association between those variables” (p. 232). For these reasons, the current study examined the relationship among
environmental work factors with outcomes of job burnout. In addition, emotional exhaustion and depersonalization’s relationship with participants’ turnover intention was examined.

Research Participants

Target Population

The target population for the present study were NCAA Division I academic advisors and learning specialists who work with college student-athletes. As reported by the NCAA in 2017-2018, there were a total of 1,861 administrators from the NCAA Division I conferences who were categorized in “Administrative” roles titled, “Academic Advisor/Counselor”. It was estimated that 80% of all of administrators in this category would be academic advisors and learning specialists. Therefore, the total target population was estimated to be 1,488. These demographics are collected annually from each member institution by the NCAA Certification of Compliance Form (NCAA, 2018). This report also suggests academic support professionals form NCAA Division I institutions are mostly female (64%) and white (68%).

Sample Design

A convenient and purposeful sampling method was utilized. Specifically, this study recruited participants from N4A. All registered N4A members were asked to take-part in an organization-wide email listserv. The researcher is a current member of N4A and received prior permission from the N4A research committee chair to conduct research through the organization’s listserv. Previous research has successfully utilized N4A’s listserv for participant recruitment. Rubin (2017) had 277 respondents yielding a 20% response rate and Smith, Dwyer, and Gellock (2018) had a total of 117 respondents for a response rate of 8.4%.

As of September 2018, there were approximately 1,955 registered members of N4A (Horning, 2018). Members of N4A are similar to the target population in that they are mostly
female (64%) and white (65%). Participants were asked in the survey to select the current role that best describes their current position from the following list of options: academic advisor, learning specialist, tutor coordinator, life-skills/career/leadership development, and “other” where participants were able to specify their specific roles. The purpose of collecting this information was to determine inclusion criteria was met for participants being academic advisors or learning specialists.

Previous studies have collected demographic and characteristic information on N4A members. For example, Rubin (2017) sought to find out more information about the makeup of the members within this organization. Participants \( n = 277 \) in this study were found to have a range in the number of years of working experience (29% worked 0-3 years, 23% worked 4-6 years, 21% worked 7-9 years, and 27% worked 10 or more years) while most reported having a master's degree (87%). In terms of training for the profession, the largest proportion of respondents (41%) reported having trained for the profession through a graduate assistantship before moving into a full-time position, while others reported undergraduate internships during college (31%) or internships after graduation (25%), and some listed “other” (27%) as experience. The majority of respondents (51%) were non student-athletes in college. In a second qualitative study, Rubin and Moreno-Pardo (2018) incorporated 22 participants from N4A, and reported close to half (47%) had worked at three or more universities over the course of their career. Demographic information similar to these prior studies was collected in the present study.

**Sample Size for Practical Significance.** Sample size was first determined based on the target population size of 1,488. The sample size determination table recommended by Bartlett, Kotrlik, & Higgins, (2001) suggests that for a population size of 1,500, a projected sample size for a continuous outcome variable with a significance level of .01 is 183 participants. Nulty
provides suggestions for approaches to boost web-based survey response rates of: sending the survey link directly to respondents via the listserv, providing a reminder email via the listserv, and providing incentives. All of these approaches were used in an effort to get the best response rate possible. The researcher also sent an email to members of the N4A research committee to gather advice on the best way to send out the survey and incentivize the members on the listserv to participate in this study.

**Sample Size for Statistical Significance.** Stata software was used to do a power analysis to determine an accurate sample size for the current study. Specifically, the powerreg command was used to calculate a power analysis a priori. Power analysis is beneficial to conduct before a study to ensure that the appropriate number of participants in a sample have adequate power to detect a true statistical relationship (Acock, 2016). Hence, power is the probability of rejecting a false null-hypothesis. For example, obtaining power of .90 is the most conservative, as it suggests one would be able to reject a false null-hypothesis with 90% confidence and avoid committing a type-II statistical error. Power analysis is also important to determine for survey research because it provides an estimate for the number of participants needed to detect a true relationship among variables and provides effect sizes, which is important for understanding practical significance (Institute for Digital Research and Education, 2018). According to Cohen’s (1988) guidelines, appropriate effect sizes for multiple regression is as follows: 0.02 as small, 0.15 as medium, and 0.35 as large.

$R^2$ was used in the powerreg code for calculating power analysis. When controlling for variables, $R^2$ tells us how much the variables of interest fit the model. We can further conduct a power analysis that tells us how many participants we need for an appropriate incremental change in $R^2$. An incremental change in $R^2$ tells the researcher how much the variables of interest
explain variance in the outcome variable after being added second into the regression model (Acock, 2016). The powerreg command mimics a hypothetical hierarchical regression model by estimating how large a sample needs to be for the proposed change in $R^2$.

The current study used Koyuncu, Burke, and Fiksenbaum’s (2006) regression model results to estimate an appropriate $R^2$ and incremental $R^2$. Similar to the current study, Koyuncu et al., (2006) measured three environmental work factors using the areas of work-life survey (control match, rewards match, and values match) and three dimensions of job burnout. The authors of this study also controlled for four additional covariates. In the authors’ first model the eight control variables explained 10% of the variance in emotional exhaustion. With the additional three work-life variables of interest explained an additional 36% of the variance in emotional exhaustion. The remaining two models’ $R^2$ change were 31% and 27% respectively. The authors used more control variables than proposed in the current study and less of the areas of work-life and were still able to explain a large amount of the variance in the outcomes of job burnout.

The below examples indicate the calculation for power using the Stata powerreg command for the current study at .70, .80, and .90 power respectively. As an example, hypotheses 1a-d is represented by the following equations:

```
powerreg, r2f(.35) r2r(.10) nvar(7) ntest(4) alpha (.05) power (.70), n = 31
powerreg, r2f(.35) r2r(.10) nvar(7) ntest(4) alpha (.05) power (.80), n = 37
powerreg, r2f(.35) r2r(.10) nvar(7) ntest(4) alpha (.05) power (.90) n = 45
```

Where r2f (.35) represents the new “full” proposed model, r2r (.10) represents the amount of variance explained by the control variables (age, gender, and the number of years in profession) entered into the first block of the hierarchical regression model, nvar (7) represents the total
number of variables in the model, ntest (4) represents the number of variables of interest, alpha (.05) represents the alpha level, and power (.70) represents a power of 70%.

**Instrumentation**

The online survey consisted of 88 items. The Maslach Burnout Toolkit for Human Services was used and consisted of the MBI-HSS and areas of work-life survey. The two subscales of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization were used from the *MBI-HSS* and four of the subscales for control match, fairness match, rewards match, and workload match were used from the areas of work-life survey (Leiter & Maslach, 2003). Job content plateau and hierarchical job plateau (Millgram, 1992) along with turnover intention (Abrams et al., 1998) were also measured on likert-type scales. Descriptive information and participant and demographic information was also collected.

**MBI-HSS**

The MBI-HSS was used to measure the job burnout outcomes of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. The MBI-HSS was developed specifically for populations who work in human services professions and consists of three subscales, two of which were used for the current study: (a) emotional exhaustion, which consisted of nine items, and (b) depersonalization which consisted of five items.

All items are measured on a seven-point Likert-type frequency scale ranging from 0 (*never*) to 6 (*daily*). Job burnout is indicated by higher scores of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Schaufeli et al., 2009). Authors Wheeler, Vassar, Worley, and Barnes (2011), who conducted a meta-analysis on the MBI scale, reported internal reliability measures from 84 studies and reported the emotional exhaustion subscale Cronbach’s alphas ranged in the high .80s while the depersonalization ranged in the mid .70s. In the MBI-
HSS manual, internal consistency scores reported from early studies using the measure reported internal consistencies in Cronbach’s alphas averaging .90 for emotional exhaustion, and .79 for depersonalization (Leiter & Maslach, 2016).

**Areas of Work-Life**

The four subscales of the areas of work-life measured job mismatches in the work environment. Reliability measures have been reported from a normative sample ($N = 22,714$) published in the areas of work-life manual and sampler set developed by Leiter and Maslach (2011). The six subscales are: (a) control match, consisting of three items, Cronbach’s alpha = .83, (b) fairness match, consisting of six items, Cronbach’s alpha = .80, (c) rewards match, consisting of four items, Cronbach’s alpha = .78, and (d) workload match, consisting of six items, Cronbach’s alpha = .67. All items on each subscale were measured on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). For each of the four subscales, an extreme match is indicated by a high score (greater than three), and an extreme mismatch as a low score (less than three) (Leiter & Maslach, 2000).

**Job Content Plateau**

Job content plateau was developed from Millgram’s (1992) dissertation work that examined employees’ perceptions of the likelihood they will be met with future challenges and responsibilities in their work. It consists of six items. See Appendix A for scale items. All items were measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). In its development, the scale reported high internal reliability measures with a Cronbach’s alpha of .86 and has been used since in other studies with reported Cronbach’s alpha of .91 (Hurst Kungu, & Flott, 2012). Job content plateau is a covariate variable in the hierarchical regression analysis for impact on turnover intention.
Hierarchical Career Plateau

Hierarchical career plateau is a measure developed by Millgram’s (1992) dissertation work that examined the likelihood of future advancement of an individual’s career. It consists of six items. See Appendix A for scale items. All items were measured on a seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). In its development, this scale reported high internal reliability of measures with a Cronbach’s alpha of .90, and recent studies also reported internal reliability with Cronbach’s alpha of .94 (Hurst et al., 2012). Hierarchical career plateau is a covariate in the hierarchical regression analysis for impact on turnover intention.

Turnover Intention

Turnover intention is the measure of organizational turnover intention that consists of four items. A higher score indicates a higher intention to leave the organization. In its development, it showed internal consistency with Cronbach’s alpha of .88 (Abrams et al., 1998) and has been used since in other studies with reported Cronbach's alpha of .77 (Barak, Levin, Nissly, & Lane, 2006). All items were measured on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). See Appendix B for scale items.

Descriptive Variables

Participant characteristics were collected and used for descriptive statistics and control variables. In order to have adequate power, not all variables were able to be controlled for simultaneously. Hence, based off past research, age, gender, and number of years in the profession were used as control variables in the models.

NCAA Division/Organization. There are three NCAA divisions, Division I, II, and III. According to the NCAA’s (2019) website, “the NCAA’s three divisions were created in 1973 to
align like-minded campuses in the area of philosophy, competition and opportunity” (para. 1). National Association for Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) were also listed as an option choice. Participants were asked to select the organization their current institution is affiliated with in order to determine inclusion criteria for analysis and generalizability of the sample.

**Unit Reporting Structure.** Participants were asked “To what university unit does your student-athlete services department report?” Options were: Athletics (Athletic Director), Student Affairs (Academic Provost), and Other (please specify).

**Number of hours worked per week.** Participants were asked, “How many hours on average do you work per week?” A follow-up question, “Does the number of hours you work per week fluctuate depending on the time of the academic year?” If participants answered “yes” they were asked to indicate in a response box, “Please indicate the reasons for why the number of hours you work fluctuates.”

**Number of years in the profession.** Participants were asked “How long have you worked in the profession of student-athlete services?” with a drop-down list to choose from that ranged from, “less than 1” to “80.”

**Number of years in current position at current institution.** Participants were asked “How many years have you worked at your current institution?” with a drop-down list to choose from that ranged from “less than 1” to “more than 40.”

**Total number of institutions.** Participants were asked “How many institutions in total have you worked at during your career in student-athlete services?” with a drop-down list to choose from that ranged from “1” to “15.”

**Control Variables.** The survey included demographic questions as well. Participants were asked to provide their age (self-reported), gender (Male, Female, or Non-binary);
race/ethnicity (American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, White); education level (High school diploma, Some college, Associates Degree, Bachelor’s Degree, Master’s Degree, Doctoral Degree, Professional Degree (e.g. JD)), and salary range (under $30,000, $30,000 - $40,000, $40,000 - $50,000, $50,000 - $60,000, $60,000 - $70,000, $70,000 - $80,000, $80,000 - $90,000, $90,000 or above).

Validity. Construct and external validity were both considered in the study design, instrumentation, and procedures of data collection. Construct validity is the degree to which the scales of the study measure the variables that are intended to be measured (Mitchell & Jolley, 2013). Scales for this study were chosen based upon previous research and validation of past researchers who have published credible peer-reviewed results using the scales. Internal reliabilities (Cronbach’s alphas) reported in previous studies and metanalyses have been reported in the above scale information section. For results of this study to have practical significance, external validity is important to consider. Achieving adequate power and sample size was met in order to provide generalizability that reflected the population.

Convergent validity and discriminant validity were also used in scale determination. Convergent validity demonstrates factors that correlate with other measures of the construct while discriminant validity shows that measures are not too highly correlated (Mitchell & Jolley, 2013). The MBI and MBI-HSS burnout toolkit provides evidence for both convergent and discriminant validity. For example, the MBI has shown discriminant validity from constructs such as depression, job dissatisfaction, anxiety, and anger (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1999). For convergent validity of the MBI-HSS, Maslach et al., (1996) explain, “correlating scale scores with the observations of others, with job conditions that were hypothesized to be associated with
burnout, and by relating burnout to other personal attitudes and reactions, and various longer-term outcomes” (p. 17). Pearson’s \( r \) bivariate correlations and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) were analyzed for both convergent and discriminant validity by assessing multicollinearity.

**Procedure**

After Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, data collection began and concluded in January 2019. One reminder survey was sent out a week after the initial survey was sent. Qualtrics software was used to develop and administer the online survey. 330 remote licenses were purchased through MindGarden survey products, based on the funding received for the number of licenses approved to be purchased. The survey was piloted to current members of N4A who are no longer active academic support professionals.

The survey link was sent via email to the research committee chair which included the recruitment email and survey link. The survey was then sent out to the N4A Listserv by the research committee chair for participant recruitment. Once participants clicked on the survey link, they were brought to a participant consent form that explained the participant’s involvement in the study, potential risks and benefits of participating, confidentiality, and were given the researcher’s contact information for any inquiries. Before allowed to begin the survey, participants were asked to give their informed consent to participate in the research study.

Once participants clicked the informed consent link to begin the survey, they were not able to move on to the next page of the survey unless they answered all of the questions, except for the demographic questions. The purpose for this was to account for and reduce missing data. At the bottom of each survey page participants were reminded that they could leave the survey at any time. All data was stored on the Qualtrics survey software password protected website and a flash drive to which only the researcher and committee chair had access. At the end of the
survey, participants were asked to voluntarily provide their email address for a chance to win a Kindle Fire and one of 50 $25 gift cards to Amazon.

Analysis

Hierarchical Multiple Regression

Multiple regression allowed the researcher to use multiple predictors in the exploration of the outcome variables of interest. For this reason, multiple regression allowed the researcher to examine multiple predictors at one time, accounting for more of the variance (Acock, 2016). For the current study, four unique hierarchical multiple regressions were analyzed to answer research questions one through three. This type of hierarchical multiple regression is a type of multiple regression that is based on theory and is used to understand how variables inputted into the model make a unique theoretical contribution to the outcome. PE fit theory and the areas of work-life model were used as the rationale to guide the hierarchical multiple regression analysis.

For example, for research question one, the control variables of age, gender, and the number of years in the profession were added first in “block one” and the four areas of work-life variables (control match, fairness match, rewards match, and workload match) were added second in a “block two.” Hierarchical regression has been used with similar predictor and control variables to account for the unique contribution of interested variables that predict outcomes of job burnout and turnover intention (Timms & Brough, 2013). The unique contribution was examined by the incremental change in $R^2$ after the variables of interest were added into each regression model.

Regression Diagnostics

First, the regression assumptions for multiple regression analysis of outliers/influential cases, linearity, normality, homoscedasticity, and multicollinearity were assessed for
generalizability of the data using Stata. Since participants had to answer all Likert-type scaled questions to complete the survey, this alleviated any missing data. Extreme outlier cases that had influential effects on data analysis were also examined. Influential cases determined by Cook’s Distance using $4/N$ were removed from the final analysis (Altman & Krzywinski, 2016). A histogram of residual plot of errors was used to check for homoscedasticity and linearity of the data. Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg test was used to check for homoscedasticity, Goodness-of-Link (examines y/outcome variable), and the Ramsey’s RSET (examines x/predictor variables).

To check for normality, a bar graph that examined standardized residuals, kernel density plot, pn for residuals, and swilk test to examine normality of residuals were used. To check for multicollinearity, the VIF was used. One last step of using the “regcheck” command was used to assess all of the assumptions at once (Acock, 2016). Bootstrap analysis with 1,000 sample replications was used for each hierarchical regression model.

**Research Questions**

Descriptive statistics for frequency, mean, and standard deviation were calculated for participant characteristics and scaled variables. To answer research questions one, two, and three, three unique hierarchical multiple regressions were analyzed. In block one age, gender, and the number of years in the profession were added first. In block two, control match, fairness match, rewards match, and workload match were added as the predictor variables of interest in relation to the outcomes of emotional exhaustion (RQ1) and depersonalization (RQ2). For research question three, one unique hierarchical multiple regression was analyzed with age, gender, and the number of years in the profession, job content plateau, and hierarchical job plateau added in block one. In block two, emotional exhaustion and depersonalization were added as the predictor variables of interest in relation to the outcome of turnover intention (RQ3).
Chapter Four: Findings

The purpose of the current study was to investigate factors in the work environment that impact job burnout among academic support professionals who work with college student-athletes. Additionally, the effect job burnout had on turnover intention was explored. PE fit, in conjunction with the areas of work-life model, were the theoretical foundations used to guide this study. Participants were members of N4A and were asked to take a survey sent out through the organizational listserv. Three unique hierarchical regressions were used in the analysis. The following section will discuss the results outlined in the methods section. First, preliminary analysis including measurement reliability and regression diagnostic tests will be discussed, followed by the results for research questions one through three and their corresponding hypotheses.

Preliminary Analysis

Stata 14.2 statistical software package was used for the data analysis. New variables were computed by summing the items for each scaled factor (control match, fairness match, reward match, workload match, emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, turnover intention, job content plateau, and hierarchical job plateau). All scaled items were then standardized to get corresponding z scores for each factor.

Measurement Reliability. Internal consistency and reliability measures were assessed by Cronbach’s alpha. Control match consisted of four items (α = .74), fairness match consisted of six items (α = .83), reward match consisted of four items (α = .85), and workload match consisted of five items (α = .72). The covariates of job content plateau consisted of six items (α = .79) and hierarchical job plateau of six items (α = .91). The outcome variables of emotional exhaustion consisted of nine items (α = .92) and depersonalization consisted of five items (α =
Lastly, the outcome variable of turnover intention consisted of four items ($\alpha = .80$). All scales were above the threshold of .70 considered good for measurement of internal consistency (Acock, 2016).

**Regression Assumptions.** Before beginning the main analysis, the regression assumptions for each research question and corresponding hypotheses were checked. Both visual (Residual vs. Fitted Plot, Histogram, Kernal Density, Normal Probability Plot) and statistical (Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg, Ramsey RESET, Shapiro-Wilk; Variance Inflation Factor (VIF), and Cook’s Distance) tests were used to examine any possible violated regression assumptions of heteroscedasticity, non-linearity, non-normality of errors, multicollinearity, and significant regression outliers. Pearson’s bivariate correlations and VIF indices were examined for collinearity. Multicollinearity was not found since all $r$ coefficients were below the maximum threshold of .90 (Acock, 2016). All bivariate Pearson’s $r$ correlations can be found in Table 1. Lastly, the “regcheck” Stata command was then used to test all of the previously listed assumptions at once.
Table 1 Pearson’s $r$ bivariate Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>(11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in profession</td>
<td>0.75*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Content Plateau</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Job Plateau</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Match (5)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
<td>-0.29*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness Match (6)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>-0.26*</td>
<td>0.43*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards Match (7)</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>-0.36*</td>
<td>-0.46*</td>
<td>0.50*</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload Match (8)</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Exhaustion (9)</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>-0.40*</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.40*</td>
<td>-0.55*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization (10)</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>-0.35*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.42*</td>
<td>0.72*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intention (11)</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>-0.41*</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>-0.37*</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. * Indicates significant relationships $p < .05$
**Regression Assumptions Research Question One.** For research question one, Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg test was significant ($p < .05$) and indicated possible heteroskedasticity of the data. However, the visual test of the Residual vs. Fitted Plot showed less of a concern. Further, there was no evidence of non-linearity, non-normality of errors, or multicollinearity. A careful examination of regression outliers was also taken into account. Cook’s distance $4/N$ was used as the cut-off (0.016). Twelve significant outlier observations corresponded to a reduction of 5% of data in the final analysis. Outlier observations skewed data due to the variables of age, gender, and number of years in the profession (Altman & Kryzwinski, 2016). The decision to remove outliers was based on the recommendations of Osborne and Overbay (2004) that suggest cleaned data after removing outliers can lead to a decrease in errors of inference. After a sensitivity check which compared three models for outliers, the researcher chose to run the final model excluding overly influential cases due to outliers. Appendix C provides visual diagnostic plots and tests used to assess regression diagnostics and outlier sensitivity analysis.

**Regression Assumptions Research Question Two.** For research question two, there was visual evidence using the rvfplot for possible non-linearity and heteroskedasticity of the data. Additionally, Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg test ($p < .05$) also indicated possible heteroskedasticity. Follow-up tests of Goodness-of-link and Ramsey RSET tests were both non-significant, which indicated a linear relationship. Visual tests of predicted residual plots showed possible evidence of non-normality of residuals. However, the Shapiro-Wilk Test was non-significant ($p > .05$) and there was no evidence of multicollinearity. Cook’s distance using $4/N$ as the cut-off indicated there were 12 significant outlier observations corresponding to a reduction of 5% of the data in the final analysis. A sensitivity analysis for each regression was checked to examine the differences in slope and standard errors before and after outliers were removed.
Outliers skewed data due to age and years in the profession (Altman & Kryzwinski, 2016). Based on the recommendations of Osborne and Overbay (2004), significant outliers were removed to decrease the error of inferences drawn from the results. Appendix D provides visual diagnostic plots used to assess regression diagnostics and outlier sensitivity analysis for research question two.

**Regression Assumptions Research Question Three.** For research question three, there was no evidence of heteroskedasticity, non-linearity, non-normality of errors, or multicollinearity. Cook’s distance 4/N was used as the cut-off (0.016). There were 18 significant outlier observations removed from the analysis (Altman & Kyrzwinski, 2016). A sensitivity analysis for each regression was checked to examine the differences in slope and standard errors before and after outliers were removed. The final model was removing outliers corresponding to a reduction of 5% of the data in the final analysis. These decisions were made based on Osborne & Overbay’s (2004) recommendations that cleaned after the removal of outliers can lead to a decrease in errors of inference. Appendix E provides visual diagnostic plots used to assess regression diagnostics and outlier sensitivity analysis for research question three.

**Bootstrap Analysis.** Bootstrap analysis was used in an effort to correct for non-normality of residuals for research question two. In order to be consistent, bootstrap analysis was used for each of the three unique hierarchical multiple regressions. Wu (1986) recommends to determine a moderate to large number where 200 resamples is large enough to bootstrap standard errors and 1,000 is large enough to bootstrap confidence intervals. Therefore, for the current study, 1,000 samples with replacement bootstrapping was conducted for each unique hierarchical multiple regression. Based on Wu’s (1986) recommendation for bootstrap analysis, all variables were
standardized to compute Z scores to be consistent. Regressions were run again to compute standardized beta coefficients.

A total of 350 participants began taking the online survey and 292 participants completed it. This resulted in a 16% response rate. There were 244 useable responses used in the analysis based on inclusion criteria if participants reported being affiliated with NCAA Division I and reported being an academic advisor (67%), learning specialist (16%), or a combination of multiple roles of being an academic advisor and/or learning specialist (17%). Participants were mostly Caucasian (73.1%) and female (73.0%) which is slightly higher than the membership of N4A as reported by Horning (2018) at 64.0% female and 65.0% Caucasian. The participants’ average age was 37, and have worked in the profession of student-athlete services for approximately 11 years. Similar to Rubin’s (2017) study, most respondents held a master’s degree (85.0%) and were a former college athlete (54.1%). Additionally, participants reported working on average 50 hours per week and at their current institution for one to three years (86.0%) making an average salary of $40,000 - $60,000 (54.9%). Table 2 provides an inclusive list of sample demographics.
Table 2

*Sample Demographics (N = 244)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Degree (e.g., J.D.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Under $30,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>$30,000-$40,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>$40,000-$50,000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$50,000-$60,000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>$60,000-$70,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$70,000-$80,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>$80,000-$90,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$90,000 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Unit Reporting Structure</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Report to Athletic Department</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Report to Student Affairs</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Report to Other*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Student-Athlete?</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Participants who self-reported a different reporting structure other than “athletic department” or “student-affairs”.

**Research Question One**

For research question one, one hierarchical multiple linear regression investigated to what extent job factors (control match, fairness match, rewards match, and workload match) impact emotional exhaustion of academic support professionals after controlling for age, gender, and the number of years in the profession. Age, gender, and number of years in the profession were entered in step one, followed by control match, fairness match, rewards match, and workload match in step two. The final model was statistically significant \( \text{Wald} (7, 224) = 252.02, p < .001 \).
The incremental change in the adjusted $R^2$ from step one to step two was .41 and explained a corresponding 46% of the total variance in emotional exhaustion. The covariate age ($\beta = -0.19, p < .05$) was a statistically significant predictor of emotional exhaustion.

Results for Hypothesis 1a were statistically significant and indicated that for every increase in one standard deviation on the work-life scale for control match, participants’ reported levels of emotional exhaustion decreased by 0.24 standard deviations. Results for Hypothesis 1b were statistically non-significant. Results for Hypothesis 1c were statistically significant and indicated that for every increase in one standard deviation on the work-life scale for rewards match, participants reported levels of emotional exhaustion decreased by 0.22 standard deviations. Lastly, results for Hypothesis 1d were statistically significant and indicated for every increase in one standard deviation on the work-life scale for workload match, participants’ reported levels of emotional exhaustion decreased by 0.43 standard deviations. Table 4 shows the final regression model with reported $R^2$ values ($R^2$), regression coefficients ($B$), standard errors ($SE B$), standardized beta weights ($\beta$), and confidence intervals (95% CI).

**Research Question Two**

For research question two, one hierarchical multiple linear regression investigated to what extent the job factors (control match, fairness match, reward match, and workload match) had an impact on depersonalization of academic support professionals after controlling for age, gender, and the number of years in the profession. Age, gender, and number of years in the profession were entered in step one followed by control match, fairness match, rewards match, and workload match in step two. The final model was significant $Wald (7, 234) = 119.46, p < .001$ and the incremental change in the adjusted $R^2$ from step one to step two was 0.25 which explained a corresponding 34% of the total variance in depersonalization. The covariates age ($\beta$
= -0.27, \( p < .001 \)), gender (\( p < .001 \)), and number of years in the profession (\( \beta = 0.07, p < .01 \)) were all significant predictors of depersonalization.

Results for Hypothesis 2a were statistically significant and indicated that for every one increase in standard deviations on the work-life scale for control match, participants’ reported levels of depersonalization decreased by 0.21 standard deviations. Results for Hypothesis 2b and fairness match were statistically non-significant. Results for Hypothesis 2c were statistically significant and indicated that for every one increase in standard deviations on the work-life scale for rewards match, participants reported level of depersonalization decreased by 0.20 standard deviations. Lastly, results for Hypothesis 2d were statistically significant and indicated that for every one increase in standard deviations on the work-life scale for workload match, participants reported levels of depersonalization decreased by 0.34 standard deviations. Table 4 shows the final model with reported \( R^2 \) values (\( R^2 \)), regression coefficients (\( B \)), standard errors (\( SE B \)), standardized beta weights (\( \beta \)), and confidence intervals (95% CI).

**Research Question Three**

For research question three, one hierarchical multiple linear regression investigated to what extent emotional exhaustion and depersonalization impact turnover intention among academic support professionals after controlling for age, gender, number of years in the profession, job content plateau, and hierarchical job plateau. Hypotheses 3a and 3b stated that perceived emotional exhaustion and depersonalization would be positively correlated with turnover intention, in that as outcomes of job burnout increased, participants reported intentions to turnover would also increase. The final model was significant \( \text{Wald} (7, 218) = 130.59, p < .001 \). The incremental change in the adjusted-\( R^2 \) was 0.08 explaining a corresponding 30% of the total variance in turnover intention. The control variables age, gender, job content plateau, and
hierarchical job plateau were all statistically significant predictors of turnover intention. Results for Hypothesis 3a were statistically significant and indicated that for every increase in one standard deviation on of emotional exhaustion participants’ reported levels of turnover intention increased by 1.24 standard deviations ($p < .001$). Results for Hypothesis 3b and depersonalization were statistically non-significant. Table 5 shows the final hierarchical regression model with the reported adjusted $R^2$ values ($R^2$), regression coefficients ($B$), standard errors ($SE B$), standardized beta weights ($\beta$), and confidence intervals (95% CI).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scaled Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work-life Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Match</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.4 – 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness Match</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.7 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Match</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload Match</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1 – 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes of Job Burnout</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.11 – 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0 – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover Intention</strong></td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1 – 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 244$. $M =$ mean. $SD =$ standard deviation. Work-life factors were measured on a 5-point likert-type scale. Control match had four items, fairness match had six items, rewards match had four items, and workload match had five items. Lower scores indicate a greater mismatch. Outcomes of job burnout for emotional exhaustion and depersonalization were measured on 7-point likert-type scales ranging from 0 – 6. Emotional exhaustion had nine items and depersonalization had five items. Higher scores indicate greater levels of burnout. Turnover intention had four items measured on a 5-point likert-type scale. Higher scores indicate a greater level of turnover intention.
Table 4.  
Hierarchical Multiple Regressions Predicting Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>[-0.67, -0.18]</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.36**</td>
<td>[-0.35, -0.11]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[-2.60, 4.29]</td>
<td>2.45*</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[0.80, 4.10]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in the Profession</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>[0.30, 0.97]</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>[0.11, 0.44]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>[-0.44, -0.06]</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.27**</td>
<td>[-0.26, -0.08]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[-1.67, 3.51]</td>
<td>2.29**</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[0.97, 3.62]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Profession</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>[-0.00, 0.51]</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>[0.02, 0.27]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Match</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td>[-1.61, -0.54]</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>[-0.73, -0.19]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness Match</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-0.26, 0.73]</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.57]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Match</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>[-1.15, -0.33]</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>[-0.56, -0.11]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload Match</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.43**</td>
<td>[-1.66, -1.09]</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.34**</td>
<td>[-0.68, -0.36]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 232 for Emotional Exhaustion, n = 232 for Depersonalization. Both regressions used bootstrap analysis with 1,000 sample replacements. *p < .05, p** < .001. R² = Adjusted R-squared. B = Unstandardized Coefficients. SE B = Standard Error. β = Standardized Beta Weights. Age is continuous. Years in the Profession is continuous. Males = 1. Control Match, Fairness Match, Reward Match, and Workload Match 1 = extreme mismatch, 5 = extreme match.
Table 5

*Hierarchical Multiple Regression Predicting Turnover Intention*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-1.22**</td>
<td>[-0.21, -0.07]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1.43*</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.54, 2.32]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Profession</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Content Plateau</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.05, 0.21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Job Plateau</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.03**</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.06, 0.18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.76*</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.16, -0.02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1.29*</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.46, 2.12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Profession</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.12, 0.06]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Content Plateau</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.67*</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.02, 0.14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Job Plateau</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.67*</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.02, 0.14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes of Job Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.05, 0.16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.10, 0.11]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. $n = 226$ with 1,000 sample replications bootstrap analysis. $R^2 =$ Adjusted $R^2$. $B =$ unstandardized coefficients. $*p < .05$, $p** < .001$. $SE B =$ standard error of unstandardized coefficients. $\beta =$ standardized beta weights. CI = confidence intervals. Age is continuous. Years in profession is continuous. Males = 1.
Chapter Five: Conclusions and Recommendations

Chronic work stress has been found to be directly related to job burnout among human services professionals. Specifically, job burnout has recently been found to be a significant problem among academic support professionals who work with college student-athletes (Rubin & Moreno-Pardo, 2018). This phenomenon warrants further investigation since job burnout has negative impacts on individuals, interpersonal relationships, and organizational outcomes (Leiter & Maslach, 2003). Therefore, it was the purpose of the current study to examine work factors that impact job burnout among this population. Further, this study investigated to what extent emotional exhaustion and depersonalization had an impact on participants’ intentions to their current role.

The final chapter of this dissertation will discuss the findings in the order of the conceptual hypothesized model. Figure 5 below reminds the reader of the order in which the research questions were asked. First, the impact job control match, fairness match, rewards match, and workload match have on job burnout will be discussed (RQ1 and RQ 2). Next, the effect of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization on turnover intention will be addressed (RQ3). The manuscript will end with a discussion of the practical implications and theoretical contributions for the discipline of sport management, and finish with a conclusion.
Figure 5. Hypothesized model of the antecedents and outcomes of job burnout among athletic academic support professionals that was used to outline the conclusion section.

Control Match

Job control match had the second largest statistically significant impact on emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. The factor of job control match measures the perceived job autonomy individuals feel they have to make decisions about their own work (Maslach et al., 2008). The current study found the more perceived congruence of job control, the less emotional exhaustion and depersonalization participants experienced. This is similar to Mojsa-Kajak et al. (2015), who found teacher burnout was related to a lack of congruence individuals perceived over his or her jobs. The lack of job autonomy advisors and learning specialists perceive in their roles may be due to a number of reasons further addressed in this section.

Institutional and NCAA academic policies may limit the amount of job control academic advisors and learning specialists perceive they have (Rubin, 2017). It could be that academic
staff feel a lack of autonomy in how to best advise student-athletes in his or her academic pursuits. The best advising decisions may sometimes be at odds with meeting certain academic standards. For example, if a student-athlete needs to maintain a certain amount of degree-seeking credits along with a certain grade point average to meet eligibility standards, academic support professionals may help advise student-athletes by the options they have to continue to uphold their athletic eligibility.

One specific scenario could be advising a student-athlete to switch majors in order to become more academically successful. This may happen even though it is not a major the student-athlete foresees him or herself pursuing as a career upon graduation. As a result of the lack of advising freedom, athletic programs and teams have been found to end up in what is known as “academic clustering.” Academic clustering occurs when more than 25% of an athletic team majors in the same program of study (Svyantek et al., 2017). When academic clustering occurs, it can result in more workload and oversight of academic support staff to monitor academic integrity. This is one concrete reason why academic advisors may feel a lack of control in their advising efforts.

An academic support staff member may also lack control over the specific assigned sport he or she advises. For example, academic support professionals have mentioned the pressure of working with revenue generating sports of men’s and women’s basketball and football (Rubin & Moreno-Pardo, 2018). Ridpath (2010) suggests student-athletes in these sports may often times need more support and structure compared to non-revenue sport student-athletes. Pressure from coaches and administration to aid these student-athletes to remain eligible academically in order to compete athletically, may be a result of the attempt to meet APR and GSR requirements. Ridpath (2010) states,
The disturbing trend is many minorities who play in the revenue, heavily commercialized, sports of football and men’s basketball feel they need these services not just to academically persist and graduate, but also just to maintain athletic eligibility - a crucial component of the APR measurement (p. 266).

As Ridpath (2010) suggests, advisement can differ based upon student-characteristics in regards to gender, ethnicity, and the sport he or her plays. For example, Lapchick (2019) noted the disparity between graduation success of African Americans (74%) and white (92%) males who participated in the 2018 NCAA men’s basketball championship tournament. Would advisors and learning specialists feel they have more control over their jobs if they were provided additional resources to meet the needs of diverse groups of student-athletes?

In addition to providing academic support, professionals in these roles wear many hats. For example, academic support staff on any given day, may hold one-on-one advising meetings, assist with course registration, meet with coaches and recruits, be in charge of the tutor program, handle miscellaneous daily tasks, and much more (Vaughn & Smith, 2018). Differences in job roles often vary from institution to institution. For example, an academic advisor at a Power Five school may be one of four academic advisors who work specifically with the football team, while an advisor at a Group of Five “mid-major” institution may be the only academic support person working with football in addition to other teams. Rubin and Moreno-Pardo (2018) found participants reported an increase in job burnout when academic support staff oversaw large caseloads of student-athletes which in-turn increased workloads.

Additional resources may be needed to provide academic support staff with more control over their jobs. Karasek and Theorell (1990) suggest that when individuals have more control over their jobs, stress as a result of workload can be decreased. Athletic administrators who
understand that job control can be increased by additional resources, may be able to supplement the work needs of their academic support staff and decrease experienced job burnout.

Ultimately, Leiter et al. (2010) suggest the more employees feel congruent in their work roles, the more manageable work demands become. Leiter and Shaughnessy (2006), found the more control one has over his or her job the more of a match the additional five factors of job community, fairness, rewards, workload, and values become. Further research is needed to better understand how greater matches in job control may have a direct relationship with the additional work-life factors and outcomes of job burnout. Practical solutions for increasing job control match among athletic academic support professionals will be discussed in the practical implications section.

**Fairness Match**

Job fairness match did not have a statistically significant impact on either emotional exhaustion or depersonalization. Job fairness match measured the perception of equitable treatment among employees (Maslach et al., 2008). Perceived fairness pertains to equitable treatment as it relates to available resources in the workplace (Leiter & Maslach, 2003). This differs from results gleaned by Mojsa-Kaja et al. (2015), who found depersonalization was impacted by perceived fairness. Additionally, in a longitudinal study, Maslach et al. (2008) found participants who perceived a greater mismatch in job fairness reported higher levels of burnout over time. While other studies that have examined populations of human services professions found evidence job fairness match effects burnout, academic support staff in the current study were found to have no statistical association between a greater match in job fairness and the dimensions of job burnout.
It could be concluded that academic support professionals’ perception of fairness in the workplace is not an area of concern in relation to emotional exhaustion or depersonalization. Job fairness seems to meet the expectations of staff members in these roles. It could be that academic support professionals understand where and how the resources in college athletics are allocated within departments. Whether resources and fair treatment are actually equitable is an area for future research.

**Rewards Match**

Job rewards match had a statistically significant impact on participants’ reported levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Job rewards match measures employees’ perceptions of tangible and intangible recognition of their work (Maslach et al., 2008). The greater the congruence in the area of perceived rewards, the less burnout experienced. Similarly, Rubin and Moreno-Pardo (2018) found that academic support professionals felt they received a lack of salary compensation for the amount of work required of them. Participants from Rubin and Moreno-Pardo’s (2018) study also mentioned oftentimes feeling in thankless positions. For example, when individual student-athletes and teams succeed academically, most advisors and learning specialists often go unrecognized for these feats.

In the current study, 90% of participants hold a Master’s degree or higher while making on average, a reported salary of $40,000 - $50,000. Participants of this study’s income is similar to other human services professions. For example, counselors ($50,000), social and human service assistants ($50,000), and social workers ($50,000) make similar base salaries (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015). However, in comparison to other athletic department employees, especially at the NCAA Division I level, other departmental employees make significantly higher base salaries. According an ESPN article in 2017, 39 of the 50 states’ highest state
employees were the college football or men’s basketball coaches (Gibson, 2017). In addition, these coaches receive large bonuses on top of base salaries if their teams meet APR and GSR scores (Gibson, 2017). For example, USA Today reported Dabo Swinney, who led Clemson University in the National Football Championship, amassed a $100,000 bonus for exceeding his team’s APR of 975 last season (Robinson, 2019).

In terms of intangible rewards, Rubin and Moreno-Pardo (2018) similarly concluded participants in their study do not feel recognized and thanked for the hard work they put in compared to other athletic department employees. Leiter and Maslach (2003) mention a mismatch in rewards it could be due to the social rewards system not matching with individuals perceived values. How can athletic departments focus on building a greater job match both in tangible and intangible ways to increase job rewards match? This concern and potential solutions are addressed in the practical implications section.

**Workload Match**

Lastly, job workload match had the largest statistically significant impact on both emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Job workload match measured employees’ perceived workload expectations given the amount of appropriate resources to get the job done (Maslach et al., 2008). Hence, the more academic support professionals felt greater congruence in the amount of workload they performed, the lower levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization experienced. This finding is consistent with previous literature that has found greater perceived mismatches in the areas of workload, effects increased levels of experienced job burnout (Jimenez & Dunkl, 2017; Linden et al., 2018; Mojsa-Kaja et al., 2015). Rubin and Moreno-Pardo (2018) also found this to be true; the authors’ concluded that personnel in these
positions take on various roles accompanied by large amounts of workloads. A participant from that study stated:

And I’m saying, ‘Why can’t we work 40 hours? Why can’t this be a job, where we have somebody who actually respects our time? Why have we created a monster that there is a belief that if somebody texts me at 1:00 AM, I have to respond to them?’ (p. 12).

Findings from the current study echo that of Rubin and Moreno-Pardo’s results. Academic support professionals in college athletics feel a mismatch in their perceived workloads. Specifically, individuals in these positions work intensely for prolonged periods of time and may struggle with the boundaries of work-life integration.

Academic support professionals may feel their work can never be left behind at the end of the work day. This finding highlights the work culture of collegiate athletics. Additional occupations within college athletics such as athletic trainers, coaches, and administrators have also reported high stress as a result of the large time commitment dedicated toward their work (Clapper & Harris, 2008; Hardin et al., 2015). A recent study by Taylor et al. (2019) concluded that intercollegiate athletic employees have a strong association with workaholism. Specifically, the authors’ found workaholism was found to have a statistically significant impact on job burnout. Given the high amounts of workload and perceived mismatch in this area, future research could further investigate the relationship between workaholism and job burnout among academic staff members.

Participants in the current study reported working, on average, 50 hours per week and 87% indicated that the number of hours he or she work per week fluctuated depending on the time of academic year. Rubin and Moreno-Pardo (2018) similarly found that time demands increased around peak times of the semester such as course registration and grade reports. This
finding could reflect that schedules and workload among academic support professionals often fluctuate with the demands of an academic calendar. Additionally, Vaughn and Smith (2018) reported academic advisors can take on a large amount of job roles that have the potential to lead to increased workloads and job stress. Since the number of hours individuals work can fluctuate based on the academic calendar, strategies could be implemented by athletic departments to support these staff members during heightened times of workload and support more time off during “down times” of an academic year. As Jimenez and Dunkl (2017) found, even work environments that require a high amount of workload, given the appropriate amount of resources needed to meet the work demands, can have an impact on the reduction of experienced job burnout. Solutions for increasing employees’ workload match will be discussed in the practical implications section.

**Job Burnout Outcome: Emotional Exhaustion**

Emotional exhaustion has been found to be a direct result of chronic work stress caused by factors within the work environment (Bliese et al., 2017). It measured employees who are physically and mentally drained from their work. Academic support professionals in this study, on average, reported being emotionally exhausted once a month to a few times a month. An overall mean score of 22.64 out of a possible score of 54 was reported. In comparison to other human services professions, participants in this study reported a slightly higher emotional exhaustion score compared to other human services professions as reported by Maslach and Jackson (1981) in the MBI-HSS manual. Those who work in Social Services \((n = 1, 538, M = 21.35)\), Medicine \((n = 1,104, M = 22.19)\), Mental Health \((n = 730, M = 16.89)\), and “other” professions \((n = 2,897, M = 21.42)\) all had mean scores below those of the current study (Maslach, 1981). These descriptive statistics are important findings that indicate that in
comparison to other helping professions, athletic academic support professionals may be experiencing a larger amount of job burnout. This is important for athletic administrators to understand since the dimension of emotional exhaustion has been found to be directly related to work fatigue, decreased health conditions, lower work performance, and decreased job satisfaction (Bliese et al., 2017).

Job control match, rewards match, and workload match all had a statistically significant impact on participants’ levels of emotional exhaustion. Additionally, the covariate age was found to significantly predict lower levels of emotional exhaustion. As individuals age, reported levels of emotional exhaustion decreased. This finding is similar to Leiter and Maslach (2003) who reported that older individuals are more likely to experience greater congruence in his or her work roles. Could it be that older academic support professionals have learned how to cope with the demands of the job better? This finding will be addressed in the upcoming future directions section.

Not only is emotional exhaustion a problem among individuals at work, but Bakker et al., (2005) have indicated emotional exhaustion can be contagious between coworkers and in-turn ingrained in an organization’s culture. Recent work by Taylor et al., (2019) have found this to be true in college athletic departments across the country. The authors’ found collegiate administrators have a high association with workaholism which is defined as an uncontrollable need to work incessantly. Further, they found that workaholism among this population leads to job burnout. For this reason, the job burnout outcome of emotional exhaustion may be college athletic culture problem. For example, being around individuals at work with low work energy could have the potential to impact the energy of coworkers around them. This is another area further research should explore.
Job Burnout Outcome: Depersonalization

Depersonalization is the second way job burnout manifests itself. It measured the phenomenon of employees becoming detached from their work and the recipients they serve. Participants in the current study reported experiencing the outcome of depersonalization on average once a month to a few times a year. This corresponded to a mean score of 7.13 out of a possible score of 30. In comparison to other human services professions, participants in this study had similar scores when compared to Health Professionals ($n = 730, M = 5.76$), Social Services ($n = 1,538, M = 7.46$) and Medicine ($n = 1,104, M = 7.12$), as reported by Maslach and Jackson (1981) in the MBI-HSS manual. This finding is consistent to Leiter and Maslach (2003) who have reported the outcome of depersonalization often times manifests itself less in comparison to emotional exhaustion.

The covariates age and the number of years spent in the profession were both found to significantly impact levels of depersonalization. As individuals age, reported levels of depersonalization decreased; however, the number of years in the profession positively impacted levels of depersonalization. The number of years in the profession however, only explained a small amount of the variance in depersonalization. There may be something unique about aging and chronic work stress. Implications for future research based on this finding will be discussed in an upcoming section.

Unlike research question one, gender had a significant impact on the outcome of depersonalization. Specifically, males reported experiencing higher levels of depersonalization when compared to females. Career psychologist Parsons (1909) was one of the first scholars to note that career fit may vary based on gender. Additionally, John Holland’s (1997) theory of vocational personality types (RIASEC) which has been applied in many contexts, consistently
finds differences in occupational choice based on gender. Women often are drawn to professions working with “people” (social and artistic) while men have shown greater interest working with “things” (Su, Rounds, & Armstrong, 2009). The RIASEC personality types seem to be at odds with the current study’s population. While differences based on gender was not a focus of the current study, it was a significant finding. This leaves a question, do men who enter academic support services for student-athletes do so for different reasons compared to females and therefore get burned out from work differently? If so, it could be concluded men become more cynical in the profession based on certain mismatches of job expectations when compared to females. One explanation could be that women in society as a whole are socialized based on gender norms to be caring and helpful within their job roles. Therefore, more women pursue jobs in the helping professions like academic support roles. This finding is a clear example of sport acting as a microcosm of society that possibly women are going to burn-out from depersonalization because of these expectations based on their gender roles when compared to males.

**Turnover Intention**

Turnover can have a significant negative impact on organizations’ bottom lines. In the current study it measured participants intentions on leaving their current jobs. Specifically, research question three investigated the impact emotional exhaustion and depersonalization had on turnover intention after controlling for age, gender, the number of years in the profession, job content plateau, and hierarchical job plateau. In the final model, emotional exhaustion was found to have the biggest impact on participants’ turnover intention. Since a decrease in emotional exhaustion in the current study was impacted most by job control match, rewards match, and workload match, athletic departments should serve to find ways to increase job congruence in
these areas. By doing so, administration would work to alleviate both burnout and turnover among academic support staff.

Swider and Zimmermann (2010), in a quantitative review, analyzed 115 studies and found job burnout to have a stronger correlational relationship with turnover intention ($r = .33$) when compared to absenteeism ($r = .23$), but a smaller relationship when compared to job performance ($r = .36$). The current study found a similar statistically significant relationships between turnover intention and emotional exhaustion ($r = .36$) while a smaller relationship with depersonalization ($r = .25$). According to Cohen’s (1988) guidelines, these are medium to large effect sizes for correlations. However, emotional exhaustion was the only outcome of job burnout that had a statistically significant impact on turnover intention. According to results of this study, if athletic administrators want to strive to retain top employees in academic support positions, a focus should be placed on interventions that would reduce levels of emotional exhaustion. Findings from this study suggest decreasing levels of emotional exhaustion would be to find ways to increase athletic academic support employees’ job match in the areas of control, rewards, and workload. Practical solutions for increasing congruence in these areas are addressed in the next section.

Job content plateau and hierarchical job plateau were also found to be significant predictors of turnover intention. Individuals who felt a lack of challenge in his or her current role or a lack of mobility to move-up within his or her organization are more prone to want to leave his or her current position. Rubin and Moreno-Pardo (2018) also found this to be true. One participant in the authors’ study mentioned,

There’s not really a lot of places to move up. And so you get to a point and then what’s the next step? You’ve got to move. And you’ve got to move a lot of times, like across the
country, and so that gets exhausting, and it gets to the point where I’m like, ‘I don’t want to recreate my life again’ (p. 8).

Hitting a job plateau has also been found among advisors who serve the general student population. For example, Marshall et al., (2016) found that 23% of student affairs professionals left the profession due to a lack of challenge in their daily roles. It could be that if professionals in these positions are feeling “stuck,” they may also perceive a lack of job fit and in-turn think about leaving the profession altogether. While not the focus of the current study, job plateauing was a significant finding that warrants further investigation. In the upcoming section related to future research, career adaptability will be addressed in relation to job plateauing.

**Practical Implications**

The current study examined specific areas within the work environment that have an impact on academic support professionals’ perceived mismatch of job expectations. Leiter, Maslach, and Jackson (2012) suggest pinpointing areas within work environments where additional resources are needed to develop greater job congruence among employees. Based on Leiter et al.’s (2012) recommendations, there are several important managerial implications to be gleaned from the current study’s results. The most practical implications highlight the statistically significant relationships between emotional exhaustion with job control match, rewards match, and workload match. Demerouti et al.’s (2001) JD-R model suggests the more resources in the work environment the better. According to the JD-R model, when employees have an abundance of resources to supplement job demands, employees will become more engaged and experience less job burnout. Additionally, Bukstein (2016) suggests administrators should begin to think differently about the current business model of college athletics where it is
commonplace to put revenue back into coaches’ salaries and facility renovations. The author in this section will make suggestions for collegiate administrators to improve job mismatches among advisors and learning specialists that will in-turn increase job congruence in the areas of control, rewards, and workload in order to alleviate experienced emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and turnover intentions.

Almost every NCAA Division I athletic program places student-athlete academic success and excellence at the forefront of their athletic mission statements. Since most athletic departments follow a top-down leadership structure, athletic directors have the ability to make an impact that permeates the different sub-units within an athletic department. Athletic directors should ask themselves, what does it “look-like” for my athletic department to “live-out” the mission that supports the academic excellence of student-athletes? Below are practical solutions the author makes for athletic departments and athletic directors to provide support to their academic support teams in an effort to increase job matches and reduce job burnout and turnover intentions. This will only help support their missions of providing student-athletes with the best academic experience as possible.

Results from this study suggest that first and foremost, athletic directors should begin to focus on reducing emotional exhaustion and depersonalization by placing a focus on academic support professionals’ workloads. In an ideal world, athletic departments would be able to find ways to decrease workloads during the heightened times of an academic year to decrease chronic work stress. One-way athletic directors and academic support unit supervisors could do this is by providing additional resources for academic advisors and learning specialists. First however, they must identify areas where the additional resources are most needed. Then, strategic models
could be developed to meet the increased work demands during different times of an academic year.

For example, if workload is perceived as too much around the times of course registration, athletic departments could find ways to build partnerships across campus to develop a more “hands-on-deck” approach in an effort to lighten the burden of workload often felt during times of course registration. Another solution could be to supplement academic support staff by investing in software that could help efficiently accomplish tasks and reduce workload. For example, electronic systems that send out grade reports to faculty members could alleviate paper documentation still used at some institutions today. Lastly, which may cost a significant amount of budget allocation is to hire more professionals in these positions to spread the workload among more individuals. As mentioned in the previous section, there could be many ways for leaders to help increase the resources that alleviate workloads. Ultimately, this would also provide academic support professionals with more control over his or her job.

If unable to provide tangible resources to reduce workloads, supervisors should encourage academic support professionals to take time off as a way to reduce workloads. Rubin and Moreno-Pardo (2018) discuss that supervisors should provide encouragement and support employees to take vacations during downtimes in order to regain energy levels. Another strategy a supervisor can implement is to encourage employee work-life boundaries. Since there is often a 24-seven work mentality in collegiate athletics, supervisors and athletic departments can show they value work-life balance by helping advisors and learning specialists set boundaries between their work and professional lives. One specific example, would be for supervisors to support their staff members if they choose to leave their work behind them at the end of the work day (Dixon & Bruening, 2007).
One last example to tackle workload match is to have structured meetings with academic advisors and learning specialists that utilizes open dialogue with supervisors about the expectations of workload. Oftentimes, making sure the work just gets done can become a top priority. However, checking-in and reevaluating workloads needs to be taken seriously in order to make sure workloads are compatibles with employees’ expectations of what they can feasibly accomplish. Ultimately, Leiter and Maslach (2003) suggest that organizations should work to engage employees by working to make workloads more compatible if their goal is to reduce job burnout.

As mentioned above, it would be in an ideal world to find ways to decrease workloads to create a better job match in this area. However, these aforementioned solutions may cost departments money that they currently can’t afford to spend. The literature suggests that a congruence in the area of job control can actually increase congruence in all other areas (fairness, rewards, and workload). Athletic departments may not be able to decrease workload, but they can find ways to increase individuals’ job control. Fostering greater job autonomy in employees could also be a cost-free way to ultimately reduce job burnout. For example, supervisors should take the time to understand more about how and why employees feel a mismatch in control over their current roles. Could there be opportunities based on organizational structure and the leadership of unit supervisors to increase job control match among academic support professionals?

The third and final area athletic administrators could find solutions to increase job match is through both tangible and intangible reward systems. Tangible rewards could relate to work resources, promotions, and pay structures. For example, the NCAA’s new model to distribute revenue based on institutions academic success could be used to support academic units. As
mentioned above, many institutions currently have bonus structures in place for coaches but fail to also recognize the academic support team in the same way. However, while a possible solution to provide monetary bonuses to academic support staff based on performance off the field, athletic directors would need to take into account the ethical considerations for how this could impact academic integrity among support staff.

Another possible solution for increasing job match in the areas of rewards is to focus on intangible social recognition that would not cost athletic departments anything. It is unlikely that academic support professionals go into the profession for the perks of the salary. For this reason, a lack of match in the area of rewards could be due to the lack of recognition for the hard work put in to support athletes in their academic endeavors.

For example, it is common practice for many college athletic directors to block-off time in their busy schedules to visit coaches and team practices. If not already doing so, athletic directors and unit supervisors could make it a point to do the same schedule blocking visits to academic support units. Not only would this send a clear message that academic support professionals are valued for the work they do but it would also indirectly send a message to student-athletes that the athletic director values academic success just as much as team practices and games. These are just a few potential tangible and intangible solutions to better recognize the hard work of individuals who dedicate significant time to support student-athletes off the court and field.

Addressing turnover also has practical implications for athletic departments. Hom, Lee, Shaw, and Huasknecht’s (2017) article titled, “One hundred years of employee turnover theory and research” makes practical suggestions for managerial practices in retaining employees. Specifically, the authors urge practitioners to focus on: selective hiring practices, the
socialization and training process of newly hired employees, and tracking who leaves and where they go to better understand the type of employees leaving and for what reasons. By gleaning advice from Hom et al., (2017) athletic directors can begin to take a proactive approach in addressing contextual factors in the work environment (like those addressed above) that effect burnout and turnover among employees who work in academic support roles.

**Theoretical Contribution**

PE fit was the theoretical foundation used for the current study. Kristof-Brown et al. (2005) define PE fit as a match that is well suited between a person and his or her environment. The current study explored the PE fit dimension of PJ fit through the lens of job control match, fairness match, rewards match, and workload match. These areas of job congruence were adapted from Leiter and Maslach’s (2000) areas of work-life model. PJ fit suggests a greater perceived job fit can positively impact outcomes such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, job involvement, trust, work engagement, and overall well-being (Jansen & Kristof-Brown, 2006; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005).

The areas of work-life factors began as a starting point to strategically identify mismatches within the job environment among academic support professionals. Specifically, the current study suggests greater perceived mismatches in job control, rewards, and workload had a statistically significant impact on job burnout. For example, the more academic support professionals perceived discrepancies in his or her workload, the greater emotional exhaustion and depersonalization that was reported. In turn, greater levels of experienced emotional exhaustion impacted individuals’ intention to want to leave his or her current role.

The current study applied PE fit theory by exploring the single dimension of PJ fit with four factors from the areas of work-life model. In a metanalyses on PE fit the authors summarize
five dimensions of PE fit: person-vocation, person-organization, person-job, person-group, and person-person. While the current study made advances in understanding PJ fit by investigating participants’ control match, fairness match, rewards match, and workload match, further research in the additional dimensions is warranted. For example, the work-life factors of community and values could be explored. Community would seek to understand how individuals fit with his or her work group in the PG dimension while values would examine fit in the PO dimension. PE fit could also be explored outside the areas of work-life model. For example, no factor in the area of work-life model directly examines the dimension of PP fit. Scholars could use a different approach to investigate PP fit to capture employees’ and supervisors fit with one another.

From a sport and organizational management perspective, PE fit theory and specifically the dimension of PJ can aid athletic departments to better understand the job mismatches that occur among academic support professionals. Jansen and Kristof-Brown (2006) suggest organizations should investigate PJ fit as early as the hiring process. For example, strategic interview questions or assessment tools should be used to find the best fit individual for the intended job role. In addition, Jansen and Kristof-Brown (2006) discuss the importance of skill-based job training during employees’ socialization process to strategically develop a greater perceived job congruence among employees. When organizations actively work to hire and develop individuals to be the best match in their respective job roles, less job burnout and turnover will result.

**Future Directions**

Results from the current study supplement work from prior scholars in the area of job burnout and the discipline of sport management. However, future research is needed in this area to continue to explore the factors that impact job burnout and turnover and related variables
among academic support professionals. Additionally, multilevel analysis approaches to understanding job fit are warranted.

Maslach et al. (2012) have discussed how job burnout is a social phenomenon that impacts individuals imbedded in larger work environments. For example, Swider and Zimmerman (2010) found relationships between certain personality traits and job burnout. Specifically, as it related to sport, Schaffran et al. (2016) found collegiate coaches who have perfectionism-related personalities have increased chances of experiencing job burnout. Personal and contextual investigation is needed to further explore how personality and individual characteristics impact job burnout among specific populations within athletic departments.

Future research is needed to continue to explore job mismatches and how they impact burnout and turnover. The two factors of community and values were not studied in the current study and warrant further investigation. Additionally, job control match, fairness match, rewards match, and workload match all provide avenues for further investigation. For example, in what specific ways do academic advisors and learning specialists feel a lack of control in their jobs? Additional research is needed to explore how current advising practices and job control as it pertains to NCAA and institutional standards may lend to a lack of job control and further, job burnout. Further, as mentioned above it has been found that increasing a greater job match in the area of job control can lead to a greater match in all other areas (fairness, rewards, workload, community, values). Further research could examine how job control directly leads to greater matches in these other areas specifically among this population of academic support providers. Scholars interested in this area could also seek to understand how leadership impacts employee job control. For example, do different leadership styles (e.g., athletic directors and unit supervisors) impact job control match differently than others?
Further investigation on how age impacts burnout among support professionals is another avenue to study. For example, do individuals who are the same age but enter the profession at different points in their careers experience depersonalization differently? Could there be a cut-off point that once you work a certain amount of years to “get over the hump” job burnout decreases? While the literature suggests that job burnout is a result of chronic work stress that develops over time, older participants working in academic support roles in the current study were found to have less job burnout compared to younger individuals. There is something unique about older individuals who seem to be preserving in this profession and warrants further investigation for how and why they do not feel the effects of job burnout.

One finding that impacted turnover intentions was job content plateau and hierarchical job plateau. In relation to job plateauing, additional research investigating this area could examine career adaptability. Career adaptability is how an individual makes his or her current job work for them (Jiang, 2016). For example, scholars have found the more that individuals encompass characteristics of career adaptability, the greater perceived job fit and lower turnover intention individuals have (Jiang, 2016; Shabeer, Mohammed, Jawahar, & Bilal, 2018). In order to strategically help employees, develop career adaptability, supervisors should be encouraged to have open dialogue with his or her employees.

Additional research is needed to understand how academic support professionals’ emotional exhaustion may be impacted by his or her peers in the work setting. Could low energy among coworkers be an additional cause for higher amounts of emotional exhaustion and vary by institution? Current research finds that athletic department employees have a relationship with workaholism (Taylor et al., 2019). More research is needed to identify additional factors and relationships among those factors that relate to emotional exhaustion.
As discussed in the review of literature, job burnout research has turned to a positive psychology approach. This approach focuses on employee building work engagement rather than decreasing job burnout. Solution-based models could be investigated in order for additional practical implications to emerge from which athletic directors could benefit. Coping strategies is another area of research in which applying a positive psychology lens could help combat work stress and develop greater job alignment among academic support professionals. For example, Charoensukmongkol (2013) found that mindfulness meditation practices of employees in human services professions can act to decrease levels of job burnout. Further, in Halbesleben and Buckley’s (2004) review on job burnout, the authors highlight a need for future research to focus on intervention-based research to combat the workplace stress and the phenomenon of job burnout.

This study had an interesting finding related to the outcome of depersonalization and turnover intentions differing by gender. Males are unique in the profession of working in academic support units as they were impacted more than females by these two outcomes. Further research is needed to examine how male and females differ in their career and job expectations. Could there be different coping strategies to keep males in the profession based on these findings? Future research is warranted to further understand how social characteristics impact job burnout and turnover.

Another future direction is to explore differences based on experience and job training for the profession. For example, a little over half of the participants in the current study (53.5%) were former college student-athletes. Student-athletes oftentimes understand the schedules and time management skills needed to work with college athletic teams at a competitive level. Do advisors and learning specialists who were former college athletes handle heightened workloads
to a greater extent than those who were non-athletes? Future research is needed to explore the nuances between these two groups.

Additionally, further research to identify differences across conference alignment and institutional type is needed. For example, does job congruence differ based upon mid-major athletic programs compared to Power five programs? Mid-major programs often have similar high academic and athletic expectations of its student-athletes, while often times lack similar resources to Power Five institutions. Another difference that needs to be further explored is on academic support professionals who work with revenue generating sports of basketball and football. Participants in Rubin and Moreno-Pardo’s (2018) study mentioned the pressure working with high profile teams and coaches, while Ridpath (2010) suggests revenue generating sport athletes have different academic needs.

Conclusion

On average, participants in the current study experienced what Leiter and Maslach (2016) refer to in the job burnout literature as *overextended*. Employees who are overextended experience higher levels of emotional exhaustion compared to depersonalization. It was the goal of the current study to allow findings to guide the researcher to make practical suggestions about how athletic departments can begin to make systematic changes to the work environment. The current study did so by investigating the job factors in the work environment that lead to the development of chronic work stress and ultimately job burnout. The job factors of control match, rewards match, and workload match were all found to have a statistically significant impact on greater levels of experienced emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Ultimately, athletic administrators should address these mismatches in job control match, rewards match, and workload match to decrease employees’ chronic work stress, burnout, and turnover. While this
study was exploratory in nature, it serves as a great starting point for further investigation of not only job factors but the application of the PE fit framework as they relate to job burnout.

Employee absenteeism, decreased work production, and higher rates of employee turnover have all been found to be related to job burnout (Maslach et al., 2001). Since the current study found that emotional exhaustion was a significant predictor of participants’ intentions to leave his or her current role, administrators should be concerned about his or her employee well-being and the organization’s bottom line. Ultimately, these factors cost organizations a large amount of money as a result of rising health care coverage and time and money it takes to hire, train, and retain new employees.

As Maslach et al., (2012) suggest, one way to reduce burnout is to identify the mismatches in the workplace that impact job burnout. This dissertation provided an opportunity to address areas in the work environment where additional resources are needed to boost employee work engagement and reduce burnout. Ultimately, changes need to be made in order for athletic departments to retain passionate athletic academic support professionals who flourish in his or her careers.
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Appendix A

**Job Content Plateau**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I expect to be constantly challenged in my job in the future. [R]
2. I will learn and grow a lot in my job. [R]
3. My job tasks and activities will become routine for me in the future.
4. My job responsibilities will increase significantly in the future. [R]
5. My job will continually require me to extend my abilities and knowledge. [R]
6. I will be challenged in my job. [R]

**Hierarchical Job Plateau**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My opportunities for upward movement are limited at my present organization.
2. I expect to be promoted frequently in the future in my organization.
3. I have reached a point where I do not expect to move much higher in my organization.
4. The likelihood that I will get ahead in my organization is limited.
5. I am unlikely to obtain a much higher job title in my organization.
6. I expect to advance to a higher level in the near future at my organization. [R]
### Appendix B

#### Turnover Intention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In the next few months I intent to leave this organization.
2. In the next few years I intent to leave this organization.
3. I occasionally think about leaving this organization.
4. I’d like to work in this organization until I reach retirement age. [R]
Appendix C
Visual Regression Diagnostic Tests for Emotional Exhaustion

1. Normality of Residuals

![Histogram for distribution of residuals](image)

**Kernal density plot**

**Normal probability plot**

2. Homoscedasticity and Linearity

![rvf plot](image)

3. Multicollinearity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>1/VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yearsinprof</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.409489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.412798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.645865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.652532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness1</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.742376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.882862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male1</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.944515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>allcob1</th>
<th>allcob-1</th>
<th>all-lin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>-0.1650</td>
<td>-0.1191</td>
<td>-0.2522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yearsinprof</td>
<td>0.1022</td>
<td>0.1021</td>
<td>0.1031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0.0921</td>
<td>0.0409</td>
<td>0.2544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>0.1467</td>
<td>0.1439</td>
<td>0.1461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness1</td>
<td>0.6917</td>
<td>0.4508</td>
<td>0.9212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>-2.3386</td>
<td>-1.3217</td>
<td>-1.2922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.9667</td>
<td>-0.9923</td>
<td>-1.0787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>0.2746</td>
<td>0.2710</td>
<td>0.2671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Regression Outliers

![Cook's D](image)

**Sensitivity check for outliers. Top line is slope and bottom line are the standard errors.**
Appendix D

Visual Regression Diagnostic Tests for Depersonalization

3. Normality of Residuals

Histogram for distribution of residuals

Kernel density plot

Normal probability plot

4. Homoscedasticity and Linearity

rvf plot

3. Multicollinearity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>1/VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yearsinprof</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.409489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.412798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.645865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.652532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness1</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.742376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.882662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.944515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean VIF</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Regression Outliers

Cook’s distance scatterplot for values above .0163

Sensitivity check for outliers. Top line is slope and bottom line are the standard errors.
Appendix E  
Visual Regression Diagnostic Tests for Turnover Intention

1. Normality of Residuals

![Histogram for distribution of residuals](image1)

2. Homoscedasticity and Linearity

![Kernal density plot](image2)

3. Multicollinearity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>1/VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.359785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yearsinprof</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.38067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmotionalE-n</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.423544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonal-n</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.424512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchia-u</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.696521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobContent-u</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.789506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malel</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.932100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean VIF = 1.99

4. Regression Outliers

![Cook’s distance scatterplot for values above .0163.](image3)

Sensitivity check for outliers. Top line is slope and bottom line are the standard errors.