

Author: Scheffen, Kelly A.

Title: *How Job Satisfaction Relates to Job Burnout & Work Engagement for Non-Tenure Track Faculty*

The accompanying research report is submitted to the University of Wisconsin-Stout, Graduate School in partial completion of the requirements for the

Graduate Degree/ Major: MS Degree Applied Psychology

Research Advisor: Sarah Wood, Ph.D.

Submission Term/Year: Spring 2021

Number of Pages: 39

Style Manual Used: American Psychological Association, 6th edition

- I have adhered to the Graduate School Research Guide and have proofread my work.
 I understand that this research report must be officially approved by the Graduate School. **Additionally, by signing and submitting this form, I (the author(s) or copyright owner) grant the University of Wisconsin-Stout the non-exclusive right to reproduce, translate, and/or distribute this submission (including abstract) worldwide in print and electronic format and in any medium, including but not limited to audio or video. If my research includes proprietary information, an agreement has been made between myself, the company, and the University to submit a thesis that meets course-specific learning outcomes and CAN be published. There will be no exceptions to this permission.**
 I attest that the research report is my original work (that any copyrightable materials have been used with the permission of the original authors), and as such, it is automatically protected by the laws, rules, and regulations of the U.S. Copyright Office.
 My research advisor has approved the content and quality of this paper.

STUDENT:

NAME: Kelly Scheffen

DATE: 1/25/2021

ADVISOR: (Committee Chair if MS Plan A or EdS Thesis or Field Project/Problem):

NAME: Sarah Wood

DATE: 1/25/2021

This section for MS Plan A Thesis or EdS Thesis/Field Project papers only

Committee members (other than your advisor who is listed in the section above)

1. **CMTE MEMBER'S NAME:** Libby Smith **DATE:**
2. **CMTE MEMBER'S NAME:** Marya Wilson **DATE:**
3. **CMTE MEMBER'S NAME:** **DATE:**

This section to be completed by the Graduate School

This final research report has been approved by the Graduate School.

Director, Office of Graduate Studies:

DATE:

Scheffen, Kelly A. *How Job Satisfaction Relates to Job Burnout & Work Engagement for Non-Tenure Track Faculty*

Abstract

This study measured how job satisfaction relates to job burnout and work engagement for university non-tenure track faculty (NTTF). The study used the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) to measure how overall job satisfaction correlated to overall job burnout and the dimensions of job burnout (Disengagement and Exhaustion) according to the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI). This study also used the JSS to measure how overall job satisfaction correlated to overall work engagement and the dimensions of work engagement (Vigor, Dedication, and Absorption) according to the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES). Sixty-three NTTF chose to participate in this study. Multiple Pearson's R correlations were ran and significant results were found. Overall job satisfaction was found to be negatively correlated to overall job burnout and both its two dimensions. And job satisfaction was found to be positively correlated to overall work engagement and all three dimensions of work engagement.

Acknowledgments

Thank you to my thesis advisor Sarah Wood, for joining this project and sticking by me throughout this long process. Also thank you to Libby Smith for helping this project through its multiple pitfalls. And thank you to Marya Wilson for the positive energy and knowledge you brought to this project. Without all of your help this would never have been completed.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Chapter I: Introduction.....	6
Purpose of the Study	6
Job Burnout.....	7
Work Engagement	10
Job Satisfaction	11
Job Satisfaction, Job Burnout, and Work Engagement.....	12
Chapter II: Methodology.....	16
Participants.....	16
Instrumentation	16
Job Satisfaction	16
Job Burnout.....	17
Work Engagement.....	17
Data Collection Procedures.....	18
Chapter III: Results	20
Demographics	20
Survey Scoring.....	22
Research Questions.....	22
Chapter IV: Discussion, Conclusion, Limitations and Recommendations.....	24
Conclusions.....	27
Limitations	27
Recommendations.....	28

References.....	30
Appendix A: Job Satisfaction Survey.....	36
Appendix B: Oldenburg Burnout Inventory.....	38
Appendix C: Shortened English Version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale.....	39

Chapter I: Introduction

Job burnout and work engagement have been studied extensively and much is already known about these two constructs. Specifically, high levels of burnout have been associated with higher depression levels, higher turnover levels, and lower self-reported faculty teaching ability (Hätinen, Kinnunen, Pekkonen, & Aro, 2004; Lackritz, 2004; Zhang & Feng, 2011). And high work engagement levels have been associated with higher self-reported levels of thriving at work, higher levels of quality of care, and greater general health (Freeney & Fellenz, 2013; van der Walt, 2018). While both of these constructs have been studied across diverse populations, research suggests that exploring the links between these constructs and job satisfaction in additional unique populations is needed (Brewer & Clippard, 2002; Prosser et al., 1997; Yan, Su, Wen, & Luo, 2017; Zhang & Feng, 2011). One unique population that could benefit from further research is non-tenure track university faculty (NTTF). Non-tenure track faculty face some unique challenges. Tenure-track faculty typically have relatively higher job security and their job tasks consist of a mixture of teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities. Non-tenure track faculty are typically hired on when needed, often with short notice, and they will generally be exclusively focused on teaching. NTTF currently make up over half of the state funded faculty in the United States (Curtis & Thornton, 2013; Fagan-Wilen, Springer, Ambrosino, & White, 2006; Kezar & Maxey, 2013). Understanding how job burnout and work engagement relate to job satisfaction in this population is important as it may highlight the need to work towards improving NTTF job satisfaction levels.

Purpose of the Study

With NTTF currently making up over half of the state funded faculty throughout the United States, it is important to know what factors could be affecting NTTF's professional and

personal lives (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). While NTTF positions can vary greatly, some NTTF are negatively affected by inconsistent workloads, low pay, and poor healthcare (Hsu & Waldman, 2019) Despite these negative aspects of their jobs, NTTF often stay employed in the educational field because of their love for teaching. Previous research shows NTTF may differ from other career fields on job measures while also highlighting the importance of measuring the job satisfaction and job burnout relationship for unique populations (Brewer & Clippard, 2002; Kezar & Sam, 2011). This study examined the relationships between overall job satisfaction, overall job burnout, and overall work engagement among NTTF. In addition, the relationships between overall job satisfaction and the individual dimensions of job burnout as measured by the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) and the dimensions of work engagement as measured by the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) were explored. How these results relate to and may affect non-tenure track university faculty specifically are discussed. Finally, the difficulty of measuring NTTF on job measures will also be discussed.

Job Burnout

Employees suffering from high levels of burnout are exhausted and hold negative attitudes towards their work (Demerouti, Mostert, & Bakker, 2010). Burnout has been shown to affect people both personally and professionally. Job burnout affects employees' levels of depression, stress, and has a direct negative effect on measures of quality of life (Hätinen et al., 2004; Prosser et al., 1997). Also, a meta-analysis by Kahill (1988) found that previous research shows burnout relating to a large number of physical health issues including gastro-intestinal problems, sleeping issues, back pain, headaches, physical exhaustion, substance abuse, and an increased number of colds. High job burnout has also been shown to negatively affect employees work by producing more turnover, lowering job commitment, lowering self-reported job

performance, and raising absenteeism (Enginyurt et al., 2016; Kahill, 1988; Lackritz, 2004; Zhang & Feng, 2011).

Burnout was originally identified by Freudenberger (1974), who found exhaustion occurring in positions where excessive demands were placed on employees. The construct of burnout was then expanded to cover the emotional exhaustion and cynicism that employees experience when working with other people. Believing that burnout only occurred in the human services fields, Maslach and Jackson (1981) developed a scale called the Maslach-Burnout Inventory (MBI) to measure job burnout specifically for human services employees. Later the MBI General Survey (MBI-GS) was created for use outside of the human services fields. Both measures are currently the most widely used measures of job burnout and both contain three dimensions. The first of the three dimensions in the MBI is emotional exhaustion or the draining of emotional resources caused by contact with others. The second dimension is depersonalization or the employee holding a negative attitude towards those helped by their own services. And the last dimension is personal accomplishment or employees viewing their work with people negatively (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). The third dimension of burnout in the MBI, personal accomplishment, was found to be weakly associated ($< \pm .30$) with the other dimensions of job burnout, leading some researchers to exclude personal accomplishment entirely (Demerouti et al., 2010; Hultell & Gustavsson, 2011).

While the MBI and MBI-GS are still commonly used scales for measuring burnout, a more recent measure of job burnout, the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) was designed by Demerouti et al. (2010). OLBI uses only two dimensions, the first being *exhaustion*, or employee's physical, affective and cognitive strain caused by extended exposure to various tasks at work. (Demerouti et al., 2010). And in place of the MBI dimension of depersonalization, the

OBLI uses *disengagement*. Disengagement is when employees distance themselves from their work and decreased willingness to keep working in a job (Demerouti et al., 2010). OBLI has an advantage over the MBI & MBI-GS as it uses both negatively and positively worded questions that force survey takers to read and respond more carefully to the items (Demerouti & Bakker, 2007).

Multiple factors have been shown to affect job burnout levels. People with jobs in the teaching and medical fields that require constant social interaction with others are significantly more likely to report being affected by burnout syndrome (Gökçen et al., 2013; Russell, Altmaier, & Van Velzen, 1987). Like teachers, it might be expected that NTTF would also have high levels of burnout due to their high amounts of social interactions with students; however, multiple findings show the opposite. In a study measuring burnout and the factors that affect burnout for university faculty, Lackritz (2004) found burnout to be about half as common for university faculty compared to what would be expected in corporate American work. Also, burnout was found to be higher for tenured and tenure-track employees when compared to NTTF. In other words, even though NTTF may experience stress related to relatively less job security, at least some research suggests they do not experience high levels of burnout. Teaching load, time grading and number of office hours available were all factors found to be directly related to job burnout among university faculty (Lackritz, 2004). These findings suggest that burnout levels for university faculty are not as influenced through social interactions as burnout levels would be for similar professions, like teachers. Previous research highlights how NTTF may differ on job measures when compared to other similar career fields and the need for further research on NTTF's levels of job burnout.

Work Engagement

NTTF have been shown to have lower than expected levels of job burnout, as a result researching NTTF's situation from a positive perspective may better align with how NTTF view their current job when compared to measuring this situation as a negative. Work engagement is identified as a positive and fulfilling feeling employees may hold about their work (Demerouti et al., 2010). While work engagement was originally just measured as the opposite of burnout, Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, and Bakker (2002) argue that work engagement cannot be determined by just measuring the opposite scores of the MBI, as participant's answers to negatively worded items don't always agree with their answers to positively worded items. To address this, a new scale for work engagement was developed by Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) called the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES). Work engagement as defined by the UWES is made up of three dimensions. The first dimension is *dedication*, or how eager an employee is to work and the level of pride the employee has in their work. (Demerouti et al., 2010). The second dimension is *vigor* or willingness to invest large amounts of effort and concentration in work (Demerouti et al., 2010). And the final dimension is *absorption* or employees being highly immersed in their work to the point that time feels as though it is passing quickly (Schaufeli et al., 2002).

The construct of work engagement as described currently through the UWES is relatively new. Because of this, more research on how work engagement relates to different constructs and how work engagement affects various populations still needs to be studied. Current research shows that work engagement relates to a few positive characteristics. Specifically, work engagement was found to be positively related to self-reported levels of thriving at work, to be a significant partial mediator between supervisor support and quality of care among doctors, and

positively related to levels of self-reported general health (Freeney & Fellenz, 2013; van der Walt, 2018). It is expected that NTTF would have high levels of work engagement given their low levels of job burnout, but currently no research has been conducted measuring work engagement levels for NTTF.

Job Satisfaction

When compared to job burnout and work engagement research on NTTF, a large amount of research has been conducted on NTTF's job satisfaction levels. Currently there are still debates on the definition and the content of the construct of job satisfaction, but job satisfaction is commonly referred to as the emotional reaction an employee has towards their job (Spector 1985). Job satisfaction has been highly researched because of the relationships job satisfaction has with other important constructs. For example, job satisfaction is found to be significantly related to employees' intentions to quit their current job, perceived physical health, perceived mental health, and absenteeism (Gustainiene & Endriulaitiene, 2009; Hom, Caranikas-Walker, Prussia, & Griffeth, 1992; Schaumberg & Flynn, 2017; Swider, Boswell, & Zimmerman, 2011).

While job satisfaction overall has been extensively studied, the factors that have shown to affect an employee's job satisfaction level may vary greatly from job to job (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001; Spector, 1985). However, a few general relationships of job satisfaction have been researched. Bozeman and Gaughan (2011) state that freedom to choose how to conduct work, proper peer and supervisor recognition, proper free time to spend at home, and fair pay are all factors that lead to high job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is found to be higher when employees have more prestigious occupations and are working in higher paying positions (Smith, 2007). Possibly because of these factors, past research has shown higher job satisfaction when compared to other office jobs for both tenure-

track and non-tenure track university faculty (Reevy & Deason, 2014). Waltman, Bergom, Hollenshead, Miller, and August (2012) found that for NTTF, working with students and having a higher level of career flexibility are factors positively related to job satisfaction. While NTTF's job satisfaction remains high, research attempting to measure what may be negatively affecting job satisfaction for NTTF found that job satisfaction is reduced by the stress and fear of having less job stability, lack of opportunities for career advancement, unclear employment policies, and lack of respect from colleagues (Feldman & Turnley, 2001; Waltman et al., 2012).

Job Satisfaction, Job Burnout, and Work Engagement

Multiple studies show job satisfaction significantly relating to job burnout (Brewer & Clippard, 2002; Kumar, 2015; Prosser et al., 1997). Also, many factors have been shown to affect both job satisfaction and job burnout. Aspects of a job like perceived social support from their supervisor, perceived social support from peers, and perceived levels of stress are all factors that affect both burnout and job satisfaction (Russell, Altmaier & Van Velzen, 1987; Fagan-Wilen et al., 2006). And in teaching professions, higher workloads as well as social support from colleagues and supervisors have shown to relate to both levels of job satisfaction and job burnout (Hultell & Gustavsson, 2011).

Previous research points to at least two possible reasons for the job satisfaction/job burnout relationship. It's possible that as employees were suffering the effects of job burnout, their perceived satisfaction for their job reduced. It is also possible that multiple variables such as education level and feeling respect from other employees may be affecting both variables (Brewer & Clippard, 2002). Previous research on NTTF points to the latter as NTTF are found to have high job satisfaction and low job burnout, possibly thanks to their education level and respect felt from others outside of their career field (Lackritz, 2004; Reevy & Deason, 2014).

One problem is that this relationship is rarely measured for university faculty. This study will measure job satisfaction and job burnout to determine whether these constructs are related for NTTF. Previous research using different populations showed job satisfaction was negatively related to job burnout (Brewer & Clippard, 2002; Kumar, 2015; Prosser et al., 1997). For this study, it was hypothesized that for NTTF, overall job satisfaction will be negatively correlated with job burnout (Hypothesis 1).

Additionally, this study aimed to measure how job satisfaction relates to the individual job burnout dimensions. Multiple studies have measured the relationship between overall job satisfaction and the individual dimensions of burnout according to the MBI; exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Job satisfaction was negatively related with emotional exhaustion and positively related with personal accomplishment (Brewer & Clippard, 2002; Kumar, 2015). It's possible that more exhausted employees tend to carry more negative feelings about their work. These same studies have found no significant relationship with overall job satisfaction and depersonalization (Brewer & Clippard, 2002; Kumar, 2015; Prosser et al., 1997). It's possible that there is no relationship between job satisfaction and depersonalization because even as employees lose satisfaction in their jobs, they are still able to relate to the people they serve. Emotional exhaustion and depersonalization are still seen as the key dimensions of job burnout. They are measured using the OBLI, with depersonalization being measured through the dimension of disengagement (Demerouti et al., 2010).

This study measured job satisfaction and the job burnout dimensions of exhaustion and disengagement to determine whether these constructs are related for NTTF. It was predicted that emotional exhaustion will negatively correlate to overall job satisfaction (Hypothesis 2). And it

was predicted that disengagement will not significantly correlate to overall job satisfaction (Hypothesis 3).

Due to NTTF having high levels of job satisfaction and low levels of job burnout, a positive perspective gained by measuring NTTF's work engagement levels may more accurately define NTTF's situation when compared to just measuring job burnout. Multiple studies show a strong correlation with work engagement and job satisfaction (Alarcon & Lyons, 2011; Lu, Lu, Gursoy, & Neale, 2016). The correlation has shown to be so strong that it has been argued that work engagement is the same construct as job satisfaction. But research has shown that although they are related, the constructs of work engagement and job satisfaction are two separate constructs (Alarcon & Lyons, 2011; Lu et al., 2016; Yan et al., 2017). It's possible that as employees become more engaged and as health improves, job satisfaction levels also increase. This study examined the relationship between job satisfaction and work engagement amongst NTTF. In this study it was hypothesized that overall job satisfaction will positively correlate to overall work engagement (Hypothesis 4).

And finally, this study aimed to measure how job satisfaction relates to the individual work engagement dimensions according to the UWES; vigor, dedication, and absorption. Previous research found that while all three of the dimensions of work engagement had a significant relationship with job satisfaction, it's the dimension of dedication that most predominantly relates to job satisfaction when compared to vigor and absorption (Lu et al., 2016). Currently the exact cause and effect relationship of these variables is unknown but there are a few possible reasons why these relationships occur. For the job satisfaction/dedication relationship, it seems possible that as job satisfaction increases employees become more eager to go to work. What may be more beneficial to organizations is the job satisfaction/vigor

relationship; this relationship possibly suggests that as job satisfaction increases so does an employee's concentration and effort spent towards work. And for the job satisfaction/absorption relationship, it's possible that either high job satisfaction leads to more employees becoming absorbed in their work, or that employees who find themselves more absorbed in their work tend to be more satisfied with their jobs. For this study, it was hypothesized that dedication will positively correlate to overall job satisfaction (Hypothesis 5). It was also hypothesized that vigor will positively correlate to overall job satisfaction (Hypothesis 6). And it was predicted that absorption will positively correlate to overall job satisfaction (Hypothesis 7).

Chapter II: Methodology

This study focused on non-tenure track university faculty (NTTF). NTTF participants were measured on levels of job satisfaction, job burnout, and work engagement. The surveys were distributed through email and Amazon's M-Turk program.

Participants

Non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) from various English-speaking universities were given the opportunity to participate in this study. The first sample of NTTF were gathered by using a snowball method, participants were either emailed an online survey or viewed the online survey that was posted on social media. Participants were asked to send the survey to other NTTF participants. However, only a few NTTF participants were willing to participate in this study when using this method. Participants were then also collected through Amazon's M-turk survey hosting service. The survey specifically asked for NTTF and a limitation was added to the service so that the survey was only visible for participants holding a graduate degree. Participants were given a dollar for participating in the survey when taking the survey through M-turk.

Instrumentation

To measure job satisfaction, job burnout, and work engagement; three scales were used for this study. All the measures combined included 61 items for participants to answer. Each scale required different methods for overall score calculation.

Job satisfaction. The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS; Spector, 1985) was used to assess overall levels of Job Satisfaction (See Appendix A). The JSS was made up of 36 positively and negatively worded items broken up into 9 subscales of job satisfaction. Negatively worded items will be reversed, then multiple scores will be calculated. First, a score for each subscale was

created by adding up ratings for the items in each subscale. Second, an overall job satisfaction score was created by adding the score of all items. In the case of missing item scores, the item's score was replaced with the mean score made up from the other item scores in the same subscale. This was done because the scores would otherwise be added improperly (less than expected) with missing values.

Job burnout. The English translated version of the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI; Demerouti et al., 2010) was used to measure overall job burnout and was also used to measure the two dimensions of job burnout according to the OLBI, Disengagement and Exhaustion (See Appendix B). The OLBI was made of 16 items in total where participants were asked how much they agree or disagree with each item on a four-point scale. Both Disengagement and Exhaustion contained 8 items with 4 of those items being negatively worded and the other 4 being positively worded. To match the direction of both the JSS and the UWES-9, the answers were displayed in reverse order. Making a 1 on the four-point scale equal to “strongly disagree” and a 4 equal to “strongly agree”. After reverse coding the negatively worded items, the participant's scores on disengagement, exhaustion, and overall levels of job burnout were calculated by finding the mean of the items related to each construct with overall job burnout equaling the mean of all the items.

Work engagement. To measure work engagement the shortened English version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003) was used (See Appendix C). The shortened version was used to help reduce the total number of survey items so respondents did not get fatigued. The UWES-9 was made up of 9 items with 3 items to cover each dimension of work engagement: vigor, dedication, and absorption. Each item asked the participant how frequently they experience a given feeling, with answers ranging from 0 (Never)

to 6 (Every day). The participant's scores on vigor, dedication, absorption and overall levels of work engagement were calculated by finding the mean of the items related to each construct with overall work engagement equaling the mean of all the items.

Data Collection Procedures

All of the instruments used were grouped together into one online Qualtrics survey that was emailed to participants through snowball sampling and the survey was posted on Amazon's M-turk program. The snowball method consisted of the survey being first sent to three professors at a Midwest university and then was asked to be passed on to their peers. Upon starting the survey participants were told the purpose of this study and were told that by proceeding to take the survey they were consenting to conduct in this study. On this screen it was made known to participants that they were free to leave the study at any time. Participants were asked to complete the following instruments in random order; the JSS, OLBI, UWES-9. Participants were thanked and told the researchers contact information after completing the survey.

Overall, it was a challenge gathering NTTF participants for this study. This study used multiple convenient methods of collecting NTTF participants that consisted of both snowball sampling and the use a survey hosting system. The first of these methods started through email as three Midwest professors spread the survey to the NTTF in their social links while also having the survey posted on a professor's LinkedIn and Facebook account. The survey posted on the LinkedIn account was viewed over 300 times. After two months, only 12 participants attempted to take the survey. With the low number of participants, Amazons M-turk survey hosting system was used. During the first two months of using M-turk, two limitations were used to make the survey only visible for college level faculty. Participants needed to be holding both a US graduate degree and have a job in the education industry. No responses were collected during

this time span. The survey was then again posted on M-turk but this time only with the US graduate degree limitation. While not every response was a NTTF participant, this method found the largest amount of NTTF participants yet. However, this study was still only able to collect a relatively small number of participants.

One possible explanation for the increased difficulty of obtaining NTTF participants could be related to a fear of retaliation. NTTF suffer from a low level of job security and multiple lawsuits over NTTF being fired when speaking up about their working conditions have been filed in the past. When measuring the levels of job burnout across all university faculty, Lackritz (2004) found over 58% of the participants came from the tenure track. While Lackritz (2004) didn't mention the percentage of tenure and non-tenure track faculty at the university they measured, a smaller percentage of NTTF participated when compared to the national average (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). The inability to provide safe spaces for NTTF to speak openly about their jobs could be leading to difficulties of showing an accurate description of the problems facing NTTF. Future research in safe environments is needed to best describe how NTTF may be affected by job measures like job burnout.

Chapter III: Results

This study focused on NTTF but some of those who choose to conduct the survey were on the tenure track. Those tenure track participants were excluded from the analysis. For the NTTF in this study, multiple demographic questions were analyzed. The surveys were reverse coded when needed and the survey scores were calculated.

Demographics

Overall, 127 participants started or attempted to take the survey. While the survey was specifically looking for non-tenure track college level faculty (NTTF), 21 of the participants who started the survey were not college level faculty, 41 of the participants were on the tenure track, and 65 of the participants were non-tenure track college level faculty. Two of the NTTF participants completed the survey in under one minute. It is believed that they didn't read or fully comprehend the items due to how fast they completed the survey, so they were removed from the data analysis. This left the final sample size of NTTF at 63 participants. Overall, the average time participants spent on the survey was just under 7 minutes.

The survey was distributed multiple times throughout 2019 and 2020. The first 12 participants were gathered through email in the fall of 2019 (8/15/19 - 9/23/19), then 56 participants were collected in late February (2/24/20 - 3/2/20), and the final 59 participants were collected in Spring of 2020 (4/25/20 - 5/3/20). During the time of data collection, the United States with the rest of the world was affected by the Covid-19 pandemic. This caused some universities to close or teach online for the remainder of the semester. To see if these changes had a possible effect on the participants, one-way ANOVA's were run on the participants pre (8/15/19-3/2/20) and post pandemic (4/25/20 - 5/3/20) ($p < .05$ level). No significant differences in overall job satisfaction [$F(1, 61) = 0.55, p = 0.461$], overall job burnout [$F(1, 61) = 0.01, p =$

0.975], and overall work engagement [$F(1, 61) = 0.24, p = 0.624$] were found. There was 37 pre-pandemic responses and 26 post-pandemic responses. It is worth noting that there is likely a lack of power due to the small and unbalanced sample sizes of the pre-pandemic and post-pandemic groups.

When it comes to describing the NTTF who attempted to take the survey, the majority of participants only worked for one institution with only thirty two percent of participants working at multiple institutions (see Table 1). The majority of participants in this study taught more than six credits on average. And the majority of participants in this study were employed at a private institution.

Table 1

Descriptive Table

Question	Answer	Responses	Percentages
What are the average number of credits you teach each semester?	Under 3 Credits	4	6%
	3 or More Credits	23	37%
	6 or More Credits	19	30%
	9 or More Credits	8	13%
	12 or More Credits	9	14%
Do you work at one or multiple institutions?	One Institution	43	68%
	Multiple Institutions	20	32%
What type of institution/s do you currently work at?	Type	26	41%
	Type	32	51%
	Both	5	8%

Survey Scoring

Job satisfaction was measured using the Job Satisfaction Survey. Negatively worded items were reverse coded and then an overall job satisfaction score was created by adding the score of all items. In the case of missing item scores, the item's score was replaced with the mean score made up from the other item scores in the same subscale. This was done because the scores would otherwise be added improperly with missing values. For NTTF, the mean job satisfaction score was 131.68 ($SD = 24.25$). Spector (2020) shows that this is just slightly lower than the average found in other career fields, with the US total average at 138.0 ($SD = 21.6$).

Job burnout was measured using Oldenburg Burnout Inventory. For this survey, the answers were written in reverse order to match the other questionnaires used in this study. After being reverse coded the means for job burnout and its dimensions for the NTTF participants are as follows; emotional exhaustion ($M = 2.36, SD = 0.53$), disengagement ($M = 2.36, SD = 0.49$), and overall job burnout ($M = 2.36, SD = 0.49$).

Work engagement was measured using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. The mean scores for work engagement and the individual dimensions of work engagement for NTTF are as follows; overall work engagement ($M = 3.93, SD = 1.24$), Dedication ($M = 4.15, SD = 1.37$), Vigor ($M = 3.68, SD = 1.46$), and Absorption ($M = 3.97, SD = 1.12$). These are all seen as “average” scores according to Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) as all these scores fall into the 25th and 75th percentile of their average scores collected on the US population.

Research Questions

To test all seven hypotheses, Pearson's R correlations were ran to measure the relationships between overall job satisfaction, overall job burnout, disengagement, exhaustion, overall work engagement, vigor, dedication, and absorption. The first hypothesis, overall job

satisfaction will be negatively correlated with job burnout, was supported. A significant negative correlation was found between overall job satisfaction and job burnout, $r(61) = -0.76, p = 0.001$. The second hypothesis, emotional exhaustion will negatively correlate to overall job satisfaction, was supported. A significant negative correlation was found between overall job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion, $r(61) = -0.66, p = 0.001$. And the third hypothesis, disengagement will not significantly correlate to overall job satisfaction, was not supported. A significant negative correlation was found between overall job satisfaction and disengagement, $r(61) = -0.73, p = 0.001$.

This study also examined the relationship between job satisfaction and work engagement. The fourth hypothesis, overall job satisfaction will positively correlate to overall work engagement, was supported. A significant positive correlation was found between overall job satisfaction and overall work engagement, $r(61) = 0.46, p = 0.001$. The fifth hypothesis, dedication will positively correlate to overall job satisfaction, was supported. A significant positive correlation was found between overall job satisfaction and dedication, $r(61) = 0.41, p = 0.001$. The sixth hypothesis, vigor will positively correlate to overall job satisfaction, was supported. A significant positive correlation was found between overall job satisfaction and vigor, $r(61) = 0.44, p = 0.001$. And the final hypothesis, absorption will positively correlate to overall job satisfaction, was supported. A significant positive correlation was found between overall job satisfaction and absorption, $r(61) = 0.44, p = 0.001$.

Chapter IV: Discussion, Conclusion, Limitations and Recommendations

The job satisfaction and job burnout levels for non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) found in this research were higher than what Peterson, Demerouti, Bergstrom, Asberg, and Nygren (2008) and Spector (2020) have found for teachers and other employment fields in the United States. Only 16% of non-tenure track participants didn't show to be suffering from any of the dimensions of job burnout. These findings contradict what was found by Lackritz (2004) and Reevy & Deason (2014) where both studies showed high job satisfaction and low job burnout for NTTF. There are several reasons why the results of this study might be different. First, these previous studies had larger sample sizes. Second, a large amount of the data in this study was collected in the midst of a global pandemic that shifted many instructors to fully remote teaching with little to no time to prepare. In addition to worries about their own health, their family's health, and their students' health, university instructors of all types experienced an unprecedented ballooning of their workload virtually overnight. Future research should be done on this topic to determine whether these lower levels of satisfaction and higher levels of burnout are persistent problems or whether they were affected by the pandemic.

While job burnout levels were higher than what was shown in previous research, work engagement levels were still considered average. This finding could help show the importance of positively worded items in questionnaires and show the effectiveness of positive psychology in workplace settings. The average score of overall work engagement for NTTF ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 1.24$) was still slightly higher than the average level of work engagement compared to the total US population ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 1.17$) (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003).

Outside of disengagement, the relationships between job satisfaction, job burnout, and work engagement largely match what was found in previous research. Agreeing with the first

hypothesis, overall job satisfaction was shown to negatively relate to overall levels of job burnout. This relationship was stronger than what was shown in previous research (Kumar, 2015). It may be possible that supervision is playing a role in this relationship. Of the facets measured by the JSS, supervision was the facet that differed the most when compared to the average US population. The average score for supervision among the NTTF in this study was 16.1, while the average score for the US according to Spector (2020) was 18.8. Supervisor recognition was also seen as one of the largest factors affecting overall job satisfaction (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011). This research highlights how important proper supervision may be for NTTF.

As proposed by hypothesis 2, higher job satisfaction scores were found to be negatively related to emotional exhaustion scores. For the NTTF measured in this study, the relationship between job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion was larger than what was found in previous research (Brewer & Clippard, 2002; Kumar, 2015). And different than the third hypothesis, job satisfaction was found to be negatively related to disengagement. Previous research found no significant relationship between job satisfaction and disengagement (Brewer & Clippard, 2002; Kumar, 2015; Prosser et al., 1997). One possible explanation for this difference is job security, since NTTF have little job security it may be possible that their levels of disengagement would be affected more by other aspects of their job, like job satisfaction. More research on how job security relates to job satisfaction and job burnout for NTTF needs to be conducted. This finding could be highlighting a greater importance for higher job satisfaction for NTTF, as job satisfaction has been shown to relate so strongly to disengagement for NTTF. NTTF becoming more disengaged in their work could lead to negative outcomes on students.

For the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh hypotheses, positive correlations were found between overall job satisfaction and overall work engagement, dedication, vigor, and absorption.

Differing from previous research by Lu et al. (2016) and Alarcon & Lyons (2011), the correlation coefficients for NTTF measured in this study were found to be almost half the strength of other population groups. With Lu et al. (2016) finding correlation coefficients of 0.80 (vigor), 0.83 (dedication), and 0.74 (absorption). One possible reason for this is again the low number of participants. But another possible explanation could be that in fields with more important social interactions with others, job satisfaction has less of a relationship with work engagement as employees feel a stronger social obligation to be more engaged due to their work having a direct effect on those who they are working with. This possibility is supported by Yan et al. (2017) who found nurses also had stronger relationships between job satisfaction and the dimensions of work engagement when compared to other career fields. Also, the positively worded items may have caused NTTF to answer the questions differently. This idea could also explain why the job burnout dimension of disengagement is more highly related to job satisfaction when compared to work engagement.

Unlike previous research, dedication was found to be the weakest correlation of the three work engagement dimensions. Job security of NTTF may be an outside factor that reduced the impact job satisfaction had on dedication, as it is possible employees may become less dedicated to their jobs that are not dedicated to them. Previous research showed that lower dedication helped reduce the negative affects job insecurity had on other factors such as negative family relationships (Ruokolainen, Mauno, & Cheng, 2014). And similarly, higher job commitment was found to lead to more stress, anxiety, and depression in NTTF (Reevy & Deason, 2014). More research on the effects of job security on the job satisfaction and dedication relationship needs to be conducted. Overall, this research shows why universities may want to look for methods of increasing NTTF's job satisfaction, as job satisfaction for NTTF has shown to relate to all the

dimensions of work engagement. This means that NTTF with higher levels of job satisfaction were shown to also have significantly higher levels of pride in their work (dedication), increased willingness to invest large amounts of effort in work (vigor), and were more immersed in their work (absorption).

Conclusions

Job Satisfaction was shown to negatively relate to job burnout and positively relate to work engagement for NTTF. This study shows that NTTF became more disengaged in their work and showed more emotional exhaustion as their job satisfaction levels decreased. The difference in the strength of the relationships between job satisfaction and job burnout in unique populations like NTTF suggest that the relationship may be affected by outside variables. More research needs to be conducted on different career fields to best learn what causes these relationships. Also, these results show how important it is to research the use of positive psychology when asking participants to describe their jobs as the relationship between job satisfaction and work engagement differed from the relationship between job satisfaction and job burnout.

Limitations

Asking NTTF about their job satisfaction, job burnout, and work engagement levels was not an easy task. The sample used in this study was not randomly selected but instead was chosen based on convenience. Due to how the sample was chosen, conclusions made from this study may not generalize to the overall population. The results of this study don't show a cause and effect relationship as there was no independent variable being manipulated. Also, self-reports were used to measure employee job satisfaction, job burnout, and work engagement

levels. And overall, this study had a lower number of participants. As a result, the power of the statistical tests used in this study may have been affected by the small sample size.

Recommendations

Future research on NTTF would benefit greatly by providing a safe environment when measuring how NTTF feel about their jobs. This study highlights an issue facing NTTF when it comes to their lower than average levels of job satisfaction and their higher than average levels of job burnout. Job satisfaction and job burnout levels have shown to relate to increased levels of turnover, absenteeism, depression, and stress (Gustainiene & Endriulaitiene, 2009; Hätiinen et al., 2004; Hom et al., 1992; Prosser et al., 1997 Schaumberg & Flynn, 2017; Swider et al., 2011). These relationships highlight the importance of improving NTTF's job satisfaction and job burnout levels to reduce these negative effects. Working to improve NTTF's job satisfaction is extra important when compared to other career fields as it may lead to also helping the students NTTF work with on a daily basis. Ehrenberg and Zhang (2005) show that institutions that used more non-tenure track and part time faculty were found to have lower graduation rates. However, these negative effects could be reduced if universities properly used non-tenure track and part time faculty to help balance out the number of students to teachers in a university (Jacoby, 2006).

NTTF's current employment and health insurance is tied to their employment status. With Covid-19 currently affecting both peoples' personal health and the national economy, NTTF's lower levels of job security put them at an extra risk of being negatively affected by Covid-19. If higher education is to continue through and after this pandemic, support for the large number of NTTF throughout this nation needs to be increased. Kezar and Gehrke (2014) state that the effects caused by the large number of NTTF hires may be mitigated by decision leaders choosing to promote proper planning and data collection measures. If something isn't

done to help improve job burnout and job satisfaction levels for NTTF, this could lead to universities being unable to fulfill their goals of providing the best possible education for students.

References

- Alarcon, G. M., & Lyons, J. B. (2011). The relationship of engagement and job satisfaction in working samples. *The Journal of Psychology, 145*(5), 463-480.
doi:10.1080/00223980.2011.584083
- Bozeman, B., & Gaughan, M. (2011). Job satisfaction among university faculty: Individual, work, and institutional determinants. *The Journal of Higher Education, 82*(2), 154-186.
doi:10.1353/jhe.2011.0011
- Brewer, E. W., & Clippard, L. F. (2002). Burnout and job satisfaction among student support services personnel. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 13*(2), 169-186.
doi:10.1002/hrdq.1022
- Curtis, J. W., & Thornton, S. (2013). Here's the news: The annual report on the economic status of the profession, 2012-13. Retrieved from
<https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/2013%20Salary%20Survey%20Tables%20and%20Figures/report.pdf>
- Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (September 2007). The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory: A good alternative to measure burnout (and engagement). Retrieved from
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/46704152_The_Oldenburg_Burnout_Inventory_A_good_alternative_to_measure_burnout_and_engagement
- Demerouti, E., Mostert, K., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Burnout and work engagement: A thorough investigation of the independency of both constructs. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 15*(3), 209-222. doi:10.1037/a0019408
- Ehrenberg, R. G., & Zhang, L. (2005). Do tenured and tenure-track faculty matter? *The Journal of Human Resources, 40*(3), 647-659. doi:10.3368/jhr.XL.3.647

- Enginyurt, O., Cankaya, S., Aksay, K., Tunc, T., Koc, B., Bas, O., & Ozer, E. (2016). Relationship between organisational commitment and burnout syndrome: A canonical correlation approach. *Australian Health Review, 40*(2), 181-187. doi:10.1071/AH14177
- Fagan-Wilen, R., Springer, D. W., Ambrosino, B., & White, B. W. (2006). The support of adjunct faculty: An academic imperative. *Social Work Education, 25*(1), 39-51. doi:10.1080/02615470500477870
- Feldman, D. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2001). A field study of adjunct faculty: The impact of career stage on reactions to non-tenure-track jobs. *Journal of Career Development, 28*(1), 1-16. doi:10.1023/A:1011193713662
- Freaney, Y., & Fellenz, M. R. (2013). Work engagement as a key driver of quality of care: A study with midwives. *Journal of Health Organization and Management, 27*(3), 330-349. doi:10.1108/JHOM-10-2012-0192
- Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burn-out. *The Journal of Social Issues, 30*(1), 159-165. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1974.tb00706.x
- Gustainienė, L., & Endriulaitienė, A. (2009). Job satisfaction and subjective health among sales managers. *Baltic Journal of Management, 4*(1), 51-65. doi:10.1108/17465260910930449
- Gökçen, C., Zengin, S., Oktay, M. M., Alpak, G., Al, B., & Yıldırım, C. (2013). Burnout, job satisfaction and depression in the healthcare personnel who work in the emergency department. *Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi, 14*(2), 122-128. doi:10.5455/apd.36379
- Hätinen, M., Kinnunen, U., Pekkonen, M., & Aro, A. (2004). Burnout patterns in rehabilitation: Short-term changes in job conditions, personal resources, and health. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 9*(3), 220-237. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.9.3.220

- Hom, P. W., Caranikas-Walker, F., Prussia, G. E., & Griffeth, R. W. (1992). A meta-analytical structural equations analysis of a model of employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*(6), 890-909. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.77.6.890
- Hsu, H., & Waldman, K. (2019, April 10). The professor and the adjunct. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from https://www.newyorker.com/books/under-review/the-professor-and-the-adjunct?mbid=social_facebook
- Hultell, D., & Gustavsson, J. P. (2011). Factors affecting burnout and work engagement in teachers when entering employment. *Journal of Prevention, Assessment & Rehabilitation, 40*(1), 85-98. doi:10.3233/WOR-2011-1209
- Jacoby, D. (2006). Effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation rates. *The Journal of Higher Education, 77*(6), 1081-1103. doi:10.1080/00221546.2006.11778957
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*(3), 376-407. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.127.3.376
- Kahill, S. (1988). Symptoms of professional burnout: A review of the empirical evidence. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne, 29*(3), 284-297. doi:10.1037/h0079772
- Kezar, A., & Gehrke, S. (2014). Why are we hiring so many non-tenure-track faculty? Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/why-are-we-hiring-so-many-non-tenure-track-faculty#:~:text=Yet%2C%20these%20simple%20answers%20obscure,are%20off%20the%20tenure%20track>

- Kezar A., & Maxey D. (2013, May/June). The changing academic workforce. *Trusteeship*, 21(3). Retrieved from <https://www.agb.org/trusteeship/2013/5/changing-academic-workforce>
- Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2011). Understanding non-tenure track faculty: New assumptions and theories for conceptualizing behavior. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(11), 1419-1442. doi:10.1177/0002764211408879
- Kumar, S. (2015). Influence of spirituality on burnout and job satisfaction: A study of academic professionals in Oman. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 22(3), 137-175.
- Lackritz, J. R. (2004). Exploring burnout among university faculty: Incidence, performance, and demographic issues. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(7), 713-729. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2004.07.002
- Lu, L., Lu, A. C. C., Gursoy, D., & Neale, N. R. (2016). Work engagement, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(4), 737-761. doi:10.1108/IJCHM-07-2014-0360
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 2(2), 99-99.
- Peterson, U., Demerouti, E., Bergstrom, G., Asberg, M., & Nygren, A. (2008). Work characteristics and sickness absence in burnout and nonburnout groups: A study of Swedish health care workers. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 15(2), 153-172. doi:10.1037/1072-5245.15.2.153
- Prosser, D., Johnson, S., Kuipers, E., Szmukler, G., Bebbington, P., & Thornicroft, G. (1997). Perceived sources of work stress and satisfaction among hospital and community mental health staff, and their relation to mental health, burnout and job satisfaction. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 43(1), 51-59. doi:10.1016/S0022-3999(97)00086-X

- Reevy, G. M., & Deason, G. (2014). Predictors of depression, stress, and anxiety among non-tenure track faculty. *Frontiers in Psychology, 5*, 701-701. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00701
- Ruokolainen, M., Mauno, S., & Cheng, T. (2014). Are the most dedicated nurses more vulnerable to job insecurity? Age-specific analyses on family-related outcomes. *Journal of Nursing Management, 22*(8), 1042–1053. doi:10.1111/jonm.12064
- Russell, D. W., Altmaier, E., & Van Velzen, D. (1987). Job-related stress, social support, and burnout among classroom teachers. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*(2), 269-274. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.72.2.269
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3*(1), 71-92. doi:10.1023/A:1015630930326
- Schaufeli, W., & Bakker, A. (2003). The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. Retrieved from http://www.wilmarschaufeli.nl/publications/Schaufeli/Test%20Manuals/Test_manual_UWES_English.pdf
- Schaumberg, R. L., & Flynn, F. J. (2017). Clarifying the link between job satisfaction and absenteeism: The role of guilt proneness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*(6), 982-992. doi:10.1037/apl0000208
- Spector, P.E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 13*(6), 693-713. doi:10.1007/BF00929796
- Spector, P. (2020, August). Job satisfaction survey norms. Retrieved from <http://paulspector.com/scales/our-assessments/job-satisfaction-survey-jss/job-satisfaction-survey-norms/>

- Smith, T. W. (August 2007). Job satisfaction in America: Trends and socio-demographic correlates. Retrieved from <http://www-news.uchicago.edu/releases/07/pdf/070827.jobs.pdf>
- Swider, B. W., Boswell, W. R., & Zimmerman, R. D. (2011). Examining the job search–turnover relationship: The role of embeddedness, job satisfaction, and available alternatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(2), 432-441. doi:10.1037/a0021676
- van der Walt, F. (2018). Workplace spirituality, work engagement and thriving at work. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 44*, 1-10. doi:10.4102/sajip.v44i0.1457
- Waltman, J., Bergom, I., Hollenshead, C., Miller, J., & August, L. (2012). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction among non-tenure-track faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 83*(3), 411-434. doi:10.1080/00221546.2012.11777250
- Yan, X., Su, J., Wen, Z., & Luo, Z. (2017). The role of work engagement on the relationship between personality and job satisfaction in Chinese nurses. *Current Psychology, 38*(3), 873-878. doi:10.1007/s12144-017-9667-8
- Zhang, Y., & Feng, X. (2011). The relationship between job satisfaction, burnout, and turnover intention among physicians from urban state-owned medical institutions in Hubei, China: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Health Services Research, 11*, 1-13. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-11-235

Appendix A: Job Satisfaction Survey

JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY Paul E. Spector Department of Psychology University of South Florida <small>Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994. All rights reserved.</small>							
PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.		Disagree very much	Disagree moderately	Disagree slightly	Agree slightly	Agree moderately	Agree very much
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	I like the people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10	Raises are too few and far between.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17	I like doing the things I do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6

<p style="text-align: center;">PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved.</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">Disagree very much Disagree moderately Disagree slightly Agree slightly Agree moderately Agree very much</p>					
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22	The benefit package we have is equitable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24	I have too much to do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30	I like my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31	I have too much paperwork.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35	My job is enjoyable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36	Work assignments are not fully explained.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix B: Oldenburg Burnout Inventory

Oldenburg Burnout Inventory

Instruction: Below you find a series of statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the scale, please indicate the degree of your agreement by selecting the number that corresponds with each statement

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. I always find new and interesting aspects in my work.	1	2	3	4
2. There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work.	1	2	3	4
3. It happens more and more often that I talk about my work in a negative way.	1	2	3	4
4. After work, I tend to need more time than in the past in order to relax and feel better.	1	2	3	4
5. I can tolerate the pressure of my work very well.	1	2	3	4
6. Lately, I tend to think less at work and do my job almost mechanically.	1	2	3	4
7. I find my work to be a positive challenge.	1	2	3	4
8. During my work, I often feel emotionally drained.	1	2	3	4
9. Over time, one can become disconnected from this type of work.	1	2	3	4
10. After working, I have enough energy for my leisure activities.	1	2	3	4
11. Sometimes I feel sickened by my work tasks.	1	2	3	4
12. After my work, I usually feel worn out and weary.	1	2	3	4
13. This is the only type of work that I can imagine myself doing.	1	2	3	4
14. Usually, I can manage the amount of my work well.	1	2	3	4
15. I feel more and more engaged in my work.	1	2	3	4
16. When I work, I usually feel energized.	1	2	3	4

Note. Disengagement items are 1, 3®, 6®, 7, 9®, 11®, 13, 15. Exhaustion items are 2®, 4®, 5, 8®, 10, 12®, 14, 16. ® means reversed item when the scores should be such that higher scores indicate more burnout.

Appendix C: Shortened English Version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale

Work & Well-being Survey (UWES) ©

The following 17 statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, cross the '0' (zero) in the space after the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by crossing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

	Almost never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often	Always
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Never	A few times a year or less	Once a month or less	A few times a month	Once a week	A few times a week	Every day

1. _____ At my work, I feel bursting with energy* (VI1)
2. _____ I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose (DE1)
3. _____ Time flies when I'm working (AB1)
4. _____ At my job, I feel strong and vigorous (VI2)*
5. _____ I am enthusiastic about my job (DE2)*
6. _____ When I am working, I forget everything else around me (AB2)
7. _____ My job inspires me (DE3)*
8. _____ When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work (VI3)*
9. _____ I feel happy when I am working intensely (AB3)*
10. _____ I am proud on the work that I do (DE4)*
11. _____ I am immersed in my work (AB4)*
12. _____ I can continue working for very long periods at a time (VI4)
13. _____ To me, my job is challenging (DE5)
14. _____ I get carried away when I'm working (AB5)*
15. _____ At my job, I am very resilient, mentally (VI5)
16. _____ It is difficult to detach myself from my job (AB6)
17. _____ At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well (VI6)

* Shortened version (UWES-9); VI= vigor; DE = dedication; AB = absorption

© Schaufeli & Bakker (2003). The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale is free for use for non-commercial scientific research. Commercial and/or non-scientific use is prohibited, unless previous written permission is granted by the authors