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Abstract

The pressures of performance, organizational growth and health, and economic hardship in higher education are well documented in the literature and media. However, the opportunity presented from literature is to provide research aimed at understanding the actual ramifications of these pressures today in the context of higher education. This mixed methods research proposal seeks to address the deficiency in the literature by studying the relationship between employee leadership styles and burnout in an Upper Midwest Christian university. The study employs a mixed method convergent parallel study design; in which quantitative and qualitative data will be obtained simultaneously. Frequencies and narrative analysis will be used to analyze the qualitative method and descriptive statistics, correlations, and ANOVA will examine the relationship between transformational leadership and burnout. T-tests will be used to test the hypotheses as predicted in this study. The implications resulting from this study are beneficial to the university under review, in addition to higher education research as it specifically relates to understanding the effect leadership styles may have on the psychological well-being of employees, especially for institutions with growth and sustainability strategies.

Introduction

In the current economic climate, many organizations push their workforce emotionally, physically, and mentally to achieve organizational objectives while giving little attention to the impact leadership styles and the holistic well-being of their employees have on the achievement of key performance indicators. This increased emotional, physical, and mental stress in the workplace, defined as burnout, have been largely researched over the past 40 years in a wide variety of sectors, from health care to universities (Schaufeli, Leiter, & Maslach, 2009; Watts & Robertson, 2011). Leadership and culture are major components of organizational health; thus, university leaders are well advised to understand the influence of leadership on employee well-being (Watts, Robertson, Winter, & Leeson, 2013; Skakon, Nielsen, Borg, & Guzman, 2010).

Burnout is costly to organizations directly and indirectly through decreased productivity, turnover, and absenteeism (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). While these and other negative organizational outcomes are not unique to burnout, it provides a framework with which to remediate the systemic problem (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). Combined with the hard costs of burnout in an organization, Kahill (1988) focuses upon five further costs to the organization: physical, emotional, interpersonal, attitudinal, and behavioral.
Although constant if unchecked, burnout can be remediated through various leadership training and employee programs (Skakon et al., 2010; Schaufeli, Leiter, & Maslach, 2009). As a Christian organization that prides itself upon the holistic development and care of its employees, the leaders of the University of Northwestern – St. Paul may greatly benefit from any data describing the levels of burnout among the staff and supporting leadership styles which effectively lower incidents of experienced burnout. The transformative potential for revised leadership training and holistic care of staff resultant from the present study cannot be underemphasized. Therefore, this study seeks to understand the relationship between an employee’s leadership style and their perceived levels and modes of burnout among non-instructional staff.

**Significance of Study**

With the mounting pressures of enrollment, sustainability, and affordability, a curious lack of research has been conducted studying the burnout of higher education administration (Eshleman, McGaughey, & Sanchez, 2013). The research is adequate for faculty of higher education (instructional staff), but little research has been conducted for burnout in the executive, management, and employee levels of these institutions (Sharma & Jyoti, 2009; Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011). Furthermore, the literature is limited in regard to show what, if any, relationship exists in higher education administration with respect to leadership style and burnout. Kanste (2008) and Kanste, Kyngäs, and Nikkilä (2007) both support and indicate that the health industry has a growing presence in the literature related to the correlation of transformational leadership and burnout.

**Transformational Leadership.** Originating in the 1970’s, transformational leadership has greatly contributed to the current interests in leadership and is renowned for being the first leadership theory to promote emphasis on the follower, not solely the leader (Northouse, 2013). Stemming from the seminal work of Burns (1978), Bass has contributed most significantly to its current, academic formation in the literature, which creates a continuum from Laissez-Faire leadership to Transactional leadership to Transformational leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The transformational leader can be defined one “who is attentive to the needs and motives of followers and tries to help followers reach their full potential” (Northouse, 2013, p. 186).
Initially targeted to management practices and social sciences, other disciplines quickly began to see transformational leadership as crucial to organizational alignment, workforce well-being, and job satisfaction (Bass, 1999; Skakon, Nielsen, Borg, & Guzman, 2010; Munir, Nielsen, Garde, Albertsen, & Carneiro, 2012).

Unsurprisingly, Skakon et al. (2010) found transformational leadership to be the most widely studied leadership theory in their review of the literature on the influence of leadership and employee well-being. This prominence is most likely due to its focus on the follower, which resulted in lower work-related stress and higher well-being (Skakon et al., 2010, p. 130). A study conducted by Nielson and Munir (2009) found inspiring self-efficacy as a mode through which transformational leaders influence their followers. As efficacy is a sub-scale of burnout, research has emerged in the literature studying transformational leadership and burnout (Kanste, 2008; Stordevr, D'hoore, & Vandenbergh, 2001).

**Burnout.** Burnout is the psychological phenomena of continued exposure to “people work” related stressors, which was originally formulated for those in the human services industry in the late 1970s by Maslach and Jackson, who were also responsible for developing the de facto measurement for burnout, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). As the terminology of burnout gained momentum in the workforce, the scholarly literature soon developed a wider approach to the impact of burnout to cover nearly all types of work (Cox, Tisserand, & Taris, 2005).

Although movements have been suggested in the literature to widen burnout to be a measurement of stress in any context, many have argued to keep burnout narrowly defined as a work-related stressor measuring emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and efficacy (Cox, Tisserand, & Taris, 2005; Bakker, Schaufeli, Demerouti, Janssen, & Van Der Hulst, 2000; Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Schaufeli, Leiter, & Maslach, 2009; Schaufeli & Taris, 2005).

Although suggested to have an inversely proportional correlation, transformational leadership and burnout has been only narrowly researched. The majority of that research is focused on the healthcare industry and there has been only limited study in the education sector (Kanste, 2008). Also deficient in the literature are the studies of transformational leadership and/or burnout in the non-teaching staff of colleges and universities.
**Burnout in Higher Education.** Once thought to be a low-stress work environment, research has emerged in the past decade measuring the stress and burnout in university faculty (Watts & Robertson, 2011). A Californian study in 2004 showed a 20% rate of burnout among faculty—a shocking discovery (Lackritz, 2004). A later study of stress in South African faculty calls for further research in non-teaching staff in universities while asserting the literature has a wealth of information on teaching staff in regards to work stress and satisfaction (Barkhuizen & Rothmann, 2008). One study has reported occupational stress in a university setting, highlighting the detrimental affects of the tertiary education workplace (Gillespie, Walsh, Winefield, Dua, & Stough, 2001). Although the detrimental affects of burnout have been documented in the literature for higher education, more research needs to be completed to determine current levels of burnout, to find if there are any positive deviants through the mode of transformational leadership, and to maximize prevention strategies for burnout in university non-teaching staff (Goldstein, Hazy, & Lichtenstein, 2011).

**Research Problem**

With the growing attention to the sector of higher education, we must seek a clearer understanding of the interplay between workforce burnout and leadership. Therefore, what is the relationship between a transformational leadership style with respect to perceived levels and modes of burnout among higher education staff?

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship in higher education between leadership styles and modes of burnout among the employees at University of Northwestern - St. Paul. This analysis will further the research literature for levels of burnout in higher education employees.

The Global Transformational Leadership score (GTL) was used to measure for transformational leadership and the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) was used to collect data to determine levels of employee burnout. The qualitative data was gathered through open-ended questions to provide greater understanding to the factors contributing to burnout in the sample.

A convergent mixed methods design was used to collect parallel quantitative and qualitative data, analyzed the data separately, then merged the results. The quantitative data was
analyzed utilizing various descriptive statistics to examine the potential relationship between transformational leadership style and employee burnout. The qualitative data was analyzed using narrative analysis to identify emerging themes. The study tested the stated hypotheses to determine if any specific dimensions among the stated variables are positively or negatively impacted by the underlying relationship between the variables specific to the context of higher education. The reason quantitative and qualitative data was collected was to explore perceived leadership styles of supervisors in relation to perceived employee burnout, to seek to understand how employees experience burnout, and to gain insight into the root cause of burnout in the population.

**Researcher’s Questions**

The qualitative portion employed semi-interview questions and asked the participant to answer open-ended statements and questions. The list of questions was derived from the researcher’s professional experience with work-related burnout. As a result, the researcher provided the proposed questions and received confirmation from a panel of experts who have direct experience with work-related burnout and stress in a wide range of vocational disciplines. The following are the questions the researcher worked through to establish what those questions would include.

Literature suggests that demographic and institutional stressors contribute to burnout in the context of higher education. Therefore, the researcher seeks to understand if there are established traits or experiences within transformational leadership that reflect the majority of the population within the higher education context. To specifically address this question, the study asks the following questions: Please describe the thoughts and feelings that you attribute to burnout; and what activities and/or experiences at work most contribute to your experience of burnout?

By examining employees internal attitudes and understanding external influences that contribute to burnout, the study seeks to further understand the influence from a supervisor’s leadership style and if it will predict lower amounts or fewer experiences of burnout in higher education employees. The following questions were developed: Given your attitudes about your work today, how long by a measurement of years could you: continue working in your current role; and continue working at the organization?
The researcher seeks to understand how transformational leadership or burnout specifically impacts any experiences that can be attributed to demographics. Therefore, the following question has been created: What is the nature of the participant’s role within the organization?

To allow for other themes not addressed through the aforementioned questions, the researcher lastly asks a generic, open-ended question for new themes to emerge pertaining to burnout in the context of higher education: Any other thoughts or observations related to your experience of burnout? A complete list of qualitative questions can be found in Appendix A.

**Research Objectives and Hypothesis**

Although the detrimental effects of burnout have been documented in the literature on higher education, Gillespie, Walsh, Winefield, Dua, and Stough (2001) indicate a need for research to determine current levels of burnout, to ascertain if there are any positive deviants through the mode of transformational leadership, and to maximize prevention strategies for burnout in university non-teaching staff (Goldstein, Hazy, & Lichtenstein, 2011). Therefore, the following hypotheses have been developed:

- **H1**: Transformational leadership will correlate inversely with levels of burnout.
- **H2**: Transformational leadership will promote increased personal efficacy to a greater degree than emotional exhaustion or cynicism.

The literature shows the importance of transformational leadership to organizational success due to its intention focus on the development of the follower. The mode of influence between leadership and burnout was shown to be improving self-efficacy. Therefore, it is important to examine if there is evidence as to what factors among the dimensions of transformational leadership positively or negatively impact or influence the specific dimensions of burnout. To move forward, the following sections define the assumptions and use of terms in this study.

**Assumptions**

The present study is based on the following assumptions. Participants are acquainted with the concept of work-related burnout. The participants are honest with rating their leadership style
and their levels of work-related burnout. Reported burnout is solely from work-related events and relationships and has no other mediated variables, such as depression, influencing participant’s response to work-related items (Bakker, Schaufeli, Demerouti, Janssen, & Van Der Hulst, 2000). The findings from this study can be used for transformative training to address issues emerging from the data of this study. The study could be replicated at other, similar locations producing congruent results.

Definition of Terms

This section provides the definitions of terms used throughout this study to avoid misinterpretation of the research goals this study seeks to achieve. The definitions are provided for the following terms: general staff, supervisors and non-supervisors, transformational leadership, burnout, and mixed-methods research design.

**General Staff.** University staff, administration, and employees are used interchangeably in this study, and can be defined as “general staff” who are not executives on the President’s Cabinet and do not have faculty or teaching status at the university (Watts & Robertson, 2011).

**Supervisors and Non-Supervisors.** Two population groups are represented in the study: supervisors and non-supervisors. Supervisors are defined as having one or more direct reports in the organization of study; non-supervisors are general staff who do not have any direct reports, although they may supervise students.

**Transformational Leadership.** Transformational leadership is the leadership style encompassed by seven behaviors aimed at developing the follower: (1) communicates a vision, (2) develops staff, (3) provides support, (4) empowers staff, (5) is innovative, (6) leads by example, and (7) is charismatic (Northouse, 2013; Carless, Wearing, & Mann, 2000). “Transformational leaders…are those who stimulate and inspire followers to both achieve extraordinary outcomes and, in the process, develop their own leadership capacity” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p.3).
**Burnout.** Burnout is the prolonged psychological response to the chronic experience of emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy related to stressors in the workplace (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001).

**Mixed Methods Research Design.** Mixed methods research is a research design that combines data collection, analysis, and discussion from both quantitative and qualitative data sets (Creswell, 2014). Other terms for mixed method research designs include: integrating, synthesis, multimethod, and mixed methodology (Creswell, 2014, p. 217).

**Literature Review**

The aim of this review of literature for is to provide the conceptual and theoretical framework of pertinent, connected, and parallel research in the fields of transformational leadership, burnout, and higher education. The precedent literature corroborating transformational leadership styles of supervisors and its affect on employees in higher education is non-existent; the deficiency in the literature prompted this study. Therefore, the majority of the literature reviewed indirectly relates to the present study. However, these indirect connections from other vocation focuses and studies provide the necessary foundation for the continued study of the relationship between leadership styles and burnout.

First, transformational leadership, one of the few leadership styles thought to decrease burnout, will be discussed and reviewed as a leadership trait that promotes followers self-efficacy, among other sub-characteristics (Bass, 1999). Second, the background of burnout will be described, as well as the recent criticisms of the most prevalent instrument for measuring symptoms of burnout, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), (Schaufeli, Leiter, & Maslach, 2009). Third, the small representation of research directly studying the affects of transformational leadership and the role of supervisors upon burnout will be reviewed. Following this is a discussion of research pertaining to burnout in higher education. Finally, the present study will be described with the appropriate conceptual and theoretical frameworks and defined as to where it stands in the body of literature. The literature review will conclude with a brief summary of the chapter.
Transformational Leadership

At the core, transformational leadership refers to the charismatic ability of a leader to motivate followers to change and transform, assumingly for the better (Northouse, 2013). In over 35 years since the seminal work of Burns (1978), research on transformational leadership has grown outside of social psychology and management literature into broader disciplines including education and nursing (Bass, 1999; Northouse 2013). Transformational leadership is characterized by seven factors: idealized influence (charisma), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, continent reward, management-by-exception, and Laissez-faire (Northouse, 2013, p. 191). These seven factors are split into the three leadership styles on the leadership continuum: transformational (factors 1-4), transactional (factors 5-6) and Laissez-Faire (factor 7) (Northouse, 2013, p. 190-191).

Migration of Original Definition. The original scope of transformational leadership was to connect the success of the leader with the success of the follower (Burns, 1978). Bass (1985) expounded this definition to make the outcome of transformational leadership primarily based on the follower and secondarily based upon the leader (Northouse, 2013). Since that time, transformational leadership has been understood to empower followers through visionary and charismatic leadership to improve performance and reach fullest potential (Northouse, 2013; Avolio, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1990).

Organizational Importance of Transformational Leadership. Reflecting on the research of transformational leadership, Bass (1999) remarked that the presence of a transformational leader is crucial to organizational alignment. By aligning followers with the organizational goals and by inspiring them to simultaneously reach their goals autonomously, transformational leaders serve as a conduit for the increased performance, well-being, and personal satisfaction of the follower (Bass, 1999; Weberg, 2010).

Transformational Leadership Leads to Follower Self-Efficacy. Emerging research has shown transformational leaders inspire increased follower well-being and personal satisfaction through the mode of self-efficacy (Nielsen, Yarker, Randall, & Munir, 2009). Self-efficacy is “the belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce
given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Taking into account the presence of self-efficacy can predict well-being and health, and transformational leaders instill self-efficacy in their followers, the construct of transformational leadership affecting follower health and well-being is well founded (Ajzen, 2002; Nielsen & Munir, 2009).

**Transformational Leadership Instrumentation.** The most common measurement of transformational leadership is the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass (1985). Since the first design, the MLQ has undergone much research and revision and has been established as the standard (Northouse, 2013). However, other instruments that highly correlate with the MLQ have been developed. The Global Transformational Leadership score (GTL), developed by Carless, Wearing, & Mann (2000) is the most common alternative. The GTL has been used for its shorter length and ability to maintain a high degree of convergent validity (Nielsen & Munir, 2009; Munir et al., 2012).

**Employee Burnout**

After 40-plus years of research, the concept of burnout has become a widely experienced phenomenon and is well-established in the research literature (Schaufeli, Leiter, & Maslach, 2009). Concern for burnout started as a grassroots movement in the health services industry, as idealized public servants became disillusioned with their original, lofty goals of service and quickly came to the attention of social researchers (Schaufeli et al., 2009). Originally developed for health services occupations and other such vocations with high “people work,” burnout has been broadened in scope to include all types of work, including students and athletes (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Cox, Tisserand, & Taris, 2005).

**Definition of Burnout.** Simply, burnout is defined as, “a prolonged response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors on the job” (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001, p. 397). Originally, Maslach and Jackson (1981) discovered three independent factors of burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion is key to experiencing burnout and “is characterized by a lack of energy and a feeling that one's emotional resources are used up” (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993, p. 623). Depersonalization is the second key to experiencing burnout, and is the distancing of people or work as objects (Maslach...
& Jackson, 1981). Finally, personal accomplishment has been revised as inefficacy, and relates to “no longer feeling effective in fulfilling job responsibilities” (De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2009, p. 1058). Burnout has been differentiated from depression and exhaustion and should be considered only in relation to work or work-like occupations, i.e., students (Bakker et al, 2000; Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Schaufeli & Taris, 2005).

**Burnout Instrumentation.** Parallel to discovering burnout in the health industry, Maslach & Jackson (1981) established the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), which measures these three components of burnout, indicating burnout is more than just exhaustion (Schaufeli et al, 2009). Although dominant in the burnout literature, the MBI has come under some academic criticism. Kristensen, Borritz, Villadsen, and Christensen (2005) argue for a single-factor measurement of burnout as exhaustion, and propose their Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI). Others have created an instrumentation that maintains a two-factor definition of burnout, including exhaustion and depersonalization (or cynicism) (Halbesleben & Demerouti, 2005). Although these authors state valid points against the MBI that should be considered, the MBI stands as the authoritative instrument to measure the full complexities of burnout (Schaufeli & Taris, 2005; Shirom, 2005).

**Leadership and Burnout in Higher Education**

Once thought to be a low-stress work environment, research has emerged in the past decade measuring the stress and burnout in university faculty (Watts & Robertson, 2011). A Californian study in 2004 showed a 20% rate of burnout among faculty; a shocking discovery as this was the first academic study of burnout in a university setting in over a decade (Lackritz, 2004). Lackritz (2004) found many demographic and institutional factors that correlate to higher levels of burnout in university faculty, namely number of students, teaching load, and lack of funding.

A later study of stress in South African faculty calls for further research in non-teaching staff in universities, as the literature has a wealth of information on teaching staff in regards to work stress and satisfaction (Barkhuizen & Rothmann, 2008). Barkhuizen and Rothman (2008) further suggest work-life balance may contribute to overall feelings of burnout in faculty. An early study does research all staff occupational stress, both teaching and non-teaching,
highlighting the detrimental affects of the tertiary education workplace (Gillespie, Walsh, Winefield, Dua, & Stough, 2001). Gillespie et al. (2001) also prompted research of burnout in higher education: “…occupational stress is having a debilitating impact on the personal and professional welfare of a significant proportion of university staff, and in their opinion, is clearly affecting the quality of education and research produced in the universities” (p. 70). Although burnout is starting to be studied in universities, the relationship between leadership and burnout is lacking research, leading to the indirect review of this relationship from other sectors, primarily healthcare.

**Related Studies That Address Leadership Style and Burnout**

In a review of three decades of literature relating leadership styles to follower well-being, Skakon, Nielsen, Borg, & Guzman (2010) found transformational leadership to be the dominate leadership style studied, due to its focus on improving follower performance and potential. A connector between transformational leadership and burnout is follower self-efficacy. Transformational leaders instill greater levels of self-efficacy in followers and a component of burnout is defined as a lack of self-efficacy. Therefore, it is not surprising that a number of studies have shown a significant, negative relationship between transformational leadership and burnout. Further research conducted in a diverse range of occupational fields is suggested to confirm the generalization of the relationship between transformational leadership and burnout (See Skakon et al., 2010 for a recent review.)

**Charismatic Leadership and Burnout.** Charismatic leadership is a leadership trait shown by De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2009) to help prevent burnout in followers. Although found to be a significant relationship, the degree was dependent on compatible personality types between the leader and follower. By focusing on the first factor of transformational leadership, charisma, De Hoogh & Den Hartog (2009) created an opening to explore the relationship of transformational leadership and burnout.

**Transformational Leadership and Burnout.** Although theorized by Seltzer et al. (1989) to reduce stress and burnout, the link between transformational leadership and burnout was not explored until the late 2000s. Kanste, Kyngäs, and Nikkilä (2007) pioneered research
relating transformational leadership and burnout testing nurses and their supervisors with the MLQ for transformational leadership and the MBI for burnout, identifying the potential relationship between the two variables.

At the same time, though independent of each other, Hetland, Sandal, and Johnsen (2007) showed this relationship was a result of the transformational leader supporting their followers’ goals. Having previously researched and theorized an explicit connection between transformational leadership and burnout, Kanste (2008) again measured MLQ against the MBI and found a modestly significant relationship. These results were used to prompt managerial training to increase transformational leadership skills of nursing supervisors (also supported by Dvir et al., 2002).

**Burnout at the University of Northwestern – St. Paul.** There has been one study concerning burnout conducted at the University of Northwestern – St. Paul by Eshleman, McGaughey and Sanchez (2013). The mixed-method approach of Eshleman et al. (2013) provided qualitative insight that burnout may be present in staff at the site, but the statistical analyses were inconclusive. The present study will be the first of such a study to use two psychometric measurements supported in the literature.

**Conceptual and Theoretical Frameworks**

From this body of research, the present study aims to explore if a relationship between transformational leadership and follower burnout exists in a small, private, higher education institution. Therefore, this exploratory, descriptive, correlated study seeks to understand the level of burnout among the population, to see whether transformational leadership is also present, and to measure how transformational leadership affects the levels of burnout. The precedent measures, variables, and instruments lead the researcher to assume a positivistic view of the quantitative data (Wardlow, 1989; Popkewitz, 1980). Finally, the findings of this research will inform executives on a corrective action to address levels of burnout in keeping with critical science theory (Crotty, 1998; Fay, 1987).
Summary of the Literature

In conclusion the literature shows the importance of transformational leadership to organizational success, particularly because of its intent focus to develop the follower. The mode of influence between supervisors and employees is shown to improve self-efficacy. While the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is the most popular instrument to measure transformational leadership in the literature, the shorter Global Transformational Leadership score (GTL) highly correlates to the MLQ in the seven factors of transformational leadership.

Burnout in the literature has developed from its early focus on “people work” common to public service industries to all sectors of work. Due to the popularity of the word, some researchers would merge burnout into the larger, more generic category of stress. However, the literature has found strong evidence to keeping the three-part construct for burnout: emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and efficacy. By maintaining this three-part construct, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) remains the standard for measuring burnout in the literature.

Ironically, the literature is sparse with recent burnout research in the higher education industry. Adequate research has been conducted on teaching staff stress, job satisfaction, and burnout, but the research into administration, staff, or non-teaching staff and burnout is nearly non-existent. The literature available in this domain does inform future research into burnout in higher education. It appears that no study has explored the relationship of leadership and burnout in higher education, which indicates the usefulness of the present study.

There exists in the literature some research into the relationship between leadership and burnout, however. Primarily in the healthcare industry, a modest, but significant negative relationship was found between transformational leadership and burnout. One previous study was conducted at the University of Northwestern – St. Paul, however its conclusions regarding the significant presence of burnout were inconclusive.

In keeping with transformative, positivistic, and Christian worldview and philosophical frameworks, this study seeks to understand the relationship between transformational leadership and burnout at the location of study. Furthermore, the study aims to inform executives on an effective approach to reduce negative findings through positive actions and trainings.
Method and Design

This study employed a mixed methods design, a convergent parallel study in which quantitative and qualitative data is collected together and analyzed separately to confirm or disconfirm the results (p. 219). Campbell & Fiske (1959) affirm this mixed methods approach, arguing that multiple forms of data collection are required to explore a psychological phenomenon. This exploratory, descriptive, correlated research seeks to understand the level of burnout among the population, to discover if transformational leadership is present, and if so, if it affects the levels of burnout of the population. This research is cross-sectional and single-stage sampling in nature, collecting the data directly from the population at one point in time and at random from a list provided by the organization (Creswell, 2013).

Based on prior research (Eshleman et al., 2013) the researcher defined the selection criteria as all employees who are not on the President’s Cabinet. From this list, a random sample was given the survey, understanding their participation is voluntary, confidential, and that all participants had equal access to participate in the survey (Creswell, 2013). Sample stratification was not completed on the population list, as the census of the current population was not made available to the researcher. Given the small size of the proposed population, the present study is an exploratory pilot study, specific to the workforce at a single, private higher education institution. This limitation will be discussed in further detail in a later section. The following provides detail into the participants, measurements, and procedure for the study.

Participants

At the beginning of the data collection, the survey was sent to a total of 222 participants, of which 94 responded satisfactorily (42%). The participant sample was all the general staff of an Upper Midwestern Christian University who were not members of the President’s Cabinet. Slightly more than two-thirds of the participants (67%) were non-supervisors, and the participants were mostly women (61%). Nearly half of the participants have been employed less than 6 years (46%), while the remaining participants have been employed from 7 to 29 years. Most of the participants have earned a Bachelor’s degree or higher (87%), while only 3% have never attended college. The full demographic characteristics of the participants are shown in Appendix C.
Measurements

The Global Transformational Leadership score (GTL) was used to measure for transformational leadership of the supervisors from the employees perspective, and the Maslach Burnout Inventory General Survey (MBI-GS) was used to collect data to determine levels of burnout. The qualitative data was gathered through open-ended questions to provide greater understanding to the factors contributing to burnout in the surveyed employees.

Global Transformational Leadership Score (GTL). The most common measurement of transformational leadership is the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass (1985). However, there has been research into other instruments developed that highly correlate with the MLQ, of which the GTL score is the most common, developed by Carless et al., (2000). The GTL has been used for its shorter length and ability to maintain a high degree of convergent validity with Cronbach’s α of at least 0.90 (Nielsen & Munir, 2009; Munir et al, 2012; Carless et al, 2000). The questions were slightly modified to be inclusive to all employees, removing the specific supervisor language. Example questions from the GTL are as follows: As an employee I give encouragement and recognition to staff; As an employee I treat staff as individuals, support and encourage their development; As an employee I communicate a clear and positive vision of the future. Responses are given on a scale from “To a very large extent” to a “very little extent.”

Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey (MBI-GS). MBI is deeply rooted in the literature. Created by Maslach & Jackson (1981), their research established the MBI measures of the three components of burnout: emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and personal efficacy (Maslach et al, 2001). The MBI still stands as the authoritative instrument to measure the full complexities of burnout (Schaufeli & Taris, 2005; Shirom, 2005). The general survey form of the MBI, the MBI-GS, is the instrument of choice in the literature for measuring burnout for environments outside of education and health services (Maslach et al, 2001).

The internal consistency of the MBI-GS for North America respondents has a Cronbach’s α of 0.81 (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Jackson, 1996). The MBI-GS is recommended for general work populations such as the proposed study population and the size will not affect the validity of the results (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001).
The MBI-GS contains 16 statements of job-related feelings. Respondents rate the frequency of their feelings concerning their job on a scale from 0 to 6. Example question are as follows: I feel emotionally drained from my work; I can effectively solve the problems that arise in my work; I have become more cynical about whether my work contributes anything.

**Qualitative Questions.** The qualitative questions asked the respondent to answer the open-ended statements and questions. An example question is as follows: Please describe the feelings and thoughts that you attribute to burnout. The list of questions was derived from the researcher’s personal experience with work-related burnout and was confirmed by a panel of experts who have also experienced work-related burnout and stress. A complete list of qualitative questions can be found in Appendix A.

**Demographic Measures.** Data on age, gender, race, marital status, tenure (length of employment in years), and education were collected and included in the analyses, based upon the literature for both the independent and dependent variable (Munir et al, 2012; Maslach, & Jackson, 1981). The complete instrument for demographic measures can be found in Appendix B, and participant data shown in Appendix C.

**Procedure**

To obtain data regarding transformational leadership style and burnout, an online questionnaire was created that combines the *Global Transformational Leadership Scale (GLT)*, the *Maslach Burnout Inventory General Survey (MBI-GS)*, and concluded with several semi-interview questions.

The questionnaire was sent to participants via an emailed link created through Survey Monkey and sent by blind carbon copying (BCC) the request for participation (Appendix D). Utilizing this online option for the location of the questionnaire, the responses were received anonymously and the results retained on a HIPPA compliant server as outlined by this service. Prior to entering the survey, the participants were required to sign and agree to an informed consent form, with the option to discontinue at any time (Appendix E).

In following the protocol suggested by Dillman (1978), a notification letter was sent to participants two days before the survey was administered (Appendix F). A follow-up e-mail was
sent four days prior to the close of the survey to encourage any non-respondents to take the survey (Appendix G). The hyperlinks to the survey were designed to allow only one response per computer, to prohibit participants from completing the survey multiple times. All recipients who requested a copy of the final results were sent a communication thanking them for participating and following the survey feedback method of Burke (2011), received a copy of this final report.

Participants that did not agree to the consent form, those who opted-out and those failing to complete all questions were omitted from the data collection and analytic process. The semi-interviews were administered at the same time as the survey, as the questions appeared at the end of the online survey made available to participants. The researcher acquired approvals from the Director of Human Resources at the University of Northwestern – St. Paul and the Institutional Review Board before starting this study (Appendix H).

Survey Monkey was used to ensure the data remains in a HIPPA-compliant and secure data base where the researcher will store the surveys until the conclusion of the study. Immediately at the conclusion of the research outlined here, the researcher destroyed all electronically stored documents and questionnaires received during the data collection phase. Any hard- or digital copies made by the researcher were put through a shredding system to ensure the data is destroyed or was permanently removed from the hard drive of the computer system used during the research project.

Since the survey and semi-interview questions appeared in the same method of communication, the researcher allowed the data to be collected over the course of 10 days. At the conclusion of the ten days, the survey closed and analysis began. The internal consistencies of the two constructs, the GLT and the MBI-GS were greater than the generally accepted minimum Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of 0.70 with a value of 0.76 (Nunnally, 1978; Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Reliability of Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cronbach’s $\alpha$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Instrument</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Transformational Leadership Scale</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maslach Burnout Inventory - General Survey</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

The analysis section will review the way in which the qualitative and quantitative data was examined. The software program, PSPP ver. 0.8.2, was used for all analyses. On the basis of the graphical representations (histogram), it can be concluded that the sum variables were reasonably well described by a normal distribution (Polit & Hungler 1999). First descriptive statistics were used to summarize the demographic characteristics of the participants (Appendix C).

Second the independent variable was normalized on a scale from 0 to 100. The GLT scale (7-items) was rated on a scale from 0-4 and participant scores were summed and normalized by a constant of 3.571 to achieve a scale of 0 to 100, with 100 being the highest score on the construct. The three-factor structure of the dependent variable, the MBI-GS (16-items), was rated on a scale from 0-6, and participant scores were summed and normalized by a constant of 6.25 to achieve a scale of 0 to 100 with 100 being the highest score on the construct. This normalization was to account for the differences in Likert-like scales, similar to the methodology outlined by Nielsen & Munir (2009). One of the MBI-GS sub-scales, personal efficacy, is a reverse scale. To account for this in analyses the researcher reversed the scale after the normalization for this sub-scale of the MBI-GS to maintain uniformity in all statistical analyses. After this normalization, the means of leadership dimensions were further classified into two categories, based on the incidence of leadership behavior using the mean as a division as follows: 0.00 – 75.00 low and 75.01 - 100 high. Burnout dimensions were classified into three categories, based on the definitions by Maslach, et al. (1996) as follows: 0.00 – 25.00 low, 25.01 – 46.24 average, and 46.25 – 100.00 high.

Third mean, standard deviations, correlation analyses using Pearson product moment correlation coefficient, t-tests, and Pearson’s Chi-Square tests were conducted as appropriate for all the study variables following the guidelines set forth by Miller (1998) for descriptive, correlational, and inferential statistics.

Therefore, this study will further examine the correlations as anticipated by the two hypotheses and will utilize descriptive, correlational, and inferential statistics as outlined above to examine the statistical significance of these variables; firstly in the relationship between transformational leadership and employee burnout, secondly in demographic variables; and
thirdly in individuals variables of transformational leadership and burnout. P-values <0.05 were interpreted as being statistically significant.

For the qualitative portion, the study employed semi-interview questions as a component of the online survey. The final interviewed questions were guided by the researcher’s initial questions as explained in greater detail earlier in this study. The narrative analysis examined the narrative data collected from the participants and categorized the responses into various emerged themes. These themes will be reviewed a second time to narrow the focus and to identify three underlying themes. Finally, the findings seek to identify any new information or provide further detail into information that emerges from the quantitative portion of the study. The next section will discuss the results in relation to the hypotheses outlined earlier in this study and the themes which emerged from both the qualitative and quantitative data.

Results

This section will report the results of the statistical analyses conducted on the research data. Descriptive statistics for the demographic characteristics are shown in Appendix C; correlations of transformational leadership and burnout are reported in Table 2; correlations between burnout and demographics are shown in Table 3.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations, Pearson product moment coefficient</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership Score</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout, Personal Efficacy</td>
<td>-0.34***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout, Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout, Cynicism</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < 0.05. ** p < 0.01. *** p < 0.001

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations, Pearson product moment coefficient</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>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout, Personal Efficacy</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.29*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout, Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout, Cynicism</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < 0.05. ** p < 0.01. *** p < 0.001
The hypothesis $H_1$ indicated that transformational leadership would correlate with lower levels of burnout, and was found to be supported in Pearson product moment coefficient ($r = -0.34, p < 0.001$) and Pearson Chi-Square analysis $X^2 (2) = 8.79, p = 0.01$. Given this significance, the null hypothesis can be rejected and $H_1$ is supported (Table 4). Transformational leadership explains 11% of variance in burnout.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $X^2 (2) = 8.79, p = 0.01$

The hypothesis $H_2$ stated that transformational leadership will increase personal efficacy ($r = 0.34, p < 0.001$) to a greater degree than emotional exhaustion ($r = -0.23, p = 0.02$) or cynicism ($r = -0.27, p = 0.01$). In support of the hypothesis, transformational leadership was shown to increase personal efficacy to a greater extent in a two-way ANOVA ($F (1, 92) = 11.73, p < 0.001$) than emotional exhaustion ($F (1, 92) = 5.35, p = 0.02$) and cynicism ($F (1, 92) = 7.37, p = 0.01$). Given this significance, the null hypothesis can be rejected and $H_1$ can be supported (Table 5). Transformational leadership accounted for 11% of variance in increasing personal efficacy, while accounting for only 5% variance in emotional exhaustion and 7% variance in cynicism.

Table 5

ANOVA between Transformational Leadership Score and Burnout, Personal Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>156.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156.82</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1229.73</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1368.55</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA between Transformational Leadership Score and Burnout, Emotional Exhaustion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>255.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>255.49</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>4396.74</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>47.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4651.96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA between Transformational Leadership Score and Burnout, Cynicism
As expected, participant’s age also explained the variance in burnout \((r = -0.35, p < 0.001)\), explaining 12\% in reduced burnout with increased participant age, confirmed by two-way ANOVA \((F (1, 92) = 12.73, p < 0.001; \text{Table 6})\). Pearson’s Chi-Square disconfirms the notion that supervisors have less burnout in comparison to non-supervisors \((X^2 (2) = 1.22, p = 0.54)\) or higher levels of transformational leadership \((X^2 (2) = 1.22, p = 0.27; \text{Table 7})\).

The qualitative, phenomenological research collected through interviews as part of the survey \((n=40)\) validate the research findings of the quantitative data. New themes not captured through the constructs also emerge from these interviews. By using a mixture of quantitative and qualitative codes, confirmed by another coder, the researcher triangulated the data for qualitative validity in exploring emerging themes (Creswell, 2013, p. 201-202). Participants with high burnout tended to self-confirm the incidences of burnout and also pointed to a lack of transformational leadership qualities in the organization and others as a root problem to their experience and feelings of burnout.
Three themes emerged from participants with high burnout as to what causes burnout: expectations, accountability, and empowerment. One participant declared, “Burnout can be from priorities not clearly defined. Too much to do, with unrealistic expectations.” Another participant shares the related nature of burnout, expectations, and accountability, “a lack of accountability and responsibility [exists] at varying levels; which when paired with increasing demands makes work difficult to do well and efficiently.” Finally a comment that connects all three is telling to these themes, “Increased tasks and inability to accomplish them because of time constraints or not having the resources to complete them well.” Expectations, accountability, and empowerment emerge as three themes that are not accounted for in the research instrument. However, a surprising, practical implication also emerged from the interviews: the importance of visionary, transformational leadership.

A participant with low burnout and high transformational leadership illuminated a key takeaway for leaders looking to reduce their own and their followers’ burnout levels. The participant’s response was simply, “I am building a cathedral.” Knowing the culture of the location of study, the researcher immediately recalled an artifact of the culture: a fictional story of a stone cutter who clearly understood the vision of his work. This stone cutter does not just cut one stone after another in utter boredom or fatigue, but rather understands that the stones he cuts will be used to build a grand cathedral where many will come to experience the peace of God. This motivates and invigorates the stonecutter to continue working diligently at his task. This story is often shared in the organization to highlight the importance of knowing the how and the why of one’s contribution to the organization is important to the overall success of the organization.

To establish if the data supported a relationship between visionary transformational leadership and burnout, a Pearson product moment correlation and two-way ANOVA was conducted on the GTL variable specifically targeting the vision component of transformational leadership against the burnout score. There was shown to be a substantial and significant negative relationship between an employee with high vision (“I communicate a clear and positive vision of the future”) and burnout, accounting for 26% of variance in transformational leadership’s effect on burnout ($r = -0.51, p < 0.001; F (1, 92) = 32.79, p < 0.001; Table 8; Table 9). The research indicates that a leader who can articulate and carry a vision of the future can have a substantial impact on the psychological well-being of themselves. As will be discussed in
a later section, exploring this relationship with other elements of leadership and burnout must be explored to provide a clearer understanding of this relationship. The next section will discuss the limitations of the present study.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations, Pearson product moment coefficient</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership, Vision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout Score</td>
<td>-0.51***</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < 0.05. ** p < 0.01. *** p < 0.001

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA between Vision subscale and Burnout Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations

This study has specific limitations. It includes self-reported data that does not permit an all-encompassed look at the situation (Leedy and Ormrod, 2013). The small population of employees at one location influences the sample size. In addition, due to the cross-sectional design, trends of persistent burnout or positive change in transformational leadership cannot be accurately measured. Due to the procedures, the study was distributed at the conclusion of the academic year, rather than at the beginning of the year and may result in higher reported levels of burnout. Finally, the sample population for this study is limited to non-instructional university staff and will be ineligible to be generalized to all university employees.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship in higher education between leadership styles and modes of burnout of the employees at an Upper Midwestern Christian university. This analysis furthers the research literature for levels of burnout in higher education general staff and provides recommendations for future research. The results suggest that employees exhibiting high levels of transformational leadership exhibit lower levels of burnout. This study also indicates that the mode through which transformational leadership reduces
burnout can be in part due to transformational leadership increasing one’s personal efficacy. A surprising discovery was the relationship between visionary transformational leadership and burnout. This prompts future research into specific elements of vision casting and burnout.

The results also suggest that burnout is ambiguous and holistic to a person. The researcher would recommend further research into the topics of job-satisfaction and employee development to explore the themes that emerged from the interviews. The researcher would also suggest future study into vocational calling and some spiritual health measurements, given the religious affiliation of the location of study. These variables may also explain the lower levels of burnout among participants. Leaders within higher education must be flexible to provide the right leadership necessary to reduce risk of burnout in their workforce in order to promote sustainability and growth.
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Appendix A
Participant Interview Questions

1. Please describe the thoughts and feelings that you attribute to burnout:

2. What activities and/or experiences at work most contribute to your experience of burnout?

3. Given your attitudes about your work today, how long by a measurement of years could you continue working in your current role? Please explain why.

4. Given your attitudes about your work today, how long by a measurement of years could you continue working at the organization? Please explain why.

5. Describe the nature of your role at the organization.

6. Any other thoughts or observations?
Appendix B
Participant Demographic Instrument

Participant Information
Instructions: Please respond to the following items by inserting the requested information and/or supplying check marks.

1. What is the year of your birth? ____________________________
2. What is your sex? ____________________________
3. What is your ethnicity? (optional):
   ☐ Hispanic or Latino
   ☐ Not Hispanic or Latino
   ☐ No Response

4. What is your race? (optional) Please select all that apply:
   ☐ American Indian/Alaska Native
   ☐ Asian
   ☐ Black or African American
   ☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   ☐ White

5. What is your marital status?
   ☐ Married ☐ Divorced ☐ Single ☐ Widowed

6. How long, in years, have you been employed at the University of Northwestern – St. Paul
   ____________________________

7. Which is the highest level of education you have completed?
   ☐ High school graduate
   ☐ 1 or 2 Yr College Degree, diploma or certificate
   ☐ Some Bachelor’s degree credits
   ☐ Bachelor’s degree (B.A./B.S.)
   ☐ Some graduate degree credits
   ☐ Graduate degree (Master’s, MBA, MFA)
   ☐ Terminal degree (Ph. D., Ed.D., J.D., D.Min., D. Miss.)
   ☐ Other (please specify):
   ____________________________
### Appendix C

#### Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>12.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (N=94)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS Graduate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 Yr Degree, diploma, Certificate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Bachelor's degree credits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree (BA/BS)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate degree credits</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree (Masters, MBA, MFA)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Supervisors</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Invitation to Participate

Good afternoon!

Thank you for your consideration to assist me with my Master’s Capstone Project, aimed at identifying the levels of burnout of employees in higher education, and possibly what relationship one’s personal leadership style has upon that burnout.

At this time I would like to invite you to participate in my research study. This research is in fulfillment of my Capstone project in my Master’s of Organizational Leadership program and you were selected at random as a possible participant in this study because you are either a supervisor or a non-supervisor at UNW that is not on the President’s Cabinet.

This survey will take you no longer than 25 minutes, but will greatly aid my research! Participating in this study is completely voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with University of Northwestern - St. Paul in any way. Even if you decide to participate now, you may change your mind and stop at any time. If you decide to withdraw early, your responses and information will be discarded and will not be used in the final data collection. Unfortunately there’s no compensation for completing the survey, other than my deep gratitude for your assistance. In order for you to complete the survey, please review the attached “Informed Consent Form.” Once you have read the form and consent to participate, please click the below link.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me.

I would be grateful if you completed the survey by the deadline, April 17, 2014.

Consent
By clicking on the link to the survey via SurveyMonkey, you are agreeing to participate in the evaluation process.

“I have read and understand the above consent form and desire of my own free will to participate in this study."

Please print or copy the above contact information for your records.

I AGREE

Thank you,
Appendix E
Participant Consent form

Consent to Participate in a Research Study
University of Northwestern – St. Paul
Saint Paul, MN 55113


Principal Investigator: J. Ryan Dembeck, Masters of Organizational Leadership (MOL) Student, University of Northwestern – St. Paul, MN.

Co-investigator: N/A

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Dale Hutchcraft, MOL, University of Northwestern - St. Paul

Invitation to participate in a research study

You are invited to participate in a research study about staff leadership and burnout here at the University of Northwestern – St. Paul (UNW). The purpose is to determine if a staff member’s transformational leadership style reduces the levels of their burnout in the context of Higher Education. I hope to learn what relationship might exist between the following:

- transformational leadership of supervisors and burnout of supervisors
- transformational leadership of non-supervisors and burnout of non-supervisors
- leadership styles of supervisors and leadership styles of non-supervisors
- burnout levels of supervisors and burnout levels of non-supervisors
- leadership styles of supervisors and burnout levels of non-supervisors

You were selected at random as a possible participant in this study because you are either a supervisor or a non-supervisor of University of Northwestern-St. Paul that is not on the President’s Cabinet. This research is in fulfillment of my Capstone project in my Master’s of Organizational Leadership here at UNW.

Description of subject involvement

If you agree to participate in the research study, your participation will require approximately twenty-five minutes. You will be asked to complete three surveys and participant information for this study through SurveyMonkey®.

Benefits

The possible benefits of your participation are:

- the opportunity to play a part in helping others understand the relationship between a leadership style and burnout in the context of Higher Education.
the opportunity to reflect on your holistic well-being in relationship to your current work environment.
- the opportunity to play a formative role in future changes and training implemented at UNW based on the anonymous feedback you provide.

**Risks and discomforts**

There are some minor risks associated with this sensitive study because while the data collection is completely anonymous, some responses could identify the participant or other participants. However, the researcher will remove any and all personally identifiable information from your responses. Furthermore, the researcher will not provide the raw data to UNW or the Department of Human Resources, and will delete the entire database at the conclusion of the research. There is no risk of physical harm, as this program evaluation does not consist of performing any physical procedures.

**Compensation**

Unfortunately, there is no compensation for completing the survey.

**Confidentiality**

I plan to publish the results of this study, but will not include any information that would identify you. Any information obtained in connection with this study that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. In any written reports or publications, no one will be identified or identifiable and only aggregate data will be presented. To keep your information safe, the researchers will code the data with a random number.

There are some reasons why people other than the researcher may need to see information you provided as part of the study. This includes organizations responsible for making sure the research is done safely and properly, and the faculty of the UNW MOL Program.

**Storage and future use of data**

The data you provide will be stored in secure file within SurveyMonkey® and in a password-protected PSPP database. The researchers will retain the data for the length of the research study, and the data will not be made available to other researchers for other studies following the completion of this research study.

The researcher will dispose of your data by shredding any printed materials and deleting any digitally recorded responses from the survey immediately upon completion of the research study.

**Voluntary nature of the study**

Participating in this study is completely voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with University of Northwestern - St. Paul in any way. Even if you decide to participate now, you may change your mind and stop at any time. If
you decide to withdraw early, your responses and information will be discarded and will not be used in the final data collection.

**Contact information**

If you have questions about this research, you may contact J. Ryan Dembeck, 651-357-4189 or jrdembeck@unwsp.edu, or Dr. Dale Hutchcraft, MOL Program Director, UNW – 651-628-3408 or drhutchcraft@unwsp.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, or wish to obtain information, ask questions or discuss any concerns about this study with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact the University of Northwestern Institutional Review Board, 3003 Snelling Avenue North Saint Paul, MN 55113 or Don F. Johnson, 651-631-5693 (dfjohnson@unwsp.edu).

**Consent**

Electronically completing the survey:
By clicking on the link to the survey via SurveyMonkey, you are agreeing to participate in the evaluation process.

“I have read and understand the above consent form and desire of my own free will to participate in this study."

Please print or copy the above contact information for your records.

I AGREE
Good Afternoon!

I would like to invite you to participate in a research study about staff leadership and burnout here at the University of Northwestern – St. Paul (UNW). This research is in fulfillment of my Capstone project in my Master’s of Organizational Leadership program. You were selected at random as a possible participant in this study because you are either a supervisor or a non-supervisor at UNW that is not on the President’s Cabinet.

The purpose of this study is to determine if a staff member’s transformational leadership style reduces the levels of their burnout in the context of Higher Education. I hope to learn what relationship might exist between the following:

- transformational leadership of supervisors and burnout of supervisors
- transformational leadership of non-supervisors and burnout of non-supervisors
- leadership styles of supervisors and leadership styles of non-supervisors
- burnout levels of supervisors and burnout levels of non-supervisors
- leadership styles of supervisors and burnout levels of non-supervisors

Within the next few days I will be sending a follow up e-mail with the link to the survey and the Consent to Participate in a Research Study form. At that time you will be able to read further about the study and have the opportunity to participate after giving your consent. I value your opinion and would deeply appreciate your involvement in this study!

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you,
Appendix G
Follow Up Letter to Participants

Good afternoon!

My capstone project is coming along nicely, thank you to all who have responded already—*I am so grateful for your involvement!*

If you are on the fence because of time constraints, majority of the responses have taken only 12 minutes. If you have not yet participated, there is still time before the survey closes tomorrow at midnight, and I would be *very grateful* for your involvement. However, I certainly understand if you are unable respond at this time.

Participating in this study is completely voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with University of Northwestern - St. Paul in any way. Even if you decide to participate now, you may change your mind and stop at any time. If you decide to withdraw early, your responses and information will be discarded and will not be used in the final data collection. Unfortunately there’s no compensation for completing the survey, other than my deep gratitude for your assistance. In order for you to complete the survey, please review the attached “Informed Consent Form.” Once you have read the form and consent to participate, please click the below link.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me.

**Consent**

By clicking on the link to the survey via SurveyMonkey, you are agreeing to participate in the evaluation process.

“I have read and understand the above consent form and desire of my own free will to participate in this study."

Please print or copy the above contact information for your records.

I AGREE

Thank you,