HEBREW UNION COLLEGE JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

CINCINNATI JERUSALEM LOS ANGELES NEW YORK

Thirty Something-An in Depth look at the Alumni of the HUC-JIR School of Jewish Communal Service

by

Robyn Altmann, Andrea Bardack and Alyssa Martin

A Thesis Presented to the FACULTY of THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE-JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION-LOS ANGELES in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MAJCS.

May, 1999

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE-JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION
Los Angeles Campus

Thirty Something--An in Depth look at the Alumni of the HUC-JIR School of Jewish Communal Service

Thesis approved by

Carol Sager, Registrar

RECEIVED MAY 1 1999

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND DEDICATION 4

ABSTRACT 5

CHAPTERS

1. LITERATURE REVIEW 6

2. METHODOLOGY 29

3. PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS 37

4. GENDER RESULTS 51

5. BURNOUT RESULTS 63

6. DISCUSSION 81

REFERENCES 88

APPENDICES 92

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND DEDICATION

- We would like to thank the following people without whose help and support, this endeavor would have never been accomplished:
- Dr. Bruce Phillips for his leadership, encouragement, dedication, time and statistical knowledge. "Attention K-mart shoppers."
- The School of Jewish Communal Service for its generous funding of this project.
- Cary Sauter for her time, her ability to deliver survey's with a smile and for entering the rest of the survey data.
- The alumni who took the time to respond to the survey.

Abstract

This study examined the levels of burnout for alumni of the School of Jewish Communal Service at the Hebrew Union College. Data were gathered using a survey comprised of 83 questions including 23 questions from the Maslach Burnout Inventory. The survey was distributed twice by mail to all 450 alumni over a two month period. The results of the surveys were inputed through a coding system and then analyzed through SPSS. Overall, burnout levels were low. However, women tended to experience higher burnout than men. Interestingly, there was a high income discrepancy between men and women and it was found that there is a tendency for women to leave the field and not return.

Introduction

The School of Jewish Communal service at Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (HUC-JIR) has a tradition of surveying its alumni about every ten years in order to learn more about where they are professionally, what they are doing, and how the program has served them. Our exposure to the Jewish communal field over the past two years has increased our knowledge of the demands placed upon Jewish communal professionals. With the downsizing of agencies, limited funding, and increased pressures that communal workers face, it seemed likely that these factors have impacted job satisfaction among professionals in the field.

In order to examine this phenomenon more closely, we developed a comprehensive questionnaire that was designed to assess the level of job fulfillment that workers have, specifically to identify factors that contribute to job burnout.

This chapter reviews the literature in the field. It describes the background of the field of Jewish communal service, the creation of the Irwin Daniels School of Jewish Communal Service at HUC-JIR, an exploration of findings from previous Masters' theses, an extensive description of burnout, and the prevalence of the burnout in the field of Jewish communal service.

Chapter two discusses the methodological basis of the study. The emphasis is on the construction of the questionnaire and the study's limitations.

Chapter three provides a profile of the respondents. It compares and describes the attributes of the alumni of the school of Jewish communal service who responded to this study.

Chapter four describes gender differences that exist for the respondents of the surveys. It examines closely the issues that women face in the

Chapter five examines the prevalence of burnout in the Jewish communal field as well as the reasons that people leave the field professionally.

Chapter six contains a discussion of the recommendations and implications of this study.

Finally, an appendix is included. This consists of the questionnaire and cover letter and the comments of respondents.

History of Jewish Communal Service Training Programs

At the end of the nineteenth century, as the result of the massive waves of European Jewish immigrants, community leaders turned to the newly emerging schools of social work to obtain the professionals needed to staff their social agencies (Bubis and Reisman, 1995) in order to absorb these significant numbers of immigrants and to help them acclimate to life in America. Jewish communal leaders recognized the need to supplement the social work curriculum with content specifically aimed towards training professionals to work efficiently in the growing network of Jewish social service agencies. The first attempt to develop an educational program to train Jewish communal professionals for the American Jewish community was made in 1908 when the New York Kehilla began a short-lived training program (Bubis, 1994). Another short-lived program sponsored by Hebrew Union College followed in 1913. The first professional education program that lasted for any period of time was the Graduate School of Jewish Social Work, which at one time prepared half of all the Jewish communal professionals in the United States, and lasted from 1925 to 1940 (Bubis & Reisman, 1995). This program, which was sponsored by the philanthropist Felix Warburg, ceased to operate after his death in 1940 because of "lukewarm professional support and cooperation" (Stein, 1965).

The decade of the 1960's, with the dramatic Israeli victory in the 1967 Six-Day War and the broader societal emphasis upon ethnicity, led Jewish communal leaders to affirm a new priority for their social agencies--strengthening Jewish identity. Specialized educational programs were needed to enhance the Jewish background and skills of communal professionals to enable them to respond to the heightened Jewish interests of Americanized Jews (Bubis & Reisman, 1995). In 1968, the Irwin Daniels School of Jewish Communal Service at the Hebrew Union College was founded, followed shortly by Brandeis University's Hornstein Program in Jewish Communal Service, the Baltimore Institute of Jewish communal service, and Cleveland's Case Western University program in conjunction with the Cleveland College of Jewish Studies. After a hiatus of more than a decade, another growth spurt produced the programs at Spertus College in Chicago, the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, Gratz College in Philadelphia, Los Angeles' University of Judaism, the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, University of Toronto, and Werzweiler School of Social Work at Yeshiva University in New York.

In addition to the creation of several specialized Jewish communal education programs, the 1970s and 1980s saw the development of a recruitment infrastructure supported by sizable financial allocations. The Council of Jewish Federations' Federation Executive Recruitment and Education Program

(FEREP), the Jewish Community Center Association's increased allocation of scholarships, and the Wexner Foundation Fellowship program for communal service were tangible expressions of the Jewish community's commitment to Jewish communal service educational programs. At the same time, these institutions, as well as the Association for Jewish Family and Children's Agencies (AJFCA), developed increasingly sophisticated and specialized continuing education programs for professionals in the field.

The important role played by Jewish communal service educational programs in producing graduates who will serve the NPOs in American Jewish life is now taken for granted. Between $5 and $8 million are expended annually for the education of some 80 to 120 graduates entering the field each year from the programs mentioned above. Of the 12,000 to 14,000 professionals employed by Jewish sponsored non-profits, about 15% have attended such educational programs (Bubis, 1994).

History of HUC-JIR

The School of Jewish Communal Service at Hebrew Union College was founded in 1968 in response to a growing awareness of the importance of Jewish identity and ethnicity and the need to incorporate Jewish components in professional practice. A new set of priorities for the American Jewish community

began to emerge in the late 1960s. The combination of the events associated with the Israeli six-day war and a resurgent interest in ethnicity in America led to a heightened American Jewish consciousness. Jewish leaders increasingly began to call for enriching social agencies and to upgrade the Jewish commitment and background of the professional staff (Reisman, 1979, p. 95).

The founding director, Gerald Bubis, summed up the original goals of the program as follows: A balance was sought in the curriculum between the pragmatic and the idealistic, the cognitive and the emotional, the best that Jewish life might be and the way it is. An attempt was made to begin with the contemporary and move backwards in time in order to understand (1) the Jewish individual and the family, (2) the intellectual and ideological issues confronting her/him as a Jew and as an American, and (3) the community instruments which the Jew has created to encapsulate her/his values, meet her/his needs, and discharge her/his communal obligations (Bubis, 1971, p. 2).

Past research on SJCS Alumni

Ballin and Prum (1978) compared the motivations, expectations, and job satisfaction of two groups of recent graduates of the University of Southern California School of Social Work (USC), who were employed in Jewish agencies. The one group had earned the degree Master of Social Work (MSW) and the

second group were the recipients of the Master of Arts degree in Jewish Communal Service (MAJCS) in addition to the MSW. Respondents listed disadvantages of working in the Jewish community as the difficulty with lay-professional relations, excessive commitment of the new worker which leads to early burnout, and the narrow specialization required of workers in a large system. The factor mentioned most often as a negative factor about working for a Jewish agency was the salary. It was found that the double masters graduates were less fulfilled within their jobs than the MSW graduates. The authors speculate that the DM graduates are highly motivated, set extremely high standards, and are impatient with the necessary limitations of the setting. The discrepancy between what they want, are willing to work hard to achieve and which is achievable, creates a high level of frustration, which has a negative effect upon their sense of career achievement. The Non-Double Masters graduates, on the other hand, expect much less from the Jewish communal setting in the intangible areas of values and mission. Their sense of career fulfillment depends more upon their own growth as practitioners. The issue of worker burnout is one that was also raised in this thesis.

In 1983, Goldfarb, Lambert, & Schlossberg examined alumni perceptions of motivations for enrolling in the school of Jewish Communal Service at HUC-JIR, curricular offerings, and professional realities. It was found that graduates

view the HUC experience as more than just a graduate education; it also provides a sense of community for students. These experiences begin before admission and continue after graduation. Through their experience, graduates become part of an HUC community, which permeates their life long after they graduate. In addition, female respondents felt that their attendance at HUC was more helpful for obtaining a job than did men. They relied more upon the degree for finding a job than did their male counterparts. The authors believed that this finding was indicative of the differing gender opportunities in the field at large.

In addition, the most valuable part of their HUC experience was gaining a sense of confidence in doing Jewish communal work as opposed to being more prepared for the challenges of Jewish communal work than colleagues already in the field (Goldfarb, et al., 1983). Alumni reported the rewards of self-gratification and confidence are more important than those externally granted by the employer.

Reitman & Rotto (1984) examined the expectations of Jewish agency executives regarding professional needs, desired competencies, and hiring considerations for beginning workers in the field. The findings demonstrated that there exists a lack of significant hiring standards which is in contrast to the employer's need for specially trained entry-level workers (Bubis, Phillips, Reitman, & Rotto, (1985). Many of the executives wished for the school to place more emphasis upon skill development for students.

Burg-Shnirman, Dubin, Flaum, Hollander, Li-Dar, Macht, Michel, & Ney (1988) surveyed alumni of SJCS in order to follow up on a previous study of the curriculum and re-evaluate the direction of the SJCS. Their survey was designed to answer three questions: "Who are the graduates of HUC? What is the impact of the HUC program? What influence did attending HUC have on you as a professional?" The results were largely positive and it was found that SJCS is successfully educating professionals for a constantly changing field. Findings confirmed the existence of changing trends in the field--the increasing number of female professionals and a decreasing level of professional satisfaction--to which SJCS must respond (Bubis, Hollander, Burg-Schnirman, & Li Dar, 1990). These limitations of the field included low salaries, the need for relocation to achieve upward mobility, and the long hours required for success. Management was consistently cited as an area in which graduates wished to gain more experience and competence. Over 80% of respondents were still working in the Jewish community after five years in the field. Women were underrepresented in higher levels of management in the Jewish community: overall 44% of the male respondents held executive or subexecutive positions in comparison to only 19% of the female alumni.

Burnout

According to Maslach (1982), at least 30 different definitions and descriptions of the concept "burnout" exist. Burnout has been variously defined as (1) "a state of fatigue or frustration brought about by devotion to a cause, way of life, or relationship that failed to produce the expected reward" (Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980, p. 13), (2) "a process in which a previously committed professional disengages from his or her work in response to stress and strain experienced in the job" (Cherniss, 1980, p. 18), (3) "characterized by physical depletion, by feelings of helplessness and hopelessness, by emotional drain and by the development of negative self-concept and negative attitudes toward work, life, and other people" (Pines, Aronson, & Kafry, 1981, P.202), and (4) "a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do "people work" of some kind.

The most commonly accepted definition of burnout today is the three-component model used by Maslach (1982). One component of burnout, emotional exhaustion, refers to a lack of energy and a feeling that one's emotional resources are used up. A common symptom of this would be for a person to dread returning to work for another day. The second component, depersonalization, is marked by the treatment of clients as objects rather than people. Workers tend to display a detached and an emotional callousness, and they may be cynical towards

co-workers, clients, and the organization. The third component, diminished personal achievement, refers to a tendency to evaluate oneself in a negative manner. Individuals experience a decline in feelings of job competence and successful achievement in their work or interactions with people (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993).

The Maslach burnout inventory (MBI) is the most widely used measurement scale for assessing burnout. It consists of 22 items divided into three subscales: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion is described as "feelings of being emotionally extended and exhausted by one's work" (Maslach & Johnson, 1981;101). Depersonalization has been characterized by the following attributes: (1) negative and cynical attitudes towards clients; (2)loss of concern and feelings toward clients; (3) intellectualization; (4) stereotyping clients; (5) physically or emotionally distancing one's self; and (6) over depersonalization. Lastly, the third dimension, lack of personal accomplishment refers to a lack of feelings of competence and successful achievement of one's work. A low sense of personal accomplishment is considered to be a symptom of burnout, and is typically defined in terms of; (1) a negative evaluation and attitudes towards one's self; (2) a sense of personal devaluation; (3)lowered job productivity; and (4) feelings of an inability to handle the job competently.

The MBI focuses on a systems perspective in looking at the problem of burnout by considering conditions in the workplace. Studies have shown that there are four characteristics of work, including: low worker autonomy, high role conflict, role ambiguity and an excessive workload, and they are all correlated with a high level of burnout (Schaufeli, et al., 1993). The systems perspective is also supported by Karger (1981) who suggested that the relationship between the worker and his or her work environment should be the unity of analysis to avoid ascribing causality to the personal characteristics of victims who are forced to deal with maladies in the work place.

Previous Research on Burnout in the Jewish Communal Profession

The issue of burnout within the Jewish communal service arena is one which is increasingly becoming an area of concern for people within the community. In 1978, Ballin and Prum raised the issue of burnout when they found that "an over all vulnerability to early burnout among Double Masters graduates who are in community organization jobs." Motivation for the beginning worker was extremely high and it appeared that new workers had problems tailoring their expectations to the realities of work in the Jewish community. Respondents expressed feelings of fatigue, overwork, and the excessive demands of the Jewish community. The findings of worker burnout in

this thesis occurred during a decade in which no empirical research had yet been conducted regarding burnout. In fact, the lack of emphasis upon developing theories of burnout led to the absence of a conceptual framework for integrating and evaluating the various findings and proposed solutions (Schaufeli, Maslach, & Marek, 1993). Research has subsequently found that unmet expectations can be a source of burnout. When workers enter the profession or change jobs, they compare their expectations with their experiences. The greater the discrepancy between the two, the greater the effects are likely to be for both the employee and the new organization (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993).

In 1984, Bubis raised the issue that many problems exist within the field of Jewish communal service in terms of staff retention with his claims that "as many as 50% of people who begin in Jewish communal service are out within two years." Those who begin in Jewish communal service are too often disillusioned and discouraged and as a result, there is a heavy turnover of workers at the beginning level. The key problem areas highlighted were (1) power is limited in the field except at the highest level of executive jobs, which in turn represent only some 10% of all jobs in the field of JCS, (2) the status of JCS workers would probably be among the lowest decile of professions in the United States, and (3) Jewish communal salaries are being outstripped radically by other professions at the beginning levels. It has also been found that professionals who graduated

from JCS training programs and schools have shown greater staying power in the field.

Bubis (1994) discusses the impact that JCS training programs have upon retention rates within the field of JCS. Of the 12,000 to 14,000 professionals employed by Jewish-sponsored non-profit agencies, about 15% have attended JCS training programs. Such specialized training has a positive impact upon retention. In 1969, Scotch and Lauffer demonstrated that those who came into Jewish Community Centers with a primary dedication to social work were less likely to remain in Jewish settings than those who came with a primary dedication to the Jewish community. Later research suggests that a high proportion of graduates of specialized Jewish communal programs stay in the field for at least five years (Bubis, 1990).

Bubis (1994) provides a list of attributes that bind Jewish communal professionals together. (1) Expertise, which is the result of prolonged special training. (2) Autonomy: the freedom to develop one's own strategies and methods for accomplishing tasks. (3) Commitment: devotion to work and profession. (4) Identification with others: feeling connected with the profession and one's colleagues. (5) Ethics: maintaining a standard of moral integrity. (6) Collegial maintenance of standards: contributing to and maintaining a professional code of conduct.

In 1995, the Wexner Foundation published a report which examined the experiences of recently graduated Jewish communal professionals from the rabbinic, education, and communal service areas (Fishman, 1995). This study surveyed 280 professionals who had graduated from a major training institution for Jewish professionals in the 1980s and were in the first decade of their careers. Areas surveyed included "sources of job dissatisfaction, early work experiences which shaped feelings about the Jewish professional world positively and negatively, and aspects of background and professional training which seem related to successful job performance" (p. 65).

It was found that 10% of respondents had left Jewish professional occupations. In addition, people who trained for the rabbinate had a lower Jewish professional drop-out rate than other training programs. Among the 20 male and 42 female respondents who had studied in programs specifically devoted to Jewish communal service, women (31%) were three times more likely than men (10%) to have left the field altogether. Sources of job satisfaction included items such as making a difference in people's lives, having warm interpersonal relationships, and enhancing Jewish continuity in the United States were all instrumental in leading to job satisfaction. This data underscores the fact that for this particular group of people, job satisfaction cannot be measured only by financial or status rewards. Jewish professionals are persons with a strong sense

of vocation-or a "calling." Their job satisfaction is generally articulated in terms of ways that are connected to their calling.

Sources of job dissatisfaction for all professionals included: frustrating salary negotiations, long working hours, and difficulty juggling family and job responsibilities. Communal service workers from a social work background were more likely to feel that their salaries were not adequate to their needs or appropriate to their work. Communal administrators complained of professional fatigue or "burn-out." Fund-raisers were more likely than average to say their salaries were not adequate to their needs or appropriate for their work, and that they found salary negotiations frustrating or upsetting. Federation workers who were neither fund-raisers nor executives were the group most likely to find salary negotiations frustrating or upsetting and were also most likely to report conflict with colleagues.

When gender as well as profession was considered, striking differences between male and female professionals were found. In terms of federation workers, 100% of women complained of gender discrimination compared with 0% of men. Virtually all of the female federation workers reported that they had been subjected to gender discrimination, that they received inadequate pay, and that they found salary negotiations upsetting. Among most groups, women were less likely to report feelings of friction and/or frustration with clients,

congregants, students, and board members. The group of fund-raisers was the only one in which women were more likely than men to say that they found conflict with others difficult to manage.

Responses to the open-ended question, "What contributes most to your feelings of job frustration or burn-out?" included issues such as overwhelming amounts of work, in which there are few recognized personal boundaries, in which they feel called upon to meet the needs of many and at all times, and in which they simultaneously feel isolated and lacking in appreciation and support. In addition, in most fields, standards of professionalism either have not been properly established or are not universally honored. For the 10% of people who had left the field, reasons for this move included: being laid off, family reasons (ex. Spouse wanted to move), Jewish community too small or unappealing, general dissatisfaction, interpersonal conflict, office politics, low status of job, birth of child, or spouse wanted respondent to do something with more normal hours and better pay.

Burnout and the Jewish Community

The issues that have been raised within the field of Jewish Communal Service are congruent with the six burnout factors that were identified by Maslach

(1997): work overload, lack of control, insufficient reward, unfairness, breakdown of community and value conflict.

Work Overload: The worker and organization differ in their definition of work load. An organization views workload in terms of productivity, whereas the individual defines it as time and energy. The current work place environment impacts the work load in three ways: it is more intense, it demands more time and it is more complex. These three things combined, have proven to be more exhausting for individuals than they were in past decades. "Exhaustion--emotional, creative, or physical--undermines effectiveness, health, and well being" of a person (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). A Jewish communal worker functions as a leader, role model, and teacher while striving to "nurture the breath of Jewish life...Consequently we all become...holy tools-performing the sacred tasks of healing, serving, and building the Jewish nation" (Levine, 1985). These high expectations place added pressure upon the worker as they are required more and more to be multi-disciplinary-able to mix and match techniques and strategies, in order to respond appropriately to the changing needs and demands of the Jewish community. These high demands can lead to worker exhaustion for the Jewish communal worker.

Lack of Control: The ability to work autonomously in developing priorities for day-to-day work, selecting strategies for doing work, and being

resourceful for decision making is essential for being a respected professional. Policies that dictate the manner in which work should be performed, restrict individual autonomy. Without the freedom to balance their interests with those of the organization, individuals quickly lose interest in their job.

Insufficient Reward: In the working environment people obtain a feeling of reward both monetarily and through personal satisfaction. When people find themselves working long hours without monetary compensation or personal satisfaction, burnout is the end result. The issue of low salary and long hours required for success has been cited consistently as a limitation of working in the Jewish communal field (Bubis et al., 1990). In 1993, the New York-UJA Federation retained well respected compensation experts to analyze the compensation of the key staffs at the agencies in question. When measured against other non-profit agencies, the salaries were 12% below, and the total remuneration packages were 6% below comparable organizations (Solomon, 1995).

Unfairness: Three key elements are crucial in order for a work place to be perceived as fair: trust, openness and respect. When an organization acts fairly, it values every person who contributes to its success, it indicates that every individual is important. The absence of these elements contribute directly to burnout. The issue of unfairness and its impact upon women is particularly

relevant to the experience of women within the Jewish communal field. Concern has been voiced regarding the limited opportunities for advancement that are available for women in the field. Weiner (1993), found that women rated gender as having the most significant effect on "their ability to juggle their personal and professional lives" and their ability to manage at UJA-Federation. It is possible that women will be perceive their workplace as unfair and will be more likely to be burned out. The discussion of gender and burn out will be explored in greater depth further in this review.

Breakdown of Community: "Community is undermined through the loss of job security and an excessive focus on short term profit that excludes consideration of people" (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Without community, a group of people lack the synergy of an integrated work group. An absence of community negatively impacts both an individual's performance and the productivity of the organization. In addition, members are more vulnerable to conflict within the organization.

Value Conflict: Often organizations emphasize a dedication to excellent service or production while they take actions that damage the quality of work. Excellent quality requires total attention. There must be a match between individual and agency goals, without this there is a values conflict.

Factors that Determine Burnout

Personal characteristics also play a role in determining why some individuals experience burnout while others remain unaffected by it. Men and women often report differences in levels of the three burnout components but mixed evidence exists concerning the pattern and complexity of relationships (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). Younger individuals consistently report higher levels of the burnout components. Older, more experienced employees tend to experience lower levels of burnout than do younger employees. A possible explanation for this phenomenon is that they may actually have shifted their experience set to fit reality as a result of their work experiences (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993).

Social support has been shown to combat burnout in the work place. Cobb (1976), describes social support as "that piece of information which convinces people that others love them and care for them (emotional support), that others respect them and value them (affirmative support), and that they are part of a network of communication and mutual support (network support)." As a result of the work climate, people can find themselves in a downward spiral; they feel lonelier, and more and more isolated from colleagues and the outer world. Their social relations become fewer, and depression, burnout, and disease loom on the

horizon (Winnubst, 1982). Social support has a positive effect on the well-being of individuals through two different processes (Cherniss, 1980). First, support acts as a buffer between job-related stress and the negative effects of stressful events. Second, social support can have a main or direct effect on experienced stress. It is positively related to psychological and physical health, regardless of whether life or work stressors are present or not.

Research has found that individuals who have had greater upward career movement may experience less burnout (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). First, repeated promotion is usually followed by a reduction in client contact which reduces an individual's susceptibility to emotional exhaustion that occurs as a consequence of the demands of client interaction. Second, greater career advancement relative to coworkers may show people that they are making a positive contribution and serves as positive reinforcement. Third, workers who have had reasonable career progress are more likely to believe in the fairness and equity of organizational policies and procedures. A belief in the fairness of an agency lessens the possibility that depersonalization will occur. Concern about the limited opportunities available for women in Jewish communal leadership roles has been voiced for over a decade. A Federation survey of women in leadership and professional positions found that women tend to play a greater role in small federations than they do in large federations, on both the lay and

professional level (Wiener, 1993). For example, in small cities in 1993, 36% of the executive directors were women, compared to no female CEOs in large cities. This study found that of the 90 UJA-Federation agencies, 80% are run by men and 20% by women. Jewish community centers have higher proportions with 31% of the CEOS being female. The perception of limited opportunity for advancement within the Jewish communal field for women may lead to increased burnout.

Methodology

The sample was drawn from all 450 alumnae of the school of Jewish communal service at HUC-JIR. Of these 450 alumnae, 200 were graduates of the dual degree MSW/GWB-M.A.J.C.S program, 29 were graduates of the dual MPA/M.A.J.C.S. program, 116 were graduates of the certificate program for Jewish Communal Service, 32 were graduates of the Joint masters program in Jewish education and Jewish communal service and 1 alumni received a dual degree in gerontology and Jewish communal service. Table 2.1 compares the overall alumnae population with the sample and assesses the representativeness of the sample.

Table 2.1

	Alumni	Sample	Response Rate
MSW	44.4	48.5	48%
MPA	6.4	10.2	69%
Joint	7.1	9.2	56%
MAJCS	16.0	10.7	29%
Certif.	25.8	20.9	35%

	450	198	

The results from Table 2.1 show that the sample is representative of the alumnae population. The MSW's comprise the largest group in the sample. The certificate and single masters are under-represented in the sample. This may be due to two biases: 1)these alumnae spent the least amount of time at HUC so they have the least connection to the school and 2) they tended to graduate from HUC in the early years so it is possible we have lost touch with them. The MPA's are over represented by almost half. This might be due to the bias that the MPA program is relatively young and therefore the alumni have a newer and stronger connection to HUC.

There are two ways to compare the sample with the alumnae population. One is by looking at the year of graduation and the other is by looking at the degree(s) received. *Table 2.2 is a representation of sample representation by the year of graduation.*

Table 2.2

	Alumni	Sample	Response rate
1968-79	33.6%	31.8%	41.1%
1980-89	40.7%	33.8%	36.1%
1990-98	25.8%	34.4%	57.8%
		100%	100%

Table 2.2 shows that the most recent graduates were over-represented and they had the highest response rate. They were also the first of the alumnae to mail back their surveys. The earliest cohort (1968-79) was appropriately represented (32% vs. 34%). We expected that the response rate would correspond to the year of graduation, with the earliest graduates being the least likely to return their surveys. Instead it was the middle cohort, 1980-89 that had the lowest return rate. We speculate that since the 80's classes were so large, they were less connected to HUC and one another. This would make them less likely to respond to an alumni survey. The 60's graduates were the pioneer population and had close relationships with the school and Gerry Bubis, the founder of the school. This increased their likelihood of returning the survey. The 90's graduates are the most recent graduates and experience a sense of higher connectedness to the school and also more likely to return the alumni survey than their 80's counterparts.

The instrument used for gathering data was a survey, comprised of 83 questions. The survey was distributed twice by mail, to all 450 alumnae over a two month period. The results of the surveys were inputed through a coding system and then analyzed through SPSS.

The survey was designed to test the hypothesis that those who entered the field with a stong sense of Jewish commitment would be less likely to leave the field because of burnout. The burnout section relied upon the Maslach Burnout

Inventory (MBI) to measure the burnout rate. The MBI is a three component measure designed to assess the three components of the burnout syndrome: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. There are 22 items, which are divided into three subscales. The items are written in the form of statments about personal feelings or attitudes, and are answered in terms of the frequency (on a 7-point scale) with which the respondent experiences them. The MBI has been used widely in research on burnout, and both the measure and the underlying multidimensional model have received strong empirical support.

The survey distributed to alumni included the MBI as well as one additional question to make the burnout section more applicable to the Jewish communal field. Question 29 asked the following: "I feel I am making an effective contribution to the Jewish community." Questions 22 through 44 assess the extent of burnout and they are as follows:

Q 22. I feel emotionally drained from my work.
Q 23. I feel used up at the end of the workday.
Q 24. I feel tired when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.
Q 25. Working all day is really a strain for me.
Q 26. I can effectively solve the problems that arise in my work.
Q 27. I feel burned out from my work.
Q 28. I feel I am making an effective contribution to what this organization does.

Q 29. I feel I am making an effective contribution to the Jewish community.

Q 30. I have become less interested in my work since I started this job.

Q 31. I have become less enthusiastic about my work.

Q 32. I have become more cynical about whether my work contribues anything.

Q. 33. I doubt the significance of my work.

Q 34. In my opinion, I am good at my job.

Q 35. I feel exhilarated when I accomplish something at work.

Q 36. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.

Q 37. I just want to do my job and not be bothered.

Q 38. At my work, I feel confident that I am effective at getting things done.

Q 39. I feel I am positively influencing other people's lives through my work.

Q 40. I feel I'm working too hard on my job.

Q 41. I feel frustrated by my job.

Q 42. I feel exhilarated by work.

Q 43. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.

Q 44. I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.

It is important to mention that the subscale for respondents was as follows: 0=never, 1=a few times a year or less, 2=once a month or less, 3=a few times a month, 4=once a week, 5=a few times a week and 6=every day.

In addition to testing for burnout, this survey also employed one other dependant variable, namely retention. Questions 3-10 and 46-47 on the survey were designed to determine how many alumni are still working in the Jewish community. They are as follows:

Q 3. How many different positions have you had since leaving HUC?

Q 4. How many of these positions have been in the Jewish community?

Q 5. Is your current position in the Jewish community?

Q 6. What type of setting do you currently work in?

Q 7. Year you started this position?

Q 8. Is this position full time or part time?

Q 9. How would you describe your current position?

Q 10. How important was each of the following considerations in your decision to leave your previous position and take this position?

Q 46. Other than a job described above, have you ever worked outside the Jewish community after graduating from HUC?

Q 47. Have you ever actively sought a position outside the Jewish community after graduating from HUC?

The independent variables employed in this survey were as follows: background, comittment, social support, gender, preparation and lay conflict. Background was determined by questions 62 through question 83 and they were as follows:

Q 62. What was the denomination of your family most of the time when you were growing up?

Q 63. Do you currently belong to a synagogue/minyan?

Q 64. Is this synagogue/minyan Orthodox, Conservative, Traditional, Reform, Renewal, Reconstruction or Other?

Q 65. What kind of Jewish education did you receive most of the time when you were growing up both before and after age 13?

Q 66. Did you belong to a youth group any time when you were growing up?

Q 67. What was the highest degree you obtained before coming to HUC?

Q 68. What is your current marital status?

Q 69. Year of current or most recent marriag?

Q 70. How many times have you been married altogether?

Q 71. Year of first marriage, if more than once?

Q 72. Do you have any children?

Q 73. What are the ages of these children?

Q 74. What is your gender?

Q 75. Did you take maternity leave from work for your most recent child?

Q 76. How many months was your maternity leave?

Q 77. How many months were you paid leave?

Q 78. Did you want more time off than was originally available?

Q 79. How was this difference resolved?

Q 80. How old were you on your last birthday?

Q 81. In what state do you currently reside?

Q 82. About what size is the Jewish community in which you currently reside?

Q 83. What is the zip code of your current residence?

Commitment to the Jewish community was determined by questions 46 and 47:

Q 46. Other than a job described above, have you ever worked outside the Jewish comunity after graduating from HUC?

Q 47. Have you ever actively sought a position outside the Jewish community after graduating from HUC?

Social support was measured by question 61 which asked the following: On the average, when you have problems at work how often do you discuss them with any of the persons listed below?

Gender was addressed by question 74-78 listed above.

Preparation by HUC-JIR was covered by questions 11a, 12a, 13a, 14a, 15a, and 16a as follows:

Q 11a. How well prepared were you for fund raising by your education at HUC?

Q 12a. How well prepared were you to work with budgets by your education at HUC?

Q 13a. How well prepared were you for doing Jewish content programming by your education at HUC?

Q 14a. How well prepared were you for administration by your education at HUC?

Q 15a. How well prepared were your for supervision by your education at HUC?

Q 16a. How well prepared were you for working with lay leaders by your education at HUC?

Lastly, lay conflict is covered by questions 10u, 17a-c, 48o and 48u and they are as follows:

Q 10u. Did you like the way lay leaders treated professionals?

Q 17a. Do the professionals respect the lay leaders?

Q 17b. Do the lay leaders respect the professionals?

Q 17c. Are the board and executive committee meetings essentially meaningless because the real decisions have been made before the meetings?

Q 48o. Did you like the lay leaders in your previous position?

Q 48u. Did not like the way the lay leaders treated professionals?

Profile of Respondents

Behind the creation of the first Jewish communal service programs was a concern with professionals who had minimal commitments to Jewish communal work leaving the field. The problem was assumed to have been solved with the inception of the first programs in Jewish communal service at Brandeis University and Hebrew Union College. With the exception of the Wexner study (Fishman et. al., 1995), there are no studies on the careers of Jewish communal professionals. Fishman and her colleqgues surveyed 280 professionals who had graduated from a major training institution for Jewish professionals in the 1980's and were in the first decade of their careers. Areas surveyed included sources of job dissatisfaction, early work experiences which shaped feelings about the Jewish professional world postively and negatively, and aspects of background and professional training which seemed related to successful job performance.

The research reported on here focused on a single institution, the HUC School of Jewish Communal service. The purpose of this study was to assess job satisfaction, burnout from job, and alumni retention in the field. The underlying hypothesis was that alumni who felt Jewish communal service was a calling would be less likely to leave the field due to burnout.

In order to organize the data, respondents were split into three cohorts based upon the year they graduated: 1968-79, 1980-89, and 1990-98. Each of

these decades represents a distinct period in the history of the school. The 1970's were a period experimentation and definition. It was during this time that SJCS moved from a certificate program to a dual-degree program and set its year round curriculum in place. The 1980s were a decade of transition in which new degree programs such as MPA and the short lived gerontology program were introduced. This was also a period of the largest enrolments. The 1990's saw the retirement of Gerald Bubis, the founding director. This was also a time in which new management oriented courses were added to the curriculum along with more Judaica offereings.

It turned out that roughly one third of the respondents were found in each decade, so that experiences and opinions of alumni from each period can be compared.. Each of the decades comprised approximately 1/3 of the respondents. We wanted to look at differences in cohorts to see how the school has changed as reflected in the alumni. In fact what we found was that in many ways these are three distinct groups.

The MSW program comprised 58% of the graduates from 80-89 and 55% of the graduates from 90-98. This stands in contrast to the Certificate program which has 51% of the graduates from 1968-79. This program has declined in enrollment because in the early years the only available option was the certificate program. Over the decades as the number and diversity of programs offered has

increased only 2% of respondents received a certificate from 90-98.

The rise in the number of Joint-masters represents a new and interesting trend that has transformed the make up of the alumni. The number of students receiving a joint masters has increased from 5% in 68-79, and 9% from 80-89, to 13% from 1990-98. In addition, there appear to be fewer graduates of the single masters program over the years, compared to the dual programs in public administration and social work which have increased. This may be attributed to the fact that many people who pursue the single masters already have extensive field experience or an existing masters degree. The students entering the dual masters programs are starting at younger ages and do not have the field experience or a second graduate degree.

Table 3.1 Type of Degree By Year Graduated

	Year Graduated HUC				
	68 - 79	80 - 89	90 - 98	Total	
MSW	31.10%	57.60%	55.20%	48.50%	
GERO	0	0	1.50%	0.50%	
MAJCS	13.10%	7.60%	10.40%	10.30%	
MPA	0	12.10%	17.90%	10.30%	p= .000
Joint Masters	4.90%	9.10%	13.40%	9.30%	
Certificate	50.80%	13.60%	1.50%	21.10%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	

One out of three (32 percent) respondents are currently working outside the Jewish community. Another 28 percent of respondents have worked outside the Jewish community at some point in their careers. The longer people are in the field, the more likely they are to be working outside the Jewish community. Only 17 percent of the 90's graduates are working outside the Jewish community, as compared with 33 percent of the 80's graduates and 47 percent of the 70's When previous employment outside the Jewish community is taken into consideration, the eighties graduates are noteworthy for having worked outside the Jewish community at the same rate as the seventies graduates (62% vs. 61 percent). The

difference is that the eighties graduates returned to the Jewish community while the seventies graduates did not.

Table 3.2 Working Outside Jewish Community by Year Graduated

	Year Graduated HUC				
	68 - 79	80 - 89	90 - 98	Total	
Outside now	46.60%	33.30%	16.90%	31.70%	
Previous work Outside	12.10%	19.70%	7.70%	13.20%	
Sought work Only	6.90%	4.50%	13.80%	8.50%	
Only Jewish	29.30%	24.20%	52.30%	35.40%	p= .001
Not Working-Now, Jewish Only in Past	3.40%	9.10%	6.20%	6.30%	
Not Working - Previous Not Jewish	1.70%	9.10%	3.10%	4.80%	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Marital status and family patterns.

As would be expected, the most recent cohort is predominantly single, the eighties cohort have children now, and the seventies cohort tends to have grown children. Consistent with family values taught in the SJCS, most of the graduates are currently married: including two out of three (64%) of the most recent cohort. The number of respondents who are married increases for those who have graduated before 1989 and remains stable throughout the rest of the respondents. Divorce/separation is representative of a very small number of respondents

throughout the three decades. Graduates from the earliest two decades are the most likely to have children. Graduates from the 80-89 cohort are the most likely to have children in the household-74%. Sixty-three percent of respondents from the 1990-98 cohort have no children.

Table 3.3 Year of Graduation By Age of Youngest Child and Marital Status of Respondent

	Year Graduated HUC				
Age of Youngest Child	68 - 79	80 - 89	90 - 98	Total	
No Kids	6.50%	18.20%	62.70%	29.70%	
Under 5	12.90%	43.90%	28.40%	28.70%	
Kids 6+	29%	27.30%	3.00%	19.50%	p= .000
Teens	25.80%	3.00%	0.00%	9.20%	
19+ Only	25.80%	7.60%	6.00%	12.80%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Marital Status					
Married	91.80%	90.50%	59.40%	80.30%	
Divorce/ Seperated	4.90%	6.30%	4.70%	5.30%	
Widow(er)	1.60%	0	0	0.50%	p= .000
Never Married	1.60%	3.20%	35.90%	13.80%	
	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Types of Respondents

There are striking cohort differences in the type of employment, which goes along with the trend toward leaving the Jewish community the longer one is out of school. Respondents from 1968-79 are most likely to be in the for profit

sector (30%). Respondents from the 1980's are most likely to be working in either a nonprofit that is not in the Jewish community or in a national Jewish agency. The graduates from 1990-98 are most likely to be working within a Federation setting (36%). Other popular positions are the Jewish Community Centers or running a Jewish day school.

Table 3.4 Year Graduated by Place of Employment

	Year Graduated HUC				
Place of Work	68 - 79	80 - 89	90 - 98	Total	
Federation	24.50%	12.70%	35.70%	24.40%	
JCC	0	5.50%	8.90%	4.90%	
Counseling Agency	7.50%	7.30%	3.60%	6.10%	
B.J.E	1.90%	1.80%	3.60%	2.40%	
Running a School	1.90%	7.30%	14.30%	7.90%	
National Jewish Agency.	7.50%	18.20%	8.90%	11.60%	p= .008
Business	15.10%	14.50%	7.10%	12.20%	
Not for Profit	11.30%	23.60%	10.70%	15.20%	
Govt.	5.70%	1.80%	0	2.40%	
Education	5.70%	0	0	1.80%	
Self-employed	15.10%	5.50%	3.60%	7.90%	
Other	1.90%	1.80%	3.60%	2.40%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	

In chapter 5 the issue of leaving the field will be taken up in greater detail.

Satisfaction with Curriculum

The 1988 thesis (Burg-Schnirman et al.) looked closely at a number of curricular issues. Although this was not our main focus, we also included some curricular questions about professional skills in six areas: working with lay leaders, fund raising, working with budgets, Jewish content programming, supervision, and administration.

It should be noted that only those graduates who actually use the specific skills were asked to evaluate how well prepared they were. The overall pattern is that later graduates feel they were better prepared than earlier graduates, with the occasional exception of the eighties cohort.

Working with lay leaders

Four out of five graduates reported that they work with lay leaders: 63 percent work with lay leaders on a regular basis and another 15 percent occasionally.

The nineties graduates say they were the best prepared for working with lay leaders. In fact, almost 80 percent stated that they were "very well prepared." Although MSW and M PA students ostensibly, have comparable programs, the MPA graduates felt they were the best prepared. Perhaps more of them took management courses because of the emphases in that program. Certificate

students, who were predominantly in the seventies cohort, were the least prepared to work with lay people.

Table 3.5 Year Graduated by Preparedness of Working with Lay Leaders

	Year Graduated HUC				
	68 - 79	80 - 89	90 - 98	Total	
Very Well Prepared	40.00%	55.00%	79.50%	63.30%	p= .035
Somewhat Prepared	55.00%	40.00%	20.50%	34.20%	
Not Prepared	5.00%	5.00%	0	2.50%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Budgeting

About three quarters of all graduates, regardless of cohort, work with budgets. Most graduates did not feel well prepared. The nineties graduates were the best prepared, but only 18 percent felt they were very well prepared. The seventies graduates predominately were not prepared for budgeting (there were no budgeting classes offered in those years). During the eighties, budgeting was a component in the planning/budgeting course, and the eighties graduates felt better

prepared. In the nineties budgeting was offered as a module as part of administration, which helped better prepare the nineties graduates. There were also noted differences in budget preparation by degree received.

Table 3.6 Year Graduated by Preparedness to Work with Budgets

	Year Graduated HUC				
	68 - 79	80 - 89	90 - 98	Total	
Very Well Prepared	7.70%	2.60%	18.20%	9.80%	p= .000
Somewhat Prepared	15.40%	53.80%	56.80%	42.60%	
Not Prepared	76.90%	43.60%	25%	47.50%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Jewish Content Programming

Jewish content programming can vary from giving d'var torah (or helping a lay leader give one) to planning a board retreat, to doing a youth program at a Jewish center. At least of half of any cohort is involved with Jewish content programming. The seventies graduates felt the most prepared, which is consistent with the emphasis of the school during this time. In the beginning, the SJCS was

still concerned with legitimizing the Jewish aspect of communal service, and one of the core courses was called "The Jewish Component in Jewish Communal Practice." Although the course was still offered for at least part of the eighties, the eighties graduates felt the least prepared for Jewish content programming. The nineties graduates, by contrast, felt they were much better prepared for Jewish content programming, and this may reflect the increased number of Jewish content courses offered in the SJCS during the nineties.

Table 3.7 Year Graduated with Preparedness for Jewish Content Programming

	Year Graduated HUC				
	68 - 79	80 - 89	90 - 98	Total	
Very Well Prepared	70.60%	36.40%	60.90%	56.60%	p= .047
Somewhat Prepared	29.40%	57.60%	37.00%	40.70%	
Not Prepared	0.00%	6.10%	2%	2.70%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Administration and Supervision

At least 80 percent of every cohort does administration Table 3.8.. This is particularly for the most recent cohort who have apparently moved quickly into administration. In the early years there were no management courses offered, and those graduates were the least prepared. By contrast, management courses became requirements in the late nineties, and the nineties graduates felt they were the best prepared.

Table 3.8 Year Graduated with Preparedness for Administration

	Year Graduated HUC				
	68 - 79	80 - 89	90 - 98	Total	
Very Well Prepared	13.30%	30.40%	50.00%	31.70%	p= .000
Somewhat Prepared	44.40%	60.90%	41.70%	48.90%	
Not Prepared	42.20%	8.70%	8%	19.40%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Supervision has always been a problematic course, because few students actually had any supervision experience, and thus a course on supervision (one was offered

for a time in the eighties) is abstract. As Table 3.9 shows, after ten years about three quarters of the graduates are doing supervision (and even half of the most recent graduates are doing supervision). Overall, however, the graduates indicate that they were not very well prepared. Consistent with other findings, the nineties graduates felt they were better prepared than their earlier counterparts.

Table 3.9 Year Graduated by Preparedness for Supervision.

	Year Graduated HUC				
	68 - 79	80 - 89	90 - 98	Total	
Very Well Prepared	20.50%	30.00%	38.70%	28.70%	p= .010
Somewhat Prepared	31.80%	45.00%	51.60%	41.70%	
Not Prepared	47.70%	25.00%	9.70%	29.60%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	

Section 4 will address the findings on gender differences in the field.

Gender

As we showed in the previous chapter, the student body of the Irwin Daniel's School of Jewish Communal Service (SJCS) has become increasingly feminized, as has the field as a whole. Therefore, we have given special emphasis to female graduates and the gender issues they face. The total number of men and women who responded to our survey are 66 and 114 respectively. The response rate of females to males demonstrates the disproportionate population size, approximately two to one, which is also representative in the field of JCS.

The SJCS has moved from having equal representation of men and women to being predominantly female. The proportion of female graduates increased from 48 percent of the seventies alumni to 62 percent of the 80's graduates, to 78 percent of the nineties graduates. We would expect that the proportion will continue to increase.

Table 4.1 Gender by Year of Graduation

		Year Graduated HUC			
		68-79	80-89	90-98	Total
Gender	Male	51.80%	37.70%	21.70%	36.70%
	Female	48.20%	62.30%	78.30%	63.30%
Total		100%	100%	100%	100%

p = .003

Since the males were predominantly in the early graduating classes, the

female alumni are younger than the male alumni: 40% of female respondents are age 35 and under compared with 16% of males. The percent of men and women from 36-46 years old is almost the same. Of the respondents who are over 47 years old, 25% are female and 45% male.

Table 4.2 Age by Gender

	Gender		
Age	Male	Female	Total
35 & under	15.60%	39.50%	30.90%
36-46	39.10%	36.00%	37.10%
47 +	45.30%	24.60%	32%
Total	100%	100%	100%

p= .001

More than half (53%) of women have children in their household. Women aged 36-46 years old are the most likely to have children in their household (88%) as compared to only 20% in the 35 and under group (because they have not yet or have only recently married) and 54% in the 47 years and older group (whose children have grown).

Table 4.3 Age of Youngest Child by Age of Respondent: Females Only

	Age			
	35 & under	36-46	47+	Total
No Kids	80%	12.20%	7.10%	37.70%
Under 5	17.80%	48.80%	3.60%	25.40%
Kids 6+	2.20%	31.70%	25.00%	18.40%
Teens	0.00%	7.30%	25.00%	8.80%
19+ Only	0.00%	0.00%	39%	9.60%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

p= .000

For women, working in the Jewish community is very much influenced by their stage in the family cycle. Women from 36-46 years old are the most likely to be working part time because they have children in the household. The number of women working full time is greatest for those who are 35 and under because they tend to be single or married without children.

Eventually women over 47 years old return to the labor force, even though 40 % choose to remain working part time and 16% do not work at all.

Table 4.4 Labor Force Status By Age, Females Only

	Age of Female			
Labor Force Status	35 & under	36-46	47 +	Total
Full time	65.90%	34.10%	44%	49.10%
Part time	18.20%	46.30%	40%	33.60%
Not Workng	15.90%	19.50%	16%	17%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

p= .039

Married women are the least likely to be working full time and are the most likely to be working part time. Women who have never been married are the most likely to be working full time. This fits with the fact that they are the youngest group and are the least likely to have children. Single parents are more likely to be working full time than women who are married with the same age children. For the group of women who have no children, women who have never been married are more likely to be working than those that are married. Once their children are teenagers, married women begin to re-enter the work force in larger numbers than married women with younger children.

Table 4.5 Marital Status and Position in Labor Force by Age of Youngest Child: Females Only

		No Kids	Under 5	Kids 6+	Teens	19+ Only	Total
Married	Full time	63.60%	28.60%	29.40%	37.50%	57.10%	41.50%
	Part time	27.30%	32.10%	47.10%	62.50%	28.60%	36.60%
	Not Wrkng	9.10%	39.30%	23.50%	0	14.30%	22%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Divrced/ Separated	Full time	0	0	66.70%	100%	50%	66.70%
	Part time	0	0	33.30%	0	50%	33.30%
	Total	0	0	100%	100%	100%	100%
Never Married	Full time	78.90%	0	0	0	0	78.90%
	Part time	15.80%	0	0	0	0	15.80%
	Not Wrkng	5.30%	0	0	0	0	5.30%
	Total	100%	0	0	0	0	100%
Widow	Part time	0	0	0	0	100%	100%
	Total	0	0	0	0	100%	100%

p= .059

Where they work

The proportion of respondents working outside the Jewish community is greater for men than for women: 39 % for men and 28 % for women. This is in part because the earliest graduates are the most likely to have left the field: 47 % of the seventies graduates work outside the JC as compared with only 17% of the

nineties graduates. Women employed part time are more likely to work outside the Jewish community (39%) than those who work full time (28%).

For women, leaving and returning to the Jewish community parallels the family cycle. Women without children (who also tend to be single) are the most likely to be working full time in the Jewish community (57 percent). Women with children under 5 are the most likely not be working at all (38%). Women whose youngest child is between 6 and 12 have returned to the labor force, but are not working full time in the Jewish community. Instead, they are almost equally divided among part time Jewish work, full time non-Jewish work, and part time non-Jewish work.

Table 4.6 Place of Work and Age of Youngest Child- Females Only

	Age of Children					
	No Kids	Under 5	Kids 6 +	Teens	19+ Only	Total
Jewish-FT	57.10%	24.10%	10.00%	33.30%	33.30%	35.80%
Jewish-PT	7.10%	27.60%	25%	33.30%	33.30%	20.20%
NJ-FT	14.30%	3.40%	25%	11.10%	22.20%	13.80%
NJ-PT	14.30%	6.90%	20%	22.20%	0	12.80%
Not Workng	7.10%	37.90%	20%	0	11.10%	17.40%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

p=.003

One would expect that women with teenage or grown children would be returning to full time Jewish communal work. This is partially, true, but only one

third have done so. These women equally divided between part time and full time Jewish work, with another third working outside the Jewish community. Having left full time Jewish work with the beginning of a family, most of the women alumni have not returned to full time Jewish work. Instead, they have stayed outside the Jewish community are working part time in the Jewish community. We do not know whether this part time work is their own choice, or represents a paucity of attractive options.

Our research has indirect evidence that there are fewer desirable opportunities in the Jewish community. Women with children aged 6-12 years who are working full time are more than twice as likely to be working outside of the Jewish community (25 percent) than in the Jewish community 10 percent). We suspect that there is less flexibility within the Jewish community. Part time work also seems to be more attractive outside the Jewish community. Even women with no children who are working part time are more likely to be working outside the Jewish community.

Taking all these trends together a picture emerges in which younger female graduates start out full time in the Jewish community, have children and leave the labor force altogether or find part time employment. This part time employment is more plentiful or more attractive outside the Jewish community. Having left full time employment in the Jewish community, female graduates are

either unwilling or unable to return to it.

Salary

Based upon previous research in the field which has found that a gender gap exists in terms of salary, we were curious about any differences between the incomes of men and women in Jewish communal service. A significant difference does exist between the income earned by men and women. For people working full time, almost half (44%) of women are in the lowest income category (earning under $40,000) whereas the same proportion of males (45%) are found in the highest income category (earning more than $100,000). In contrast, there were no significant differences in the salaries earned by men and women in the non-Jewish field.

Table 4.7 Salary by Gender: Males and Females Employed Full Time in Jewish Settings

	Gender		
	Male	Female	Total
Under $40,000	10.50%	43.60%	27.30%
$40,000 - $49,999	5.30%	25.60%	15.60%
$50,000 - $59,999	13.20%	20.50%	16.90%
$60,000 - $69,999	10.50%	2.60%	6.50%
$70,000 - $79,999	7.90%	5.10%	6.50%
$80,000 - $89,999	2.60%	0	1.30%
$90,000 - $99,999	5.30%	0	2.60%
$100,000 and above	44.70%	2.60%	23.40%
Total	100%	100%	100%

p = .000

Two possible explanations can account for this income gender gap. Perhaps women work in lower paying settings. Alternatively, the female alumni have graduated more recently and thus have been in the field for a shorter period of time. The income gender gap might be in reality an experience gap. Working in different settings does not account for the income gap. In the Federation field, for example, most of the females (58%) are found in the lowest income category (under $40,000) compared to 52% of men who are found in the

highest income category (earning over $100,000). Significant differences in terms of salary were also found within the JCC and Counseling agency settings with 88% of females earning under $40,000 compared to 100% of the men earning above $50,000. Only in Jewish education and national Jewish agencies were gender differences not significant. Thus it appears that setting does account for some of the discrepancy between the salaries of men and women, but income differences remain when men and women in the same settings are compared.

Table 4.8 Salary by Gender: Full-Time Employed Males and Females by Setting

		Gender			
		Male	Female	Total	
Federation	Under $40,000	4.80%	58.30%	24.20%	
	$40,000 - $49,999	4.80%	25.00%	12.10%	
	$50,000 - $59,999	14.30%	8.30%	12.10%	p= .004
	$60,000 - $69,999	9.50%	0.00%	6.10%	
	$70,000 - $79,999	4.80%	8.30%	6.10%	
	$80,000 - $89,999	4.80%	0	3.00%	
	$90,000 - $99,999	4.80%	0	3.00%	
	$100,000 and above	52.40%	0.00%	33.30%	
	Total	100%	100%	100%	
JCC/ Counseling Agency	Under $40,000	0	87.50%	63.60%	
	$40,000 - $49,999	0	12.50%	9.10%	p= .012
	$50,000 - $59,999	66.70%	0	18.20%	
	$70,000 - $79,999	33.30%	0	9.10%	
	Total	100%	100%	100%	

Experience does not explain the income gender gap either. Within age categories, men still earned more than women. In the youngest category (35 years and under) women are twice as likely to be in the lowest income category (50% of females vs. to 22% of men). Within the same category 67% of males are earning

over $50,000 compared to 22% of females. Within the 36-46 cohort, the income gap closes somewhat and the salaries have increased: 43% of females earning 50,000-60,000 and 47% of males earning $100,000 and above. Within the oldest cohort the income discrepancy increases: 67% of females earn under $60,000, while 75% of men over $100,000. These data reflect the fact that difference in income is not accounted for solely by setting and age, but also by gender.

Table 4.9 Gender, Salary, and Age

Age		Gender Male	Female	Total	
35 & under	Under $40,000	22.20%	50.00%	42.90%	
	$40,000 - $49,999	11.10%	26.90%	22.90%	p= .055
	$50,000 - $59,999	33.30%	19.20%	22.90%	
	$60,000 - $69,999	33.30%	3.80%	11.40%	
Total		100%	100%	100%	
36 - 46	Under $40,000	11.80%	0	8.30%	
	$40,000 - $49,999	5.90%	28.60%	12.50%	
	$50,000 - $59,999	5.90%	42.90%	16.70%	
	$60,000 - $69,999	5.90%	0	4.20%	p = .053
	$70,000 - $79,999	5.90%	28.60%	12.50%	
	$80,000 - $89,999	5.90%	0	4.20%	
	$90,000 - $99,999	11.80%	0	8.30%	
	$100,000 and above	47.10%	0	33.30%	
Total		100%	100%	100%	
47 +	Under $40,000	0	66.70%	22.20%	
	$40,000 - $49,999	0.00%	0	5.60%	
	$50,000 - $59,999	8.30%	0	5.60%	p = .007
	$70,000 - $79,999	16.70%	0	11.10%	
	$100,000 and above	75%	16.70%	55.60%	
Total		100%	100%	100%	

"Burnout" Among the Alumni

The first section addresses average burnout as measured by the MBI. The purpose of the this section is to explore individual MBI question to assess levels of alumnae burnout.

Burnout was measured by 24 statements from the Maslach Burnout Index. The scores ranged from 0-6 for how often the respondent experienced positive and negative feelings about the job.

0 Never
1 A few times a year or less
2 Once a month or less
3 A few times a month
4 Once a week
5 A few times a week
6 Every day

The MBI was comprised of both negative and positive statements. A complete list of these statements is shown below along with the average score for the sample. Overall, the MBI scores for the alumni sample were relatively low, and the patterns of response to each item show why this is so.

The negative statements that reflect levels of burnout ranged from mild to very strong. The strongest negative statement was "I feel I'm working too hard on my job." This statement received a mean of 2.6 for all respondents which signifies that they were experiencing this approximately once a month to a few times a month. The items below are ranked in decreasing order, according to how

many respondents identified with the individual statement. The more powerful items, like "I have become less interested in my work since I started this job" or "I have become more cynical about whether my work contributes anything" are experienced only once or twice a year.

NEGATIVE STATEMENTS	
I feel I'm working toc hard on my job	2.6244
I feel used up at the end of the workday.	2.5732
I feel emotionally drained from my work	2.5404
I feel frustrated by my job	2.2487
I feel tired when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job	1.9495
I feel burned out from my work.	1.6010
I just want to do my job and not be bothered.	1.5330
Working all day is really a strain for me.	1.2944
I have become less enthusiastic about my work	1.2919
I have become less interested in my work since I started this job	1.1414
I feel like I'm at the end of my rope	.7929
I have become more cynical about whether my work contributes anything.	.9419
I doubt the significance of my work.	.6970

In contrast, the positive statements occur regularly. Respondents reported feeling that "in my opinion, I am good at my job," "I feel like I am effective at my work" and "I feel I am making an effective contribution to what the organization does" at least once a week.

POSITIVE STATEMENTS

In my opinion, I am good at my job.	4.5609
I can effectively solve the problems that arise in my work.	4.5253
I feel I am making an effective contribution to what this organization does.	4.4242
At my work, I feel confident that I am effective at getting things done.	4.1439
I feel I'm positively influencing other people	4.1751
I feel exhilarated when I accomplish something at work.	4.0508
I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.	4.0884
I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job	3.8611
I feel exhilarated by work	3.5480
I feel I am making an effective contribution to the Jewish community	3.2755

Overall, burnout appears to be low. Respondents reported experiencing negative feelings about twice a month, while they reported positive feelings on a weekly basis. We wanted to examine the different factors that cause the burnout and what types of people are the most susceptible. It is possible that the positive feedback they receive from work offsets alienation.

The full MBI scale scores were computed by reverse coding statements in the negative so that a 6 would be changed to a 0, a 5 to a 1, a 4 to a 2 with 3 remaining as the mid point. Thus MBI is unidirectional which means that a question about a positive feeling toward work would be scored the same way as a person who rarely experienced a negative feeling.

Given the previous discussion of gender differences in chapter four, we hypothesized that burnout would be different for men and women. Table 5.1 shows that the burnout rate is higher for women than for men (42.75 vs. 32.90).

Table 5.1 Mean MBI Score by Gender

Male	Mean MBI	32.90
	N	61
Female	Mean MBI	42.75
	N	92
Total	Mean	38. 82
	N	153
ANOVA	Sig.=.002	

While looking at gender differences it was also discovered that women tend to leave the Jewish community because of burnout. The following table illustrates that women working full time in the Jewish community experienced more burn out (45.9 vs 35.0) than women working full time outside of the Jewish community. These findings were consistent with our expectations that burnout would be associated with working in the Jewish community and that women working outside the community experienced less burn out.

Table 5.2 MBI Burnout Females-Full time vs. Part time

	Full Time	Part Time
Jewish	45.9	40.6
Non-Jewish	35.0	42.4

The literature review predicted that the longer a person is in the field, the less burnout they will experience. Our results were consistent with this hypothesis and are reflected in table 5.3.

Table 5.3 Year of Graduation

1968-69	Mean	34.51
	N	55
1980-89	Mean	36.42
	N	50
1990-98	Mean	44.14
	N	59
Total	Mean	38.55
	N	164

From this table it is clear that the most recent graduates experience the highest rate of burnout (44.14) as opposed to the earliest graduates who experience the lowest rate of burnout (34.51). This might be attributed to the long hours and stress levels most new professionals face. This finding is consistent with other studies of burnout in which younger individuals consistently report higher levels of the burnout components. Older, more experienced employees tend to experience lower levels of burnout than do younger employees. A possible explanation for this phenomenon is that they may actually have shifted their experience set to fit reality as a result of their work experiences (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993).

We also looked at marital status in conjunction with burnout. It was expected that married couples with children or single parents would have the highest burnout rates. In fact the group with the highest burnout rate was those who are married with no children (See Table 5.4).

Table 5.4: Mean MBI Score by Marital Status + Age of Youngest Child

Single, no kids	Mean	42.50
	N	18
Married, no kids	Mean	52.80
	N	20
Married, <6	Mean	34.69
	N	16
Married, 6-12	Mean	42.57
	N	14
Married, teens	Mean	31.00
	N	9
Single Parent	Mean	47.40
	N	5
Empty Nest	Mean	45.13
	N	8

The following section addresses the impact that idealism has upon job satisfaction. We hypothesized that idealistic motivations for working in the Jewish communal field would provide a buffer for job stress. Since burnout was relatively low as a whole, this factor was only true to a limited extent. The

average burnout scores for each "idealism" question that was statistically significant are listed below.

1. Jewish communal service is essential to the survival of the American Jewish community

	Mean burnout score
Strongly Agree	38.12
Agree	44.86
Disagree	32.50
Strongly Disagree	60.00
Total	40.90

ANOVA p=.061

From the burnout scores it appears that those who strongly disagree with the above statement experience high levels of burnout (60). Those who strongly identify with the above statement experience lower burnout (38.12).

2. My career in Jewish communal service has contributed to my personal Jewish growth.

	Mean burnout score
Strongly Agree	36.99
Agree	44.33
Disagree	44.05
Strongly Disagree	50.29
Total	40.76

ANOVA p=.050

The above scores suggest that alumnae who have a personal connection to Jewish communal service will experience less burnout (strongly agree-36.99) than those who have little or no connection (strongly disagree-50.29).

3. I am less enthusiastic about Jewish communal service now than I was as a student

	Mean burnout
Strongly Agree	44.19
Agree	47.00
Disagree	41.32
Strongly Disagree	22.62
Total	40.89

ANOVA p=.000

Out of the 15 questions we created to address idealism, only three were associated with burnout and essentially do not have much to do with burnout. However the last table does reflect the notion that the people who retained their student idealism are significantly less burned out than those who did not .

The literature linking social support and burnout shows that social support provides a buffer for job stress and burnout. Since overall burnout was low, social support had little impact, except for one factor. Alumnae who were in contact with lay leadership experienced less job stress and burnout. This is evident from the results below in which those who frequently talk to lay leaders experience a

mean burnout score of 30.54 while those who reported rarely talking to lay leaders experience a mean burnout score of 42.23.

4. How often to do talk with a lay leader associated with your work setting

	Mean burnout
Frequently	30.54
Sometimes	37.12
Rarely/ Never	42.23

ANOVA p=.063

This next section addresses leaving the field. One of the rationales for Jewish Communal Service is that professionals who are trained in the field will remain there. This assumption is based on a number of past studies and our own personal sense of idealism. We also felt that if people left the field it would be due entirely to burnout. The results contradicted this assumption in the case of males but not females. Several questions examined that different factors that were implicated in accepting a job. For males, the top three reasons were the same for both Jewish and non-Jewish jobs. Levels of importance were ranked with 1= very important 2 = somewhat 3 = not important. The statistically significant differences for males are in bold below. Since all male respondents are working full time, we examined differences in their current jobs in the Jewish and non-Jewish communities for full time work only. Males are more likely to choose a

position in the Jewish community for two reasons: job title and in order to move to a better community. They choose a non Jewish position to get away from a bad supervisor, and because of stress or burnout in the previous position (potentially a Jewish one).

Table 5.5: Reason For Taking a Job by Job Setting: Full Time Employed Respondents Only

	Jewish	Non-Jewish
Had to move because of spouse	2.8824	3.0000
Only position available/offered in community	2.7941	2.6364
Prestige/job title	**2.0571**	**2.5455**
Salary	1.6571	1.8636
Opportunities for advancement	1.5676	1.8636
Previous job not interesting/challenging	2.2000	2.1905
Current job more interesting/challenging	1.4118	1.5000
Previous job was not in my area of interest	2.7353	2.6316
Did not like previous supervisor	**2.7647**	**2.1905**
Preferred supervisor in new position	2.6286	2.3810
Did not like previous organization	2.6571	2.5000
Preferred new organization	2.0278	1.8636
Did not like colleagues in previous position	2.9118	2.7143
Stress or "burn-out" in previous position	**2.4412**	**2.0000**
Did not like lay people in previous position	2.6061	2.4211
Q10P	2.8485	2.9500
Previous position was eliminated	2.6765	2.7619
Previous position was no longer available after maternity or family leave	3.0000	2.9500
Wanted to move out of previous community	**2.3125**	**2.9000**
Specifically wanted to move to new community	**2.1935**	**2.8500**
Did not like the way lay leaders treated professionals	2.5625	2.5789

ANOVA Table

	Sig.
Prestige/job title	**.017**
Did not like previous supervisor	**.006**
Stress or "burn-out" in previous position	**.043**
Wanted to move out of previous community	**.009**
Specifically wanted to move to new community	**.004**
Had to move because of spouse	.255
Only position available/offered in community	.355
Salary	.312
Opportunities for advancement	.170
Previous job not interesting/challenging	.966
Current job more interesting/challenging	.666
Previous job was not in my area of interest	.534
Preferred supervisor in new position	.271
Did not like previous organization	.417
Preferred new organization	.504
Did not like colleagues in previous position	.125
Did not like lay people in previous position	.363
Previous position was eliminated	.657
Previous position was no longer available after maternity or family leave	.209
Did not like the way lay leaders treated professionals	.936

The data above show that the top three reasons for leaving a job were: the current job is more interesting/challenging, opportunities for advancement and salary. It is important to note that the differences between reasons were minimal. Men do not leave the field because of burnout and when they do leave it is for the same reasons whether they are working inside or outside of the Jewish community.

FEMALES

The next section examines the experiences of full time employed females: Although it was found that females in the Jewish community experience more burnout, this was not the main reason for seeking a new job. Females seeking full time employment choose non-Jewish jobs for the same reasons they choose Jewish jobs: Prestige, opportunities for advancement and salary. A common reason for choosing a non-Jewish job was that their old position was cut when they returned from maternity leave (see table below). It appears that the lack of competitiveness of the Jewish community with the non-Jewish world has a large influence upon why both women and men.

Table 5.6 : Reason For Taking a Job: Full Time Employed Female Respondents Only

	Full Time Employed:	
	Jewish	Non-Jewish
Current job more interesting/challenging	*1.5667*	*1.6667*
Salary	*1.9062*	*1.9231*
Opportunities for advancement	*1.8750*	*2.1538*
Had to move because of spouse	2.6774	2.8182
Only position available/offered in community	2.6774	2.9091
Prestige/job title	2.2424	2.4545
Previous job not interesting/challenging	2.2069	2.5000
Previous job was not in my area of interest	2.5517	2.7500
Did not like previous supervisor	2.5172	2.3077
Preferred supervisor in new position	2.3333	2.0769
Did not like previous organization	2.7037	2.4615
Preferred new organization	2.5556	2.2308
Did not like colleagues in previous position	2.7586	2.6923
Stress or "burn-out" in previous position	2.4138	2.3846
Did not like lay people in previous position	2.7586	2.6923
Q10P	2.5926	2.8462
Previous position was eliminated	2.7778	2.8462
Previous position was no longer available after maternity or family leave	**3.0000**	**2.7143**
Wanted to move out of previous community	2.6207	2.8462
Specifically wanted to move to new community	2.5517	2.9231
Did not like the way lay leaders treated professionals	2.7931	2.6154

ANOVA Table

	Sig.
Had to move because of spouse * Q5LFS	.558
Only position available/offered in community * Q5LFS	.229
Prestige/job title * Q5LFS	.391
Salary * Q5LFS	.945
Opportunities for advancement * Q5LFS	.325
Previous job not interesting/challenging * Q5LFS	.334
Current job more interesting/challenging * Q5LFS	.719
Previous job was not in my area of interest * Q5LFS	.364
Did not like previous supervisor * Q5LFS	.441
Preferred supervisor in new position * Q5LFS	.384
Did not like previous organization * Q5LFS	.339
Preferred new organization * Q5LFS	.224
Did not like colleagues in previous position * Q5LFS	.739
Stress or "burn-out" in previous position * Q5LFS	.917
Did not like lay people in previous position * Q5LFS	.720
Q10P * Q5LFS	.285
Previous position was eliminated * Q5LFS	.700
Previous position was no longer available after maternity or family leave *	.041
Wanted to move out of previous community * Q5LFS	.300
Specifically wanted to move to new community * Q5LFS	.124
Did not like the way lay leaders treated professionals * Q5LFS	.334

FEMALES ONLY: PART TIME

There are no differences here. Females take part time positions outside the Jewish community for the same reasons they take them inside the Jewish community

Table 5.7 : Reasons for Selecting a Part-Time Position: Females Only

	Part Time Employed:	
	Jewish-	Non-Jewish
Current job more interesting/challenging	1.8000	1.6923
Had to move because of spouse	2.4444	2.6667
Only position available/offered in community	2.6316	2.9167
Prestige/job title	2.3500	2.6923
Salary	2.2000	2.0769
Opportunities for advancement	2.4500	2.0769
Previous job not interesting/challenging	2.4500	2.0000
Previous job was not in my area of interest	2.6000	2.6667
Did not like previous supervisor	2.4500	2.3846
Preferred supervisor in new position	2.3000	2.6154
Did not like previous organization	2.2500	2.5385
Preferred new organization	2.0000	2.0000
Did not like colleagues in previous position	2.6000	2.9231
Stress or "burn-out" in previous position	2.0476	2.3077
Did not like lay people in previous position	2.7000	3.0000
Previous position was eliminated	2.8947	3.0000
Previous position was no longer available after maternity or family leave	2.8947	3.0000
Wanted to move out of previous community	2.3684	2.8333
Specifically wanted to move to new community	2.4500	2.8333
Did not like the way lay leaders treated professionals	2.7000	2.9231

ANOVA Table

	Sig.
Had to move because of spouse	.498
Only position available/offered in community	.226
Prestige/job title	.153
Salary	.635
Opportunities for advancement	.153
Previous job not interesting/challenging	.116
Current job more interesting/challenging	.722
Previous job was not in my area of interest	.787
Did not like previous supervisor	.829
Preferred supervisor in new position	.270
Did not like previous organization	.309
Preferred new organization	1.000
Did not like colleagues in previous position	.183
Stress or "burn-out" in previous position	.450
Did not like lay people in previous position	.112
Previous position was eliminated	.436
Previous position was no longer available after maternity or family leave	.260
Wanted to move out of previous community	.141
Specifically wanted to move to new community	.193
Did not like the way lay leaders treated professionals	.257

Discussion

Gender & Burnout

Our findings on gender differences in burnout are consistent with the implied consequences of the burnout literature. Research has found that individuals who have had greater upward career movement may experience less burnout (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). First, repeated promotion is usually followed by a reduction in client contact which reduces an individual's susceptibility to emotional exhaustion that occurs as a consequence of the demands of client interaction. Second, greater career advancement relative to coworkers may show people that they are making a positive contribution and serves as positive reinforcement. Third, workers who have had reasonable career progress are more likely to believe in the fairness and equity of organizational policies and procedures. A belief in the fairness of an agency lessens the possibility that depersonalization will occur.

Concern about the limited opportunities available for women in Jewish communal leadership roles has been voiced for over a decade. A Federation survey of women in leadership and professional positions found that women tend to play a greater role in small federations than they do in large federations, on both the lay and professional level (Wiener, 1993). For example, in small cities in

1993, 36% of the executive directors were women, compared to no female CEOs in large cities. Wiener (1993), found that of the 90 UJA-Federation agencies, 80% are run by men and 20% by women. In addition, women rated gender as having the most significant effect on "their ability to juggle their personal and professional lives" and their ability to manage at UJA-Federation" (Weiner, 1993). This reflects the fact that in larger urban areas with heightened competition, men remain at higher levels than do women. Jewish community centers have higher proportions with 31% of the CEOs being female. This might be due to the fact that JCC's are driven by programming, which has traditionally been predominated by women. Thus it appears that gender is consistently being cited as an obstacle for advancement in the Jewish community. If women continue to work in an environment in which a gender bias is perceived, they will be at higher risk for burnout.

The gender based findings of this thesis are consistent with the Wexner study of Jewish professionals (Fishman, 1995). The Wexner study found that women were more likely to leave the field than men. Of the 20 male and 42 female respondents who had studied in programs specifically devoted to Jewish communal service, women (31%) were three times more likely than men (10%) to have left the field altogether.

When gender as well as profession was considered, Fishman (1995) found striking differences between male and female professionals. In terms of federation workers, 100% of women complained of gender discrimination compared with 0% of men. Virtually all of the female federation workers reported that they had been subjected to gender discrimination, that they received inadequate pay, and that they found salary negotiations upsetting. This is consistent with our finding that women in comparable positions made less than men. It is not surprising that women tend to leave the Jewish communal field when they enter the child bearing phase of the life cycle and do not return since they are being paid substantially lower salaries than their male counterparts. 15 years ago Gerry Bubis (1984), the then director of the School of Jewish Communal Service, called the attention of the community to the fact that "as many as 50% of people who begin in Jewish Communal Service are out within 2 years," due in part to low salary.

While the problem of low salaries may have become less of an issue for men, women are still being short changed. With 78% of the 1990's graduates being female and a high proportion of those women leaving the field there exists the potential for a shortage in Jewish communal professionals in the not so distant future. After all, women have no financial incentives to stay in the field. Although HUC is preparing its female graduates for the realities of the Jewish

communal profession, the community as a whole does not seem to be responding to the overwhelming feminization of the field.

Burnout

One of the positive findings from this study was that overall burnout levels were low for the alumni surveyed. There were no significant differences in burnout between people working in the Jewish community and people working outside of the Jewish community. In addition, the level of burnout has a tendency to decrease as years in the field increase. This corroborates the findings of Cordes & Dougherty (1993) that younger individuals consistently report higher levels of the burnout components. Older, more experienced employees tend to experience lower levels of burnout than do younger employees. This suggests that new graduates will experience a transition phase characterized by disillusionment and frustration. The question remains as to whether or not, newer graduates are able to maintain their motivation long enough to stay in the field past the high burnout phase.

The results of this thesis also show that idealism is somewhat of a buffer for burnout. Since job stress was relatively low to begin with, idealism did not make much of a difference. However, those professionals who did retain their student idealism were significantly less burnt out than those who did not. It

would appear that those students who enter the field out of a sense of calling will be more likely to maintain their sense of idealism throughout their career. On the other hand, it is possible that high idealism will predispose people to burn out as they experience a greater discrepancy between their idealistic goals and reality.

Cobb (1976) found that social support acts as a buffer between job related stress and the negative effects of stressful events. In addition, social support can have a main or direct effect on experienced stress. From this literature, it had been hypothesized that social support would serve as a buffer for job dissatisfaction and burnout. The results show that social support had little or no effect on the burnout rate. Since overall burnout was low, social support didn't make much of a difference with one exception, alumni who had positive contact with lay leadership experienced less job stress and burnout. It would follow that if relations with lay leaders has such a large impact on decreasing burnout, the cultivation of positive lay relationships should be a priority. This is an area that warrants further study as a viable avenue for decreasing burnout and increasing worker satisfaction in this labor intensive, high stress field.

Competition with the Non-Jewish World

The issue of low salary and long hours required for success has been cited consistently as a limitation of working in the Jewish communal field (Bubis,

Hollander, Burg-Schnirman, & Dar, 1990). In 1993, the New York-UJA Federation retained well respected compensation experts to analyze the compensation of the key staffs at the agencies in question. When measured against other non-profit agencies, the salaries were 12% below, and the total remuneration packages were 6% below comparable organizations (Solomon, 1995). The Jewish Community is not competing with the non-profit sector as a whole as far as salary, opportunities for advancement and prestige are concerned. In fact these were the reasons that were most commonly cited by survey respondents for leaving the field. It is predicted that more Jewish communal professionals will continue to leave the field in search of better salary options in the non-profit sector if the Jewish community does not provide incentives for them to stay.

Concluding Remarks

The CJF reports that there is a problem keeping and attracting qualified professionals. Most graduates of HUC are women, and thus women make up the majority of professionals trained specifically for the field. The organized Jewish community is faced with a choice between either recruiting more men or making the kinds of adjustments that would retain women in the field.

As the field evolves, the Hebrew Union College will need to continue to develop a heightened sensitivity towards the dynamic changes that are occurring

in the field. Without these necessary changes, graduates of Jewish Communal Service will be unprepared for the realities of the field and the discrepancy between their idealized expectations and reality will widen. This discrepancy might result in a significant increase in burnout. Currently, graduates of HUC seem to be adequately prepared for the challenges that they will face in their future careers in the Jewish community.

As the field of Jewish Communal Service continues to develop its status as a profession the need for continued research both of the professional training programs and the communities in which those professionals work will be necessary. Such research will help to provide a uniformity within the field. It is hoped that eventually there will emerge a set of ethics and standards specific to the field of Jewish communal service which will promote the professional growth and development of this field in the 21 century.

C-JIR, LA
5698

References

Ballin, J. & Prum, M. (1978). Motivation, Expectations and Career Fulfillment of Workers in Jewish Agencies. Masters Thesis. Hebrew Union College and University of Southern California.

Bubis, G. (1994). Jewish communal service today: Paradoxes and problems. Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 71(1), p. 6-12.

Bubis, G. (1984). Recruitment and retention of professional staff for Jewish communal service. Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 60(4), 337-341.

Bubis, G. (1971). The birth of a school. Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal, Winter, 2-20.

Bubis, G., Hollander, H., Burg-Schnirman, D. & Li Dar, E. (1990). An evaluation of the HUC School of Jewish Communal Service. Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 67(1), 326-336.

Bubis, G., Phillips, B., Reitman, S. & Rotto, G. The consumer report: Hiring of entry level Jewish communal workers. Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 62(2), 103-107.

Bubis, G. & Reisman, B. (1995). Jewish communal service training programs and the Federation system. Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 71, 102-109.

Burg-Schnirman, D., Dubin, R., Flaum, T., Hollander, H., Li-Dar, E., Macht., Michel, K. & Ney, L. (1988). The Chai Report: 18 Years of HUC-JIR School of Jewish Communal Service Alumni Speak. Master's Thesis. Hebrew Union College and University of Southern California.

Cherniss, C. (1980). Staff Burnout: Job Stress in the Human Services. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Cordes, C & Dougherty, T. (1993). A review and integration of research on job burnout. The Academy of Management Review, 18(4), 621-637.

Deutsch Quint, E. (1995). Women in leadership roles in Federations: A historic review. Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 71, 96-101.

Fishman, S.B. (1995). Training for Jewish leadership and service-working in the real world. Expectations. Education, and Experience of Jewish Professional Leaders: Report of the Wexner Foundation Research Project on Contemporary Jewish Professional Leadership. Published by Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies at Brandeis University.

Freudenberger, H.J. & Richelson, G. (1980). Burnout: The High Cost of High Achievement. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Goldfarb, L., Lambert, M.J., and Schlossberg, D. (1983). Evaluation of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion School of Jewish Communal

HUC 15

Service. Master's Thesis. Hebrew Union College and University of Southern California.

Lauffer, A. (1969). The future of social work in the Jewish Community Center: The case for disinclined students. Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 46(1),

Levine, E. (1985). Jewish professional-Professional Jew: Commitments and competencies for a Jewish Mission. Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 62(1), 40-48.

Maslach, C. (1982). Burnout: The High Cost of Caring. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Maslach, C. & Leiter, M. (1997). The Truth about Burnout. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pines, A., Aronson, E. & Kafny, D. (1980). Burnout: From Tedium to Personal Growth. New York: Free Press.

Reisman, B. (1979). The Jewish component in the training programs of Jewish communal workers. Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 8(2), 95-102.

Reitman, S. & Rotto, G. (1984). The Consumer Reports: Hiring of Entry Level Jewish Communal Workers. Master's Thesis. Hebrew Union College and University of Southern California.

Schaufeli, W.B., Maslach, C. & Marek, T. (1993). Professional Burnout: Recent Developments in Theory and Research. Washington, D.C.: Taylor and Francis.

Solomon, J.R. (1995). Beyond Jewish communal service: The not-for-profit field at risk. Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 71(4), 303-308.

Stein. (1965). In Bubis, G. & Reisman, B. (1995). Jewish communal service training programs and the Federation system. Journal of Jewish Communal Service, 71, 102-109.

Weiner, A. (1995). Women in Jewish communal leadership in the 21st century. Journal of Jewish Communal Serivce, 71, 124-131.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Thirtieth Anniversary

Alumni Survey

Hebrew Union College - JIR

Irwin Daniels School of Jewish Communal Service

1. What year did you graduate HUC? _____

2. What degree did you receive from HUC?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Double Masters-MSW..... 1
Double Masters-GERO 2
Single Masters (MAJCS)..... 3
Double Masters-MPA 4
Joint Masters 5
Certificate..... 6

3. How many different positions have you had since leaving HUC?_____

4. How many of these positions have been in the Jewish community?_____

IN THIS NEXT SECTION WE WANT TO KNOW ABOUT YOUR CURRENT POSITION

5. Is this position in the Jewish community?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Yes.....1 No .....2 Not Working (SKIP TO Q.48).....3

6. What type of setting is this? *(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)*

In Jewish Community

Federation..... 1
JCC 2
Counseling Agency 3
B.J.E. 4
Running a day school or synagogue school 5
National Jewish Agency (including local branch)..... 6

Outside the Jewish Community

Business (for profit) 7
Not for profit 8
Government..... 9
Education 10
Self-employed 11

7. Year you started this position_____

8. Is this position full time or part time?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Full time ..... 1 Part time 2

9. How would you describe your current position?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Director of Agency or Federation 1
Assistant/Associate director of Agency or Federation 2
Director of Federation Department 3
Assistant/Associate director of Federation Department 4
Director of JCC 3
Assistant/Associate director of JCC 4
Director of national agency (or local branch of national agency) 5
Assistant/Associate director of national agency
(or local branch of national agency) 7
OTHER _____ 8

10. How important was each of the following considerations in your decision to leave your previous position and take this position? How would you describe your current position?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
a) Had to move because of spouse's job	1	2	3
b) Only position available/offered in community	1	2	3
c) Prestige/job title	1	2	3
d) Salary	1	2	3
e) Opportunities for advancement	1	2	3
f) Previous job not interesting/challenging	1	2	3
g) Current job more interesting/challenging	1	2	3
h) Previous job was not in my area of interest	1	2	3
i) Did not like previous supervisor	1	2	3
j) Preferred supervisor in new position	1	2	3
k) Did not like previous organization	1	2	3
l) Preferred new organization	1	2	3
m) Did not like colleagues in previous position	1	2	3
n) Stress or "burn-out" in previous position	1	2	3
o) Did not like lay people in previous position	1	2	3

p) Previous position was time limited (e.g. grant)..... 1 ..... 2 3

q) Previous position was eliminated ..... 1 ..... 2 3

r) Previous position was no longer available
after maternity or family leave ..... 1 ..... 2 3

s) Wanted to move out of previous community ..... 1 ..... 2 3

t) Specifically wanted to move to new community ..... 1 ..... 2 3

u) Did not like the way lay leaders treated professionals ... 1 ..... 2 3

v) OTHER _____

_____

NEXT, WE WOULD LIKE TO FIND OUT ABOUT HOW WELL PREPARED YOU WERE FOR THE KINDS OF THINGS YOU DO IN YOUR CURRENT POSITION

11. Do you do fund raising in your current position?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Yes (CONTINUE)..... 1 No (SKIP TO Q. 12) 2

11a. How well prepared were you for fund raising by your education at HUC?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Very well prepared ..... 1 Somewhat prepared..... 2 Not prepared 3

12. Do you do work with budgets in your current position?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Yes (CONTINUE)..... 1 No (SKIP TO Q. 13) 2

12a. How well prepared were you to work with budgets by your education at HUC?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Very well prepared ..... 1 Somewhat prepared..... 2 Not prepared 3

13. Do you do any kind of Jewish content programming in your current position?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Yes (CONTINUE)..... 1 No (SKIP TO Q. 14) 2

13a. How well prepared were you for doing Jewish content programming by your education at HUC? *(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)*

Very well prepared ..... 1 Somewhat prepared..... 2 Not prepared 3

14. Do you do administration in your current position?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Yes (CONTINUE)..... 1 No (SKIP TO Q .15) 2

14a. How well prepared were you for administration by your education at HUC?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Very well prepared ..... 1 Somewhat prepared..... 2 Not prepared..... 3

15. Do you do supervision in your current position?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Yes (CONTINUE)..... 1 No (SKIP TO Q. 16) 2

15a. How well prepared were you for supervision by your education at HUC?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Very well prepared ..... 1 Somewhat prepared..... 2 Not prepared..... 3

15b. How many employees do you supervise directly? _____

16. In your current position, how often do you work with lay leaders?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Regularly (CONTINUE BELOW). 1 Occasionally (CONTINUE BELOW)... 2

Rarely (CONTINUE BELOW)..... 3 Never (SKIP TO Q. 19) 4

16a. How well prepared were you for working with lay leaders by your education at HUC?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Very well prepared ..... 1 Somewhat prepared..... 2 Not prepared..... 3

17. Please answer the following about your agency or organization (the one with which you are now most involved). *(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)*

	To a great extent	Some-what	A little	Not at all
a) Do the professionals respect the lay leaders?	1	2	3	4
b) Do the lay leaders respect the professionals?	1	2	3	4
c) Are board and executive committee meetings essentially meaningless because the real decisions have been made before the meetings?	1	2	3	4

18. With regard to lay and professional leadership in your agency, do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? *(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)*

	To a great extent	Some-what	A little	Not at all
a) Professionals don't take the leaders very seriously	1	2	3	4
b) Lay leaders try to micro-manage rather than let the professionals do their job	1	2	3	4
c) Lay leaders treat professionals in a demeaning fashion	1	2	3	4
d) My work is appreciated by colleagues in my setting	1	2	3	4
e) My work is appreciated by the lay people in my setting	1	2	3	4

19. How many night meetings have you had in the last four weeks? _____

20. How many weekend days have you had to work in the last four weeks? _____

21. Please circle the salary range for this position:

Under $40,000	1	$70,000-$79,999	5
$40,000-$49,999	2	$80,000-$89,999	6
$50,000-$59,999	3	$90,000-$99,999	7
$60,000-$69,999	4	$100,00 and above	8

IN THE SECTION, WE WANT FIND OUT ABOUT HOW YOU VIEW YOUR CURRENT POSITION.

One purpose of this survey is to discover how HUC alumni view their jobs and the people with whom they work closely. Below there are ____ statements of job-related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have *never* had this feeling, write a "0" (zero) before the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate *how often* you feel it by writing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

HOW OFTEN:	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

HOW OFTEN 0-6	Statements:
22. _____	I feel emotionally drained from my work
23. _____	I feel used up at the end of the workday.
24. _____	I feel tired when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job
25. _____	Working all day is really a strain for me.
26. _____	I can effectively solve the problems that arise in my work.
27. _____	I feel burned out from my work.
28. _____	I feel I am making an effective contribution to what this organization does.
29. _____	I feel I am making an effective contribution to the Jewish community.
30. _____	I have become less interested in my work since I started this job.
31. _____	I have become less enthusiastic about my work.
32. _____	I have become more cynical about whether my work contributes anything.
33. _____	I doubt the significance of my work.
34. _____	In my opinion, I am good at my job.
35. _____	I feel exhilarated when I accomplish something at work.
36. _____	I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.
37. _____	I just want to do my job and not be bothered.

38. _____ At my work, I feel confident that I am effective at getting things done.

39. _____ I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.

40. _____ I feel I'm working too hard on my job.

41. _____ I feel frustrated by my job.

42. _____ I feel exhilarated by work.

43. _____ I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.

44. _____ I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.

45. Overall, how satisfied are you with your current position?
(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)

Very Satisfied ..... 1 Somewhat satisfied ..... 2 Not Satisfied 3

46. Other than a job described above, have you ever worked outside the Jewish community *after graduating from HUC*? *(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)*

Yes (SKIP TO Q. 48) ..... 1 No (CONTINUE) 2

47. Have you ever actively sought a position outside the Jewish community *after graduating from HUC*? *(circle the number corresponding to the most appropriate answer)*

Yes (CONTINUE) ..... 1 No (SKIP TO Q. 49) 2