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Job satisfaction and burnout among social workers is well-documented in the literature, yet there is a paucity of research in this area pertaining to forensic interviewers. Forensic interviewers, specially trained professionals who conduct structured interviews with children who have made allegations regarding abuse, may be particularly vulnerable to burnout as a result of their work. A cross-sectional electronic survey design was used to gather information from 148 forensic interviewers associated with Children's Advocacy Centers (CAC) located in the Northeast region of the United States. While the quantitative and qualitative findings of this research indicate forensic interviewers are satisfied with their work, a substantial number are experiencing burnout. Control was found to have a positive relationship with job satisfaction. Having a flexible schedule, developing skills in supervision, and training junior forensic interviewers are ways interviewers are provided with control. Job satisfaction and support were both found to have inverse relationships with burnout. Flexibility, in addition to relationships with supervisors and coworkers, are ways organizations provided a supportive work environment. This study supports the effects of control and support in relation to job satisfaction and burnout, as suggested by the job-demands control (support) model. Given that social work was the most common field of study among participants, social workers affiliated with CACs are well-positioned to incorporate the findings of this study into practice to benefit forensic interviewers and the clients they serve. The suggested policy and practice implications will enhance organizational support, increase job satisfaction, and reduce burnout which will lead to a
stronger workforce. Such implications impact children – and in the largest sense, society as a whole – as forensic interviewers will be more effective. Considering the growth of this specialized field of practice, the research will influence organizations to develop policies that mitigate the conditions associated with burnout among forensic interviewers.
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Chapter One: Introduction

This dissertation is focused on organizational factors affecting burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers. This chapter introduces the topic and lays the foundation for the research. The following information is presented: (a) personal experience, (b) problem statement, and (c) research overview.

**Personal Experience**

My interest in forensic interviewing was piqued in 2004 while working as a sexual assault advocate in rural north Georgia. Because the community was located in the Appalachian Mountains, children who made allegations of sexual and severe physical abuse had to travel a minimum of an hour and a half over mountainous roads from our community to receive the specialized services of a Children’s Advocacy Center (CAC). After one case with a 4-year old boy who had never been outside of the county and was scared to find out what was “over the mountain,” I initiated the development of a CAC to serve our local community. I was the first forensic interviewer for two counties and the founding director of the CAC. I loved the work and knew that abused children were receiving specialized, community-based care; but what I did not expect was how I would be impacted by hearing the stories of hundreds of abused children. I found my passion lessening and my stress increasing. There were days I found my frustration so high that I was coming home in tears. I was becoming burned out by the demands and realities of the job.

Burnout and job satisfaction have been studied extensively among child welfare workers and other human services professionals. Yet, there is a paucity of research focused on burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers. Forensic interviewers are specially trained professionals who conduct structured interviews with children who have made allegations of
abuse (Cross, Jones, Walsh, Simone, & Kolko, 2007). Forensic interviewers may be particularly vulnerable to burnout as a result of their work in which they are required to listen to, report on, and in many instances testify on behalf of children who have made allegations of serious abuse. The current research examines the prevalence of burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers and organizational factors that may mitigate or exacerbate burnout.

**Problem Statement**

Burnout is a concept associated with job-related stress experienced by social workers and other professionals. Exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduced sense of effectiveness are key indicators of burnout (Brenninkmeijer & VanYperen, 2003; Bush, 2009; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Research has shown that burnout impacts the quality of client care and has health and interpersonal consequences for the worker and agency (Beaton & Murphy, 1995; Maslach, 1976). Burnout has been identified as a factor in turnover among child welfare workers, linked to lower levels of client trust, rapport, and satisfaction (Boyas & Wind, 2010; Boyas, Wind, & Kang, 2012; Conrad & Kellar-Guenther, 2006; Mor Barak, Nissly, & Levin, 2001; Powell & York, 1992). Organizational factors have been found to influence the development of burnout (Freudenberger, 1975; Maslach et al., 2001). The research on organizational factors that affect burnout suggests excessive organizational demands can diminish energy and effort by the worker resulting in a general lack of care in work performance (Bush, 2009).

Burnout became a focus of research in the late 1970s (Freudenberger, 1975; Maslach, 1976). Concepts such as compassion fatigue and vicarious trauma are an extension of burnout also used to describe occupational stress (Bush, 2009; Sabo, 2011). Baird and Kracen (2006) and Newell and MacNeil (2010) argue that using the terms burnout, compassion fatigue, and vicarious trauma interchangeably is erroneous and that they need to be differentiated. Newell
and MacNeil (2010) present burnout as a general concept that is often a result of organizational, individual, or client-related factors, whereas compassion fatigue and vicarious trauma are a direct result of working with traumatized client populations and in the case of vicarious trauma, the worker's own history of personal trauma. Newell and MacNeil suggest that each phenomenon should be understood separately.

The conceptualization of burnout in this research is based on Demerouti, Bakker, Vardakou, and Kantas's (2003) identification of worker exhaustion and disengagement. Exhaustion, the prominent symptom of burnout, is feeling as if the worker has nothing left to give on the job. Disengagement is displayed through the withdrawal of interpersonal interactions in the workplace (Brenninkmeijer & VanYperen, 2003; Bush, 2009; Maslach, et al., 2001).

Various organizational factors have an effect on worker burnout. Daley (1979) suggests numerous organizational factors, such as caseload size and difficulty, ability to influence agency policy, and relationships with supervisors and coworkers, all influence burnout. The bureaucratic structure of child welfare agencies results in workers losing control over scheduling, limits use of peer consultation and informal support, and increases specialization of job responsibilities (Arches, 1991). Burnout has been linked to too much work and lack of support within the workplace (Maslach, 1976; Maslach, et al., 2001).

**Research on Forensic Interviewers**

There is a dearth of research about work-related stress among forensic interviewers as only three studies were identified in the literature. Atkinson-Tovar (2002) interviewed 15 youth investigators and forensic interviewers about the impact of interviewing children regarding allegations of abuse. Using grounded theory methodology, she found secondary traumatic stress and vicarious trauma to be present among her sample. Atkinson-Tovar indicated that
organizational factors, such as excessive workload and lack of support from supervisors, were determinants in work-related stress.

A study by Perron and Hiltz (2006) investigated burnout among a small non-randomized national sample ($n = 66$) of forensic interviewers. Higher organizational satisfaction was found to be significantly associated with less burnout. Organizational satisfaction was assessed based on the employee's perception (Kimball, Shumway, Korinek, & Arredondo, 2002). Duration of employment, specifically working two or more years as a forensic interviewer, was significantly associated with higher disengagement scores. The proportion of work related to forensic interviewing did not have a significant relationship with burnout. The authors report the need for further research on the relationship between organizational factors and burnout among forensic interviewers (Perron & Hiltz, 2006).

Bonach and Heckert (2012) investigated the effects of secondary traumatic stress on forensic interviewers. With a larger non-randomized national sample ($n = 256$) of forensic interviewers, job support – identified as external social support, internal job support, and external job support – was significantly related to forensic interviewers' secondary traumatic stress. Forensic interviewers in the study suggested a number of organizational factors that affect work-related stress, including holding dual roles within the organization, unsatisfactory supervision or leadership, insufficient teamwork, insufficient time for debriefing, and lack of education on secondary traumatic stress and self-care. While the conceptualization of secondary traumatic stress – stress as a result of having knowledge of a significant other's traumatic experience (Figley, 1999) – was used in this study, it is relevant in understanding the consequences forensic interviewing has on an individual. Bonach and Heckert (2012) suggest that organizations take a
more active role in providing support to forensic interviewers and call for more research on the effects forensic interviewing has on the professional.

**Research Overview**

The purpose of the current study is to understand how organizational factors are associated with burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers. The research is distinctive as it focuses on forensic interviewers, an understudied group of specialists in the forensic social work field of practice, in a more focused manner than the previous studies of this population. This research is guided by the integration of two complimentary literatures: social work and organizational psychology.

An electronic survey was utilized to collect information from forensic interviewers in the Northeastern region of the United States. This research contributes to social work, child welfare, and burnout literatures by furthering an understanding of the organizational factors associated with burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers. The research provides a better understanding of the ways organizations can support forensic interviewers and other professionals as a means to preventing burnout and increasing job satisfaction. Policy implications, social work implications, and future research are suggested.

**Summary**

This chapter introduced the research focus on organizational factors affecting burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers. Personal experience as a forensic interviewer who experienced burnout, in addition to a lack of research in the area, influenced the decision to study this topic. An electronic survey was used to gather information on organizational factors, burnout, and job satisfaction from forensic interviewers in the Northeastern region of the United States.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

The integration of two complimentary literatures, social work and organizational psychology, is used to guide the research. This chapter reviews relevant scholarship that lead to the formation of the research question and hypotheses. The chapter includes literature related to: (a) child welfare, (b) children’s advocacy centers, (c) forensic interviewers, (d) burnout, (e) job satisfaction, and (e) the job demand-control (support) model.

Child Welfare

A brief history of the child welfare system is presented. Child welfare was once viewed as the sole responsibility of parents (Barusch, 2009). Today, many view the child welfare system as having the primary responsibility of protecting children or at the least removing a child who is in an unsafe environment. Relevant child welfare policies provide a backdrop to how Children’s Advocacy Centers (CAC) came into existence.

Prior to the establishment of the child welfare system, children had few rights. There was no central authority to protect children or enforce child abuse reporting laws. The New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty of Children (NYSPCC) was established in 1875 after the abuse of Mary Ellen Wilson gained public attention. The NYSPCC began enforcing child protection laws, often removing children from their homes and placing them in institutions. In 1909, the Conference on the Care of Dependent Children set the foundation of the public child welfare system focused on less institutionalization and increased adoption and foster homes (Barusch, 2009).

The public government established its role in the welfare of children through funding. The first federal grants for child welfare services were part of the Social Security Act of 1935, which authorized Aid to Dependent Children. With this money states established child welfare
agencies and developed local delivery programs. Emphasis for child welfare services was strengthened through the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments to the Social Security Act (Murray & Gesiriech, 2010).

Major federal legislation addressing child abuse was not seen until 1974. The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act mandated certain professionals to report child abuse, resulting in an increased number of children removed from their homes and placed in foster care (Barusch, 2009; Murray & Gesiriech, 2010). Procedures and timelines for children in state custody were established in 1980 under the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act (Barusch, 2009). Modern child welfare was established under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, which established the major role of the government in the administration and oversight of child welfare services (Murray & Gesiriech, 2010).

The Victims of Child Abuse Act (VOCAA) passed in 1990 with the intent of improving the investigation and prosecution of child abuse. Since Congress passed the National Children's Advocacy Program Act of 1992 as part of the revisions made to VOCAA, the CAC model has been influential in the practice of child abuse investigations (National Children's Alliance [NCA], 2009). Funding for community-based child abuse prevention efforts was made available through the Family Preservation and Family Support Services Act in 1993 (Barusch, 2009; Murray & Gesiriech, 2010). The safety of children became the child welfare system’s priority under the 1997 Adoption and Safe Families Act (Barusch, 2009). VOCAA is currently under consideration for reauthorization by the 113th Congress (H.R. 3706, 2013).

**Child Abuse Statistics**

Child welfare scholars and practitioners widely agree that most child abuse goes unreported. For children, disclosing abuse is a complicated process impacted by factors such as
age, gender, family support, and relation to alleged offender (Lippert, Cross, Jones, & Walsh, 2009). In 2012, the most recent data available, approximately 686,000 children in the United States were confirmed victims of maltreatment. This total calculates into an average of 9.2 per 1,000 children who experienced abuse and neglect within one year's timeframe. Over three quarters (78%) of the children were neglected, 18% were physically abused, and nine percent were sexually abused. Additionally, children suffered psychological maltreatment, medical neglect, and various other forms of maltreatment (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [DHHS], 2013).

Statistics obtained from the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS, 2013) provide a summation of abused children and their perpetrators in 2012. In general, children found to be maltreated were white and under the age of three years old. When examining abuse within specific racial groups, African-American, American Indian or Alaska Native, and multi-racial children have the highest reported incidence rates. In general, confirmed victims of all types of child maltreatment were almost evenly boys and girls. Children with disabilities made up 13% of victims. In cases where child abuse was substantiated, 29% of children were exposed to domestic violence, 20% were exposed to drug abuse, and nine percent were exposed to alcohol abuse. Perpetrators were, in general, white (50%), females (54%) between the ages of 25 and 34 years old (40%). Just as with the victims, reported incidence rates were higher among perpetrators of specific racial groups. Parents were overwhelmingly the perpetrators of abuse (82%), with mothers more likely to be the abuser (37%) when looking at all types of abuse (DHHS, 2013).

Data from the DHHS (2013) are limited in identifying the characteristics of victims of child sexual abuse, which is of particular interest, because as described below, most children
served by CACs are alleged victims of sexual abuse. The information that can be gleaned indicates that the largest groups of victims were under nine years old (34%) and between 12 and 14 years old (26%). Other studies suggest the characteristics of sexually abused children are somewhat different from the general population of maltreated children. Researchers have established that girls are more likely to be victims of child sexual abuse (Briere & Elliott, 2003; Finkelhor, Hotaling, Lewis, & Smith, 1990; Finkelhor, Ormrod, Turner, & Hamby, 2005). Male acquaintances (i.e., mother's boyfriend) are commonly the perpetrators of child sexual abuse, except in cases where the child is under the age of six years old; then the perpetrator is more likely to be a family member (Snyder, 2000).

Statistics from the National Children’s Alliance (NCA, 2013a) show that in 2012, 286,457 children were served by CACs across the United States. Children who received services at CACs were mostly white (44%) and girls (63%) twelve years old and younger (74%). The alleged perpetrators were most commonly parents (25%) or other known persons (20%). Most children seen at CACs are in reference to allegations of sexual abuse (69%) and participate in an on-site forensic interview (69%).

In the Northeast region of the United States, the focus of this study, 37,755 children received services at CACs in 2012. The descriptive statistics of the Northeast region closely mirrored national statistics with a few differences. Sexual abuse allegations made up 75% of the cases seen at Northeastern CACs compared to 69% nationally. Children were slightly less likely to be white (46%) and more likely to be Hispanic/Latino (17%) in the Northeast than nationally (55% white; 14% Hispanic/Latino). While the majority of children do participate in forensic interviews (61%), slightly more were conducted off-site in the Northeast region than nationally, 7% and 3%, respectively (NCA, 2013b). The prevalence of child maltreatment, and sexual abuse
in particular, supports the use of CACs and the specialized services provided by such organizations.

**Children’s Advocacy Centers**

CACs are designed to enhance the response to suspected child abuse cases by combining the wisdom and professional knowledge of various investigative agencies and other professionals. These coordinated efforts provide the knowledge, skills, and resources necessary to assist alleged child abuse victims and their families (NCA, 2009). In 1985, the first CAC was developed in Huntsville, AL under the leadership of former Congressman Robert Cramer. As the local district attorney, Congressman Cramer recognized the lack of collaboration among the various agencies working with abused children. He envisioned a coordinated response to child abuse that included multidisciplinary partnership (National Children’s Advocacy Center, 2014).

The CAC model provides numerous benefits for abused children, non-offending caregivers, and the child welfare and legal systems. For children, there is less stress when interviews take place at child-friendly, age appropriate, neutral locations (Saywitz, Lyon, & Goodman, 2011). The unnecessary burden of having to take children to repetitive interviews is reduced for caregivers, which may mean fewer days taken off from work. Caregivers also report more satisfaction when child abuse investigations are through CACs (Jones, Cross, Walsh, & Simone, 2007). The child welfare and criminal justice systems benefit from the coordination of services, including joint decision-making, community-based referrals, and support for children and families (Cross, Jones, Walsh, Simone, & Kolko, 2007). Such coordination results in cost and time savings in child abuse investigations and increases other public benefits when agencies are not replicating investigatory duties (Formby, Shadoin, Shao, Magnuson, & Overman, 2006). While prosecution does not occur in all cases of alleged child abuse, one study found that
charging decisions were made faster in CAC coordinated cases than comparison sites (Walsh, Lippert, Cross, Maurice, & Davison, 2008). Another study found that CAC cases were more likely to be prosecuted (Joa & Edelson, 2004). Ultimately, CACs maintain focus on abused children while ensuring the systems designed to protect such children are able to do so effectively (NCA, 2009).

The NCA (2009), a membership organization, reports there are over 750 CACs across the United States. NCA sets forth ten standards for accreditation which CACs must adhere to in order to be granted accredited member status. CACs working toward complete implementation of the standards for accreditation may be granted associate/developing member status. Requirements for NCA membership include, at a minimum:

- a functioning MultiDisciplinary Team (MDT) with representation from the areas of law enforcement, child protective services, prosecution, medical, mental health, and victim advocacy;
- a signed interagency agreement and MDT protocols;
- a facility designated for interviews of children;
- MDT case review conducted on a regularly scheduled basis and attended by all MDT representative disciplines (NCA, 2011).

Becoming accredited members of NCA provides CACs with credibility when working with MDT members, local government, legislators, community partners, and potential funders (NCA, 2009).

The NCA (2009) divides CACs across the country into four regions: Northeast, Southern, Midwest, and Western. There are 114 CACs in the Northeast region, which make up 14% of CACs nationally. The Northeast region includes the states of Connecticut, Maine,
Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Individual states may have a state chapter, which provide resources, support, and training specifically to CACs within their state. Each region receives training and technical support through a Regional Children's Advocacy Center.

CACs are either free-standing nonprofits or part of host organizations. The Midwest Regional Children's Advocacy Center (MRCAC, 2013) reports that, nationally, 56% of CACs are private, nonprofit organizations. The remaining CACs are programs of larger nonprofit organizations (17%), government-based agencies (16%), hospitals (8%), or another configuration unique to the community (3%). Hospital-based CACs function as programs within the hospital system with some CACs located within the hospital buildings, others located in buildings separate from the hospital on medical campuses, and yet others located in the community separate from any of the other hospital buildings. Government-based CACs operate under the organizational auspices of government agencies, such as prosecutors', child protective services’, or law enforcement offices. Similar to hospital-based CACs, some government-based CACs are co-located with the host government organizations while others are located in the community apart from the governmental host organizations.

The organizational make-up of each CAC is based on the needs of the community and availability of resources. By not mandating one consistent organizational model, the hope is that each CAC will fit the needs of its community. Such different organizational types highlight how CACs are essentially a system of unique programs across the country and indicate the need for further research to develop an empirical picture of organizational models that provide forensic interviewing (Faller & Palusci, 2007). CACs fund operations through a variety of grant sources
such as the NCA, VOCA, other federal, state, and local funding sources, and individual fundraising efforts.

In recent years, some CACs have begun to co-locate their offices in the same buildings as other MDT members. Co-located CACs offer the convenience of shared office space while placing the services of prosecutors, child protective services workers, law enforcement, therapists, medical examiners, along with other community partners, all under one roof. Newman and Dannenfelser (2005) suggest co-locating and cross-training MDT members are ways to facilitate understanding of individual roles and coordinated investigations. Researchers also suggest the importance of relationship building among MDT members as a way to facilitate collaboration indicating that more functional teams are better equipped to investigate cases of child abuse (Newman, Dannenfelser, & Pendleton, 2005).

CACs offer a variety of services for abused children and their non-offending caregivers. Services may include medical examinations, therapeutic counseling, and case management. Services provided to the community and professionals include training initiatives, prevention programs, and outreach events. Referrals are commonly made for services not provided at CACs to community partner agencies. Forensic interviews, structured interviews conducted for the purpose of obtaining children's disclosures or non-disclosures of abuse, are among the diverse services provided at CACs.

**Forensic Interviewers**

Prior to widespread adoption of the CAC model in the 1990's, children who made allegations of abuse were routinely interviewed numerous times and in multiple locations. Law enforcement and child protective services conducted separate investigations with little communication between the agencies (Faller & Palusci, 2007; Jackson, 2004). Such a system
was neither child-friendly nor efficient. The CAC model mandates that forensic interviewers work in conjunction with MDTs, which are charged with the responsibility of investigating the allegations and making determination whether abuse has occurred (Perron & Hiltz, 2006).

Much of the current literature in the field focuses on the forensic interview process and techniques; there is a lack of empirically driven research studies focused specifically on interviewer characteristics. The MRCAC (2005) collected job descriptions of forensic interviewers from CACs across the country. The job descriptions demonstrate the breadth of educational backgrounds acceptable when hiring forensic interviewers. Some CACs require forensic interviewers to have earned bachelor's degrees, while others require master's degrees. One CAC did not require a degree, only experience as a law enforcement officer working in the field of child abuse investigations. The required fields of study for forensic interviewer positions included social work, criminal justice, law, and other human services fields. Several studies highlight the importance of promoting social work education for child welfare professionals (Barth, Lloyd, Christ, Chapman, & Dickinson 2008; Dickinson & Perry, 2002; Russell, 1987). There are currently 26 universities across the country that teach forensic interviewing skills through Child Advocacy Studies (CAST) as a certificate, undergraduate minor or major, or graduate program (Gunderson National Child Protection Training Center, 2014). Yet, none of the job descriptions required such training.

Forensic interviewers associated with CACs receive specialized training on child development, dynamics of child abuse, and interviewing skills. Trained forensic interviewers, whether CAC staff members or MDT members, are a necessary requirement in order for CACs to become accredited members of the NCA (2011). The most creditable forensic interview models are research-based and legally sound (Perona, Bottoms, & Sorenson, 2006). Training in
such models is offered through the Cornerhouse Interagency Child Abuse Evaluation and Training Center and the National Children's Advocacy Center, with 56% and 54%, respectively, of forensic interviewers indicating they have attended training at these venues (MRCAC, 2011). Other training models are offered through the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), the American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children (APSAC), and individual state programs. Forensic interviewers associated with CACs often seek out training in multiple models in order to fully develop their interviewing skills and stay current on newly developed techniques. Extensive training in the area of child abuse investigation is necessary to provide a competent and sustainable workforce that will ultimately protect children (Veith, 2006).

The MRCAC (2013) found the annual salary of forensic interviewers employed by CACs varies across the country. Entry-level, full-time forensic interviewers' salaries averaged $37,442; senior-level, full-time forensic interviewers' salaries averaged $46,377, nationally. In 2008, MRCAC found forensic interviewers practicing in the South made the least among the four regions, while forensic interviewers in the West had the highest salary. The average annual salary for forensic interviewers in the Northeast was $42,500, slightly higher than the national average of $41,778 in 2008. The range in salaries is another example of the differences among CACs when considering the forensic interview position.

Ideally, when children are referred for forensic interviews, interviewers are on staff at the CACs, but this is not always the case. Jackson (2004) found that 68% of NCA-member CACs had interviewers on-site; these CACs employed an average of 2.73 forensic interviewers. The MRCAC (2011) found that 77% of CACs reported employing a forensic interviewer, a 26% percent increase since 2009. The MRCAC also found that law enforcement officers (36%), child
protection workers (34%), and others professionals (10%) conduct interviews at CACs in addition to on-staff forensic interviewers. Larger, more established CACs may have more than one full-time interviewer, whereas, smaller or developing CACs may utilize interviewers from MDT partner agencies or individuals on a contractual basis. CACs smaller in size and located in rural communities typically have fewer interviewers on staff who may also perform other job functions in addition to interviewing, placing a greater burden on the employees. The costs associated with specialized training may prohibit CACs from having one or more forensic interviewers on staff; therefore, CACs may use contract service providers or a mix of agency employees supplemented by contracted employees to conduct interviews.

Forensic interviewers, responsible for obtaining children’s statements regarding allegations of abuse through one-on-one interviews, have special job-related stress. The semi-structured interviews must be conducted to conform to legal standards of evidence. Efforts are made by interviewers to be child-friendly and non-threatening, while remaining objective and unbiased (Anderson et al., 2010). On average, forensic interviewers can expect to conduct between one to six interviews per day (MRCAC, 2011). The pressures of conducting multiple interviews in a legally appropriate manner, the age of the interviewees, and the focus on allegations of severe abuse are unique job demands specific to the forensic interviewer position.

Within the MDT, overlap exists among the forensic interviewer and other team members’ investigatory responsibilities. For example, both child welfare workers and forensic interviewers interview children regarding allegations of abuse. Yet, forensic interviewers are called on for only the most serious allegations (sexual abuse and severe physical abuse) with the most abused and vulnerable children (Cross et al., 2007). In such cases, child welfare workers collect minimal facts and forensic interviewers conduct detailed interviews. As the single professional
responsible for collecting children's disclosures of abuse, forensic interviewers are essentially performing the job responsibilities of three professionals (child protection, law enforcement, and prosecution).

Forensic interviewers frequently act as witnesses in child protection and criminal justice court proceedings. Under certain circumstances, interviewers will be subpoenaed to testify on behalf of children and are subject to cross examination. Dependent on the state and jurisdiction, forensic interviewers may also be declared expert witnesses in court proceedings. This legal responsibility is a part of the interviewers’ role of protecting children. Becoming a part of the legal system is a different role, requiring supplementary skills. Additional burden is placed on forensic interviewers, as the outcome of the judicial proceedings may rest upon their testimony.

Working as forensic interviewers may be one of the hardest jobs as workers are impacted by the abuse inflicted upon society's most vulnerable citizens. Although the CAC model eliminates the need for multiple interviews and is designed to bring all investigative functions to a centralized, child-centric location, a great burden is placed on forensic interviewers. Forensic interviewers are in a unique position where they are accountable not only to their employing organizations, but to the MDTs investigating the allegations as well. Forensic interviewers must consider the needs of child protection, law enforcement, and prosecution while establishing trusting relationships with children. This burden is compounded with the pressure to develop empathic relationships with children in a relatively short amount of time in order to be successful in the position. Further, forensic interviewers must collect as much information as possible during interviews that can withstand the rigorous court process. Given the many unique characteristics of the position, forensic interviewers may be particularly at risk of developing burnout as a result of their work.
Conceptual Framework

Burnout

Stress experienced by workers has been recognized throughout the history of the social work profession. Being overworked, a common cause of burnout, was noted by Mary Jarrett in 1919 when discussing social workers (as cited in Robinson, 1930). Over the last four decades burnout has become recognized as a significant problem, strongly linked to work overload and lack of organizational support within the workplace (Maslach, Schaufel, & Leiter, 2001), and routinely present in child welfare (Annie E. Casey Foundation [Casey Foundation], 2003; Daley, 1979).

Freudenberger's (1975) seminal work on burnout was in reference to workers in alternative institutions, such as therapeutic communities. While conceptual in his writings, Freudenberger began to identify some of the causes of burnout based on his personal observations. He suggested burnout usually sets in after a year of employment and recognized many organizational stressors, such as lack of recognition, long hours, and low pay; eventually have an impact on individuals’ effectiveness at work. Freudenberger characterized burnout as a decrease in enthusiasm for one's work and noticeable fatigue or exhaustion. Freudenberger suggested the prevention of burnout is equally the responsibility of individuals and organizations.

Around the same time Freudenberger was promoting burnout in the psychology literature, Maslach (1976) was conducting qualitative research on 200 social services providers and the experience of burnout. Maslach supported Freudenberger's observations, highlighting the impact burnout can have on client care. A worker experiencing burnout may develop a negative
perception of clients and their problems. In turn, such feelings of cynicism have an impact on the quality of services provided and personal creativity and optimism for the work.

Demerouti, Bakker, Vardakou, and Kantas (2003) define burnout as exhaustion and disengagement. Exhaustion, the prominent symptom of burnout, is described as feeling as if the individual has nothing left to give emotionally and physically. Exhaustion is thought to be the precursor for depersonalization and the expression of cynicism as a way to deal with the stressors of the job. Disengagement is described as an expression of a pessimistic attitude toward work, often displayed through the withdrawal of interpersonal interactions as a way to cope with work-related demands (Brenninkmeijer & VanYperen, 2003; Bush, 2009; Maslach, 1998; Maslach et al., 2001).

Burnout is a term commonly recognized among professionals and lay persons. Given a person's connection to their professional identity, most workers can relate to a feeling of being burned out in cumulative aspects of their job. Since its conceptualization, the construct of burnout in human services has focused on the interaction and interpersonal impact of ongoing give and take between organizations and workers (Freudenberger, 1975; Maslach, et al., 2001). Burnout has been described as the depletion of resources when striving to meet work-related demands (Maslach, 1998). Daily (1979) suggested burnout is non-linear and periodic rewards can reenergize workers.

Various organizational factors, not just personal factors, affect the development of burnout. Researchers indicate that burnout is a result of organizational stressors such as bureaucratic limitations and demands from administrators (Arches, 1991; Newell & MacNeil, 2010). Maslach (1982) found factors related to organizational demands, such as caseload size, instruction from supervisors, rigid policies and procedures, and lack of breaks, especially when a
person held a specialized job, were influential in the development of burnout. Such demands on the worker result in diminished energy, effort, and accessible resources leading to a lack of care for work performance (Bush, 2009).

Organizational factors also mitigate the effects of burnout, especially worker turnover. Worker tenure is of particular concern as the average turnover within the field of child welfare is estimated to be between 20 and 40 percent annually in public and private organizations. The average tenure of workers in public agencies is seven years and three years in private organizations (Casey Foundation, 2003). Haar and Roche (2010) found that greater organizational support of work-family issues, such as flexibility and job control, resulted in less burnout and turnover among employees. Organizational structures that promoted work-life balance and supportive supervision were also found to reduce employee turnover (Smith, 2005).

Relationships with co-workers, supervisors, and administrators must also be considered as factors in the development or prevention of burnout. Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001) indicated that supervisor support played an important role in burnout. Supportive supervision, in particular, has been found to reduce burnout among child welfare professionals (Barth et al., 2008). The Annie E. Casey Foundation (Casey Foundation, 2003) found poor supervision to be one of the top reasons why workers leave the child welfare field. Supervisors must be aware of the risk of burnout and be able to provide support or referral for services. Meldrum, King, and Spooner (2002) cited a need for clear roles and responsibilities, communication, and accountability within the workplace. Myers and Wee (2002) provided examples of organizational strategies, such as support and respect for workers, implementing debriefing sessions, and advancing a team perspective in the prevention of worker stress. Conrad and Kellar-Guenther (2006) found positive interaction with co-workers to decrease burnout.
Coworker support is a resource for help and information, especially in jobs higher in social requirements (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008). Peer support networks, either formal or informal, are an avenue to discuss ambivalent feelings regarding particular cases (Maslach, 1976). Brotheridge (2001) found employees experience a greater sense of competence and less exhaustion when coworker support was present. Coworker support outside of the workplace has also been found to be an important consideration (Reid et al., 1999 a; b). The Casey Foundation (2003) suggested relationship building is especially important in child welfare agencies.

Perron and Hiltz (2006) laid the foundation for research on burnout among forensic interviewers. The researchers indicated that further empirical investigation was necessary to understand the potential effects of forensic interviewing especially in regard to the role organizational factors play. Perron and Hiltz specified collegial support, supervision, organizational climate, and informal contact with colleagues as organizational factors to be investigated in relation to burnout among forensic interviewers. Since the literature indicates major predictors of leaving one's job are not personal but organizational, it is possible that agency level changes can be made to impact this issue greatly (Gibbs, 2001).

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction, one of the most studied topics in organizational psychology, has been conceptualized in various ways (Jayaratne, Himle, & Chess, 1991; Landsman, 2001; Locke, 1969). Locke (1969) suggested job satisfaction is an emotionally-driven reaction to achievements or what workers want to achieve on the job. Spector (1997) defined job satisfaction as the attitude employees have about their jobs and related facets. In addition to feeling satisfied the conceptualization also includes the degree to which employees like their job (Bowling & Hammond, 2008; Landsman, 2001). Despite its multifaceted definitions, job
satisfaction is often studied in conjunction with burnout (Arches, 1991; Best, Stapleton, & Downey, 2005; Federici & Skaalvik, 2012; Maslach & Schaufeli, 1993; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2009). While commonly studied together, burnout and job satisfaction have been found to be two distinct concepts (Jayaratne et al., 1991).

Scholars consistently suggest burnout among social workers is a problem related to job dissatisfaction (Barth et al., 2008; Dickinson & Perry, 2002; Harrison, 1980; Jayaratne & Chess, 1984, 1986; Siefert, Jayaratne, & Chess, 1991). Contrary to studies that have found burnout and job satisfaction to have a negative relationship, Mandell, Stalker, de Zeeuw Wright, Frensch, and Harvey (2013) found that even though child welfare workers in their sample were experiencing emotional exhaustion, a dimension of burnout, they also had high levels of job satisfaction. Silver, Poulin, and Manning found similar results in their research on direct service supervisors. Glisson and Durick (1988) found job satisfaction to be related to the ability to apply various skills and knowledge in social work positions. Barth, Lloyd, Christ, Chapman, and Dickinson (2008) found masters level social workers were more satisfied than their peers and suggested social workers have a commitment to the values of the profession and a greater understanding of the complexities of child abuse and related policies as a result of their education. Vinokur-Kaplan, Jayaratne, and Chess (1994) found that job challenges were positively related to job satisfaction among social workers employed by public and non-profit organizations. Westbrook, Ellis, and Ellett (2006) suggested job satisfaction is related to personal characteristics, supervisor support, and commitment to child welfare.

Numerous studies have investigated the impact organizational factors have on job satisfaction among child welfare workers and other professionals. Supervisor support has been found to be positively related to job satisfaction (Allen, 2001, Barth, et al., 2008; Chen &
Organizations that supported life outside of the workplace resulted in more productive employees (Major, Cardenas, & Allard, 2004); with flexibility in particular, being linked to job satisfaction and engagement in addition to retention and employee health (Galinsky, Sakai, & Wigton, 2011). Vinokur-Kaplan and associates (1994) suggested further investigation on the impact fringe benefits (i.e. insurance) have on workers’ job satisfaction.

Organizational factors are more commonly related to job satisfaction than client-related factors (Allen, 2001; Jayaratne et al., 1991). A worker may consider compensation, benefits, and relationships with supervisors and co-workers when faced with "sticking it out" or seeking new employment. Additional research found that job satisfaction can act as a buffer for work-related stress (van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek, & Frings-Dresen, 2003).

**Theoretical Framework**

**Job Demands-Control (Support) Model**

In keeping with other studies that have linked organizational factors to burnout (Bobbio, Bellan, & Manganelli, 2012; Lizano & Mor Barak, 2012; Rafferty, Friend, & Landsbergis, 2001; Smith, 2005), this study used the job demands-control (support) (JDC(S)) model to inform the specific case of burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers. The JDC(S) model is an extension of the job demands-control (JDC) model. The JDC model posits that demands placed on employees and how much latitude is given to meet such demands affect workers. Decision latitude is defined by the control employees have over job-related tasks, which can moderate the relationship between demands and work-related stress (Van Der Doef & Maes, 1999). Demands are characterized as stress related to managing work load responsibilities, including unanticipated tasks and work-related interpersonal conflicts (Karasek, 1979). Demand
can be associated with organizational, physical, and social job-related tasks (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001). The JDC model posits that job strain is a consequence of high demands exceeding limited control resulting in a lack of energy and resources (Karasek, 1979). Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, and Schaufeli (2001) found that exhaustion is a consequence of high demands and a lack of resources which result in disengagement. When both high demands and a lack of resources are present the outcome is burnout. Johnson and Hall (1988) contributed to the JDC model suggesting that social support within the workplace acts as a moderator in jobs with high demands and little control. The JDC(S) model implies that control and support in the workplace can reduce work-related stress regardless of the job demands.

Karasek (1979) found that workers who reported exhaustion have jobs with high demands and low control. Working in child welfare can be classified as high demand to address the needs of abused children, while also functioning within the constraints of multiple bureaucratic systems with little control (Arches, 1991; Casey Foundation, 2003). In a longitudinal study, Lizano and Mor Barak (2012) found that the demands of work in child welfare impacted the development of burnout. The JDC(S) model hypothesizes that "jobs characterized by high demands, low control, and low support (or isolation) are considered to be the most noxious work situation, labeled ‘iso-strain.’ The buffer hypothesis of the JDC(S) model states that social support moderates the negative impact of high strain" (Van Der Doef & Maes, 1999, p. 89). Workers in jobs labeled iso-strain are most at risk for job-related stress (Kristensen, 1995). Van Der Doef and Maes (1999) suggested researchers should test job specific demands as a way to increase the predictive and explanatory ability of the JDC(S) model.
Researchers found job satisfaction was negatively related to burnout (Federici & Skaalvik, 2012; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2008). Karasek (1979) found the highest satisfaction in jobs with high demand and control, known as active jobs. Social support has been shown to be most beneficial in active jobs (Kristensen, 1995). Dissatisfaction related to work has been found in jobs with low demand and control, known as passive jobs (Karasek, 1979). Job satisfaction has also been found to buffer occupational stress (van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek, & Frings-Dresen, 2003).

**Research Question and Related Hypotheses**

The research question, what organizational factors are associated with burnout among forensic interviewers, guided the research. Review of the literatures on the JDC(S) model, burnout, and job satisfaction led to eight hypotheses:

- **H1**: Forensic interviewers who report higher job demands will report higher levels of burnout.
- **H2**: Forensic interviewers who report higher job demands will report higher job satisfaction.
- **H3**: Forensic interviewers who report higher job satisfaction will report lower levels of burnout.
- **H4**: The relationship between job demands and burnout is mediated by job satisfaction.
- **H5**: Forensic interviewers who report more control will report higher levels of job satisfaction.
- **H6**: The relationship between job demands and job satisfaction is moderated by control.
- **H7**: Forensic interviewers who report higher levels of support will report lower levels of burnout.
- H8: The relationship between job satisfaction and burnout is moderated by support.

**Summary**

The current limited research on burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers exposes a gap in the literature. This study was designed to address that gap by surveying what organizational factors are associated with burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers. Guided by social work and organizational psychology literatures, the theoretical framework of the job demands-control (support) model was used. This study has the potential to contribute to social work and organizational psychology knowledge-bases by expanding on the few studies on forensic interviewers and work-related stress.
Chapter Three: Methodology

A cross-sectional electronic survey was used to gather information from forensic interviewers in the northeast region of the United States. This chapter describes the research methodology. The following information is presented: (a) rationale for the research design, (b) sampling methods, (c) instrument, (d) data collection, (e) data management, (f) verification of reliability and validity, (g) data analysis, and (h) ethical considerations in this study.

Research Design and Rationale

The current research utilized a cross-sectional electronic survey design to gather information on organizational factors, burnout, and job satisfaction from forensic interviewers. A survey was an appropriate method for collecting data from this population as they were professionals accustomed to job-related paperwork and were assumed to have limited time to participate in more time intensive data collection methods. An electronic survey was chosen over a traditional paper survey due to forensic interviewers being technology-savvy professionals accustomed to using computer-based systems as part of their job-related responsibilities. Forensic interviewers use technology to digitally record interviews, create reports using word processing software, and securely send reports to Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) members via the internet. Qualtrics Survey Software, an internet-based system, was used to manage the database and distribute the survey. Qualtrics Survey Software was chosen over other survey software due to its design for academic use, availability of user support services, participant confidentiality, and professional appearance (Qualtrics Labs, 2014). The use of an electronic survey was appropriate considering the sample population.

Other researchers implemented similar data collection methods in previous studies on forensic interviewers. Perron and Hiltz (2006) obtained an overall response rate of 60% using an
electronic survey with their sample \((n = 66)\). Perron and Hiltz used a similar recruitment method as the current research in contacting Children’s Advocacy Centers (CAC) to request the email addresses of forensic interviewers and then emailing the survey directly to the interviewers. No incentive was provided and there was no follow-up method. Bonach and Heckert (2012) did not have a defined sample list and recruited only through a listserv that included forensic interviewers. Based on their estimate that 450 forensic interviewers were members of the listserv, Bonach and Heckert had a 57% response rate with a larger sample \((n = 256)\). No incentive was offered and one follow-up message was posted on the listserv. Understanding the methods and limitations of previous research was influential in the design of the current study.

The benefits of electronic surveys highlight their rapid implementation and response, ease of use, flexibility, visual appeal, and cost effectiveness (Cook, Health, & Thompson, 2000; Dillman, Smyth & Christian, 2009). Previous concerns with electronic surveys such as access and internet connection have been rectified over the past decade with improved accessibility and decreased cost of high speed internet. In addition, there are slight coverage errors for certain groups, such as professional workers, who have regular internet access and organizational email accounts (Dillman et al., 2009).

**Sampling**

**Participants**

The current research was designed to investigate organizational factors affecting burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers. The criterion for selection in this study was any individuals identified as employees, contractors, or other affiliated personnel authorized to conduct forensic interviews with National Children’s Alliance (NCA)-member CACs (accredited and associate/developing) in the Northeast region as defined by the NCA. NCA designates the
Northeast region as Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont. The NCA’s website (www.nca-online.org) listed 114 CACs in the region, of which 82 were accredited and 32 were associate/developing members. Of the 114 CACs, 46 were private non-profits and 20 were under the umbrella of a large social service agency, including organizations providing services for domestic violence, sexual assault, education, and mental health. There were 24 government-based CACs under the organizational auspice of county government, child protective services, prosecution, and law enforcement. There were 21 hospital-based CACs, including one rural health center. Two CACs were labeled as a public/private partnership. One associate/developing CAC was identified as a MDT only, meaning only the team currently existed, not a physical CAC facility (National Children’s Alliance [NCA], 2009). NCA accreditation status and organizational type were confirmed with CAC directors/coordinators during the outreach described below. See Table 3.1 for a breakdown of CACs by state. CACs and MDTs not associated with NCA were not included in the sample as there was no way to systematically identify such organizations.
Table 3.1

*Children’s Advocacy Centers by State*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>Accreditation Status</th>
<th>Organizational Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
<td>8 Accredited</td>
<td>5 Umbrella 501(c)3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Associate/Developing</td>
<td>4 Hospital-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 MDT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>2 Associate/Developing</td>
<td>2 Umbrella 501(c)3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>11 (10%)</td>
<td>7 Accredited</td>
<td>4 501(c)3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Associate/Developing</td>
<td>2 Hospital-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Government-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Public/private partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
<td>5 Accredited</td>
<td>6 501(c)3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Associate/Developing</td>
<td>2 Hospital-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Government-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
<td>8 Accredited</td>
<td>3 501(c)3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Associate/Developing</td>
<td>6 Government-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Public/private partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>39 (34%)</td>
<td>32 Accredited</td>
<td>17 501(c)3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Associate/Developing</td>
<td>7 Umbrella 501(c)3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Hospital-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Government-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>22 (19%)</td>
<td>15 Accredited</td>
<td>11 501(c)3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Associate/Developing</td>
<td>2 Umbrella 501(c)3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Hospital-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Government-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>2 Accredited</td>
<td>2 Umbrella 501(c)3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>8 (7%)</td>
<td>5 Accredited</td>
<td>5 501(c)3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Associate/Developing</td>
<td>2 Umbrella 501(c)3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Government-based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sampling Plan**

**Outreach to CAC directors/coordinators.** As neither a list nor database of all the forensic interviewers in the Northeast region exists, one was developed for this study. Forensic interviewers were identified via CAC directors/coordinators through two methods, a NCA listserv request and direct outreach to directors/coordinators.
The NCA was contacted to provide an endorsement of the study as a way of conveying a sense of trust. Working with the NCA Deputy Director, the following materials were submitted for review on June 12, 2013:

- Information on the educational institution and researcher, including curriculum vitae;
- Research proposal;
- Institutional Review Board (IRB) application;
- IRB approval letter (see Appendix A);
- Survey instrument (see Appendix B); and
- Informational consent form (see Appendix C).

As requested by NCA, I also agreed to provide NCA with a copy of my final research document.

Notification was received from NCA two days later that the materials were reviewed and approved. The Deputy Director offered to post a request for participation on the NCA listserv. The listserv announcement was used as a way to solicit contact information for forensic interviewers from CAC directors/coordinators as opposed to requesting direct participation from the forensic interviewers, the method used by Bonach and Heckert (2012). A description including a short abstract, instructions, and a link to an on-line form to input forensic interviewers’ contact information was provided to NCA (see Appendix D), as well as a list of the CAC directors/coordinators in the northeast region.

The NCA posted the request for directors/coordinators to provide contact information for forensic interviewers to the NCA listserv on July 1, 2013. The message asked CAC directors/coordinators to click on a link embedded within the message to provide the requested information. The link took the directors/coordinators to the Qualtrics Survey Software site where the University of Connecticut logo provided verification of university affiliation. The
online form prompted the directors/coordinators to input information regarding their state, NCA accreditation status, organizational type, how many forensic interviewers are associated with the CAC, and the name and email address of the forensic interviewer(s). Four CAC directors/coordinators responded to the request on the first day and nine additional responded within the next two days. Over the course of two weeks, 16 directors/coordinators (14%) responded to the listserv request.

Information for forensic interviewers was then sought out through direct outreach to CAC directors/coordinators via mail, electronic mail, and phone contact. See Appendix D for recruitment materials sent to CAC directors/coordinators. Two weeks after the NCA listserv posting, an advance notice letter was sent detailing the research to 100 CAC directors/coordinators, removing the 16 who had responded to the listserv posting. Two of 100 letters sent represented multiple contact persons identified for two of the CACs. One director/coordinator responded to the letter. The postal service returned two letters due to lack of mail receptacles.

Nine days later, 100 directors/coordinators were emailed. As before, the email included an embedded link that the CAC directors/coordinators clicked to provide the requested information. The link went to the Qualtrics Survey Software site as described above. Eight CAC directors/coordinators responded on the first day. Within five days, 18 directors/coordinators (16%) responded to the first email request.

For the fourth contact, each non-responsive director/coordinator was called on the CAC’s main line. Beginning six days after the email request, 82 phone calls were made over the course of a week. In total, 29 directors/coordinators (25%) responded to the phone call.

Three days after the last phone attempt, a reminder email was sent to the 44 remaining CAC directors/coordinators. Seven CAC directors/coordinators responded that day. Within the
next two weeks, 10 directors/coordinators (9%) responded to the reminder email request. One month after initiating outreach to the CAC directors/coordinators, contact information was obtained for forensic interviewers at 64% of the CACs.

Once data collection began in August, another attempt to contact the remaining directors/coordinators was made. Two and a half weeks after the reminder email, a second reminder email was sent to 34 directors/coordinators. Three CAC directors/coordinators responded that day with one additional response received within the next week. In total, four directors/coordinators (4%) responded to the second reminder email request.

Two months after the initial contact, a final attempt to reach out to the remaining CAC directors/coordinators was made. Follow-up phone calls were made to 28 directors/coordinators. In total, nine directors/coordinators (8%) responded to the final follow-up phone call. At this point, there was sufficient outreach with contact information obtained for forensic interviewers at 76% of the CACs.

The outreach to the CAC directors/coordinators included seven different attempts via a posting on the NCA listserv, a letter sent through the mail, three emails, and two phone calls. Two CAC directors/coordinators based in prosecutor’s offices requested to review the survey, after which both provided the requested information for their forensic interviewers. Three directors/coordinators requested an email they could send to their forensic interviewers, who could then decide if they wanted to provide their own contact information. This only resulted in one forensic interviewer providing their contact information. In some instances, a director/coordinator indicated they were not interested in having their forensic interviewers participate and asked not to be contacted again. This request was respected and no further contact was made.
Using the methods described above, 90% of the CAC directors/coordinators responded in some way. Of the 114 CACs, 87 directors/coordinators (76%) provided contact information for forensic interviewers; 16 responded but did not provide the requested information (14%). Eleven CAC directors/coordinators (10%) did not respond in any way. Directors/coordinators not providing contact information most often stated that law enforcement and child protective service workers conduct their own interviews, suggesting they were not at liberty to provide the requested information. Of those who did not provide contact information, 14 directors/coordinators offered to forward the survey link on to the forensic interviewers. This provided an opportunity for forensic interviewers to participate in the research, while respecting their confidentiality.

The information collected from the CAC directors/coordinators is the first known comprehensive list of forensic interviewers in the Northeast region. By developing the sample list, coverage error was managed by knowing exactly how the list was compiled (Dillman et al, 2009). While by no means a definitive list of the population, the methods used ensure that as many potential members of the sampling frame as possible were included. Throughout the process, it was discovered that some forensic interviewers work at multiple CACs. Such individuals were only counted once.

Prior to building the sample list, it was estimated there would be approximately 295 forensic interviewers in the Northeast region. The estimate was calculated using Jackson’s (2004) average of 2.73 forensic interviewers on staff at CACs. Using the methods described above, a total of 225 individuals were identified as a forensic interviewer as defined in this study.
Instrument

The electronic survey consisted of 108 questions used to measure the independent and dependent variables. The survey took approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. Preexisting and validated measurements, including Survey of Perceived Organizational Support, Job Content Questionnaire, External Job Support subscale, Oldenburg Burnout Inventory, and Job Satisfaction Subscale, were used.

Pilot Testing

Forensic interview experts were sought out to pilot test the instrument. The American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children (APSAC) Forensic Interviewer Supporter Special Interest Group (SIG) listserv was used to solicit pilot reviewers. The listserv was selected because of its affiliation with a professional organization and its inclusion of a variety of professionals. Listserv membership is extended to forensic interviewers, trainers, researchers, MDT members, and supervisors. The listserv is only accessible to members who apply to APSAC in order to participate (American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children, n.d.). I have been a member of the SIG listserv since February 2012.

On July 8, 2013, a message was posted on the APSAC SIG listserv requesting volunteers to pilot the survey. See Appendix E for recruitment materials for expert pilot testing. Within two days, 14 individuals responded. One possible volunteer was eliminated as she was a forensic interviewer within the Northeast region of the United States. The remaining pilot reviewers were divided into two groups: one to review a Word version and the other to review an online version of the survey. An email was sent to the second group alerting them that the survey would be sent at a later date once set up online.
On July 10, 2013, the survey, attached as a Word document, was sent via email to six individuals; four reviewers returned comments. The reviewers included three forensic interviewers from Alabama, Arizona, and Maryland and an academic from Michigan known for her expertise in child abuse and forensic interviewing techniques. Comments from the reviewers were incorporated into the survey prior to the next pilot to be conducted online.

A link to the survey, available online through Qualtrics Survey Software, was sent via email to seven individuals on August 26, 2013. The pilot survey was made as close as possible to the same format research participants would receive. Five reviewers returned comments, including feedback on the use of Qualtrics Survey Software. The second set of reviewers included three forensic interviewers from Colorado, Iowa, and Washington, a CAC program director from Texas, and an academic from Tennessee also a former forensic interviewer. Comments from the reviewers were incorporated into the survey prior to implementation.

Survey

The final version of the survey included 108 questions presented in a logical manner. See Appendix B for survey instrument. Dillman and associates (2009) suggest placing the most salient questions at the beginning of a survey and demographic questions at the end. The first question asked participants to provide an average percentage of the types of abuse for which they conduct forensic interviews. This question acted as a contingency question, meaning if a participant indicated they did not conduct forensic interviews (zero percent) then they would be thanked for their time and directed to the end of the survey. Pre-existing subscales, as described below, were next, with each subscale presented on its own “page.” Next, 37 questions asked about organizational factors specific to working at CACs including CAC descriptive information, job responsibilities, benefits, and supervision. Next were 16 demographic questions, followed by
two global questions as described below. Finally, the survey finished with an open-ended question that allowed participants to describe any final thoughts about their experience as forensic interviewers.

Independent variables.

Job Content Questionnaire. Decision latitude and social support were measured by subscales selected from the Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ). Karasek and associates (1998) define decision latitude as the control workers have in their jobs. Two subscales, skill discretion (six questions) and decision authority (three questions), measure decision latitude (control). Two subscales, supervisor support (four questions) and coworker support (four questions), measure social support. Karasek and associates define social support as the impact that support from supervisors and coworkers have on workers. The survey design included a 4-point response scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Permission to use the JCQ was obtained from the JCQ Center at the University of Massachusetts, Lowell.

The reliability for the JCQ was reported to be good and consistent across populations. The Cronbach's alpha for each subscale ranged from .69 to .85. The scale has also shown evidence of predictive validity (Karasek et al., 1998).

External job support. External job support referred to support workers received from family, friends, the public, and other professionals. A five question subscale was used to measure external job support. The 6-point response scale ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The reliability for the subscale was reported to be good with an alpha of .77 (Horwitz, 2006).

Job demands and organizational support. For the purposes of this study, 30 questions were included to measure additional job demands and organizational support specific to CACs.
Questions related to job demands included items such as number of forensic interviewers at the CACs, supervisory responsibilities, and average number of interviews conducted per week. Questions related to organizational support included items such as indirect benefits and supervisors' experience in forensic interviewing. Because MDTs are so vital to the CAC model, three questions specific to MDTs were created for the survey. The questions focused on satisfaction, support, and stress related to the MDTs participants work with most often.

**Factors.** Principal factors extraction with varimax rotation was performed on the survey items identified as job demands and items deemed as organizational support. Principal components extraction was used prior to principal factors extraction to estimate number of factors, presence of outliers, absence of multicollinearity, and factorability of the correlation matrices.

**Job demands factors.** Four factors were extracted for the job demands. Communalities ranged from .035 to .765. With a cutoff of .40 for inclusion of a variable in interpretation of a factor, 12 of the 34 variables did not load on any factor. Failure of numerous variables to load on a factor reflected heterogeneity of items on the survey.

When oblique rotation was requested, the pattern matrix failed to converge in 25 rotations. Therefore, orthogonal rotation was chosen. See Table 3.2 for loadings of job demands variables on factors, communalities, and percents of variance. The four factors identified as job demands were labeled court-based dissemination demands (seven items), opinion-based dissemination demands (five items), expert-based dissemination demands (five items), and supervisory demands (five items). Reliability was acceptable for all four factors with Cronbach’s alpha levels at or above .60.
Table 3.2

*Factor Loadings, Communalities (h^2), and Percents of Variance for Principal Factors Extraction and Varimax Rotation on Job Demands Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>H^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal court</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testify</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile court</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facts of the case</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protective services court</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion in report</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple page summary</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression of the child</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion in testimony</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on dynamics of abuse</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on forensic interviewing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 page fact sheet</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisees</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic interviewer supervisees</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director/coordinator</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>H²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic interviews</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of variance</td>
<td>17.73</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Variables are ordered and grouped by size of loading to facilitate interpretation. Loadings under .40 are replaced by dashes. Interpretive labels are suggested:

F1 Court-based Dissemination Demands (α = .87)
F2 Opinion-based Dissemination Demands (α = .66)
F3 Expert-based Dissemination Demands (α = .61)
F4 Supervisory Demands (α = .60)

Support factors. Four factors were extracted for support. Communality values ranged from .122 to .839. With a cutoff of .50 for inclusion of a variable in interpretation of a factor, five of the 24 variables did not load on any factor.

When oblique rotation was requested, variables in factor 3 were less than zero, suggesting that such a solution was orthogonal (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The first three factors aligned with the items on the pre-existing Supervisor Support, Coworker Support, and
External Job Support subscales. The fourth factor was identified as indirect support (six items). Reliability was acceptable for the fourth factor with a Cronbach’s alpha level of .60. See Table 3.3 for loadings of support variables on factor, communalities, and percents of variance for items loading on the fourth factor.

Table 3.3

*Factor Loadings, Communalities (h²), and Percents of Variance for Principal Factors Extraction and Varimax Rotation on Indirect Support Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>h²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal days off</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrief</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor experience</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor length</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Only items loading on the fourth factor are reported. Variables are ordered and grouped by size of loading to facilitate interpretation. Loadings under .50 are replaced by dashes. An interpretive label is suggested: F4 Indirect Support (α = .60).

**Dependent variable.**

*Oldenburg Burnout Inventory.* The two components of burnout, disengagement and exhaustion, were measured by the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI, Demerouti, Mostert, & Bakker, 2010). Disengagement was defined as an expression of a pessimistic attitude toward
work and exhaustion was feeling as if the individual has nothing left to give emotionally and physically (Demerouti, Bakker, Vardakou, & Kantas, 2003). The OLBI was a 16-item scale designed with a 4-point response scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 4 (strongly disagree). The response options were reversed (i.e., 1 became strongly disagree) to remain consistent with the response choices provided in the other subscales.

Although developed in German, Halbesleben and Demerouti (2005) validated the OLBI with two samples of English-speaking workers in the United States. Reliability of the OLBI-English version supported internal consistency with Cronbach’s alpha levels ranging from .74 to .87 for the exhaustion subscale and .76 to .83 for the disengagement subscale. Test-retest reliability indicated stability over time. The scale also showed support of discriminant and convergent validity.

Global items. A global item question, "As a result of my work as a forensic interviewer, I am experiencing burnout," assessed concurrent validity to check whether burnout was the appropriate construct being measured. The use of this question allowed direct comparison between the burnout measured through the OLBI and self-report of being burned out. A second global item question, "I am satisfied with my work as a forensic interviewer," assessed concurrent validity to check whether job satisfaction was the appropriate construct being measured. The use of this question allowed direct comparison between the job satisfaction measured through the Job Satisfaction Subscale and self-report of being satisfied.

Mediating variable.

Job Satisfaction Subscale. Job satisfaction was defined as employees' thoughts and feelings about their job. The Job Satisfaction Subscale (JSS) consisted of three questions taken from the larger Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Bowling & Hammond,
2008; Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, & Klesh, 1983). The survey design included a 7-point response scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

The JSS had better face validity than other scales measuring job satisfaction. A meta-analytic study found the JSS had good reliability with the coefficient alpha reported to be .84. The JSS also showed support of construct validity (Bowling & Hammond, 2008).

**Other questions.**

For the purposes of this study, additional questions gathered information on other aspects of the job, including additional roles held at the organization separate from forensic interviewing. There were also 14 demographic questions in the survey. Control variables included age, gender, children under the age of 18 years old, and tenure as forensic interviewer, at current CAC, and in child welfare field.

All questions, except three, were closed-ended with all possible response choices provided. The open-ended questions asked about supervisor's degree(s), languages in which interviews were conducted, and final comment on their work as a forensic interviewer.

**Data Collection**

Recruitment included six potential points of contact with respondents. Contact included an advance notice letter with incentive, advance notice e-mail, the on-line survey packet, a reminder e-mail for those who did not respond, a second reminder e-mail, and a thank you message to those who responded. See Appendix F for recruitment materials sent to forensic interviewers.

Dillman and associates (2009) supported the findings of Cook, Health, and Thompson's (2000) meta analysis which suggested that several email contacts provide a successful way of increasing electronic survey response rates. Kittleson (1997) suggested that the response rate in
electronic surveys can be doubled with the use of follow-up contacts. Kittleson estimated a 50-60% response rate overall via electronic surveying, whereas average paper response rates were estimated to be between 40-70% (Cook et al., 2000). In addition, Barrios, Villarroya, Borrego, and Olle (2011) found answer quality and completion rates to be better in electronic surveys.

The first contact, an advance notice letter, provided information about the study and the survey soon to arrive via email. The University of Connecticut School of Social Work letterhead and envelopes were purchased for use in the research. Each letter was personalized to include the forensic interviewer's email address where the survey would be sent. Letters were sent to 225 forensic interviewers. The letter included my university email address and cell phone number for a participant to contact if there was an error in their email address. Three individuals sent an email to correct their email addresses. The postal service returned one letter due to lack of mail receptacle.

To serve as a token of appreciation for participating in the survey, the letter included an incentive, a two-dollar bill. One forensic interviewer sent an email stating the enclosed $2 was not necessary and that ethically, no money can be accepted as part of the job. The individual said he would contribute the money to a local charity by way of a donation jar. One forensic interviewer left a voicemail asking how to return the $2, to which I responded with an email suggesting a donation be made. Four letters with varying amounts of $2 bills were received from individuals and groups of forensic interviewers for a total of $30 returned. The money returned will be used to make a donation to the NCA at the conclusion of the study.

The second contact, an advance notice email, confirmed the receipt of the advanced letter and alerted potential participants that the survey would be arriving. The email arrived between three and seven days after the advance notice letter. The email asked participants to confirm the
receipt of the email by clicking a link embedded within the email. This also served as a test to confirm email addresses and begin engaging potential participants in the survey process, while also providing an estimate of respondents.

The embedded link took participants to the Qualtrics Survey Software site where the University of Connecticut logo provided verification of university affiliation. Via the link, respondents could confirm their email addresses and/or request a paper copy of the survey. The advance notice email was sent to 225 forensic interviewers, out of which 103 (46%) responded to confirm their email addresses. No requests were received for a paper version of the survey following the advance notice email.

The third contact, the on-line survey packet, arrived between two and eight days after the advance notice email. The on-line survey packet contained an email cover letter explaining the study, requesting participation, and a link to the survey instrument on Qualtrics Survey Software. Once participants clicked on the link the IRB-approved information sheet appeared. This explained the risks and benefits of participation and the participants' rights as human subjects. A progress bar at the bottom of each page of the survey allowed participants to gauge their progress. The University of Connecticut logo was visible on all pages of the survey. The on-line survey packet was sent to 224 forensic interviewers. The sample was reduced after a potential participant informed me that she left her job as a forensic interviewer. Out of the 224 sent, 86 participants (38%) responded within three days of receiving the survey.

At the point in which a respondent completed the survey, a thank you message was automatically generated by Qualtrics Survey Software. The message thanked the participant for taking the time to complete the survey and stated the study's importance in helping CACs provide better support to and reduce burnout among forensic interviewers. Once the participant
completed the survey, they were excluded from any of the on-going contacts to solicit participation.

The next contact, a follow-up reminder email, arrived between three and four days after the on-line survey packet. Qualtrics Survey Software was set up to automatically send the reminder to potential participants who had not yet responded. The reminder email encouraged participation in the survey by stressing the importance of the research. Out of 157 reminder emails sent, 65 participants responded (41%) within seven days of receiving the reminder.

The final contact, a second reminder email, arrived between 11 and 17 days after the first follow-up reminder email. The email included a similar message as the first reminder, but with stronger language in order to assist the potential respondents in overcoming their resistance. The email also stressed the importance of participation and how the results would help provide an understanding of burnout among forensic interviewers. Out of 97 second follow-up reminder emails sent, 17 participants responded (18%) within four days of receiving the reminder.

Data collection took place between August 19 and October 3, 2013. Data collection ended once a week passed without any responses. During the data collection phase, two participants chose the “opt-out” option on Qualtrics Survey Software, but are still included in the sample size. The final sample size was 222 forensic interviewers, after removing two potential participants who informed me that they did not feel it was appropriate to complete the survey since they had just completed training and had not yet conducted any interviews. The total number of respondents was 167, resulting in a 75% response rate.

The original research proposal included a final phone contact to recruit those who had not yet responded. The phone contact was replaced with the second email reminder after I began
making phone calls, only to discover that many of those who had not responded to the survey were contracted forensic interviewers and did not have voicemail at the CACs.

Recruitment for participation began while the sample list was still being developed. Two reasons led to this: getting in contact with the directors/coordinators took longer than anticipated and I did not want to lose the credibility established with the directors/coordinators who already provided information. This resulted in four “waves” of recruitment. See Table 3.4 for waves of recruitment. Six weeks elapsed between first and final contact for the first wave; five weeks for the second wave, and three weeks for waves 3 and 4. The elapsed time between the first and final contact became more consistent with the three to four weeks suggested by Dillman and associates (2009) as the research progressed.

Table 3.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Advance Notice Letter</th>
<th>Advance Notice Email</th>
<th>On-line Survey Packet</th>
<th>Reminder Email</th>
<th>Second Reminder Email</th>
<th>Total Time</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/19/13</td>
<td>08/28/13</td>
<td>09/05/13</td>
<td>09/09/13</td>
<td>09/26/13</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>08/28/13</td>
<td>09/03/13</td>
<td>09/05/13</td>
<td>09/09/13</td>
<td>09/26/13</td>
<td>5 weeks</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>09/09/13</td>
<td>09/12/13</td>
<td>09/16/13</td>
<td>09/18/13</td>
<td>09/26/13</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>09/14/13</td>
<td>09/19/13</td>
<td>09/23/13</td>
<td>09/26/13</td>
<td>10/03/13</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All communication with potential participants included an option to request the survey in paper format through post mail. This provided an option for completing the survey in either online or paper format depending on participants' preference. Only two potential participants emailed me to request a paper copy of the survey after receiving the email survey packets. These potential participants were informed that I decided to forego the use of the paper survey as I
received a strong response rate to the electronic survey and wanted to maintain a single mode of data collection to avoid potential administration methods effects.

**Data Management**

Qualtrics Survey Software was used to distribute the survey and manage the database. Data were uploaded from Qualtrics Survey Software into an Excel document. The data were then cleaned to adjust for data found to be unusable before uploading into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 22.

Of the 167 participants who began the survey, 19 were eliminated due to insufficient data. Eight participants did not answer any questions. Two surveys were eliminated after entering zero percent on the contingency question. Four were removed because only the first question was completed. Four were removed due to only completing the first six to nine questions. One respondent worked at a CAC that was not a member of NCA at the time of the survey. The 19 removed did not significantly differ across a range of available variables from the 148 remaining participants. The usable data produced a 67% response rate.

Data were recoded for certain questions. If a respondent left the NCA accreditation or setting of the CAC blank or responded with an unknown, the correct information was replaced with information collected from the CAC directors/coordinators when developing the sample frame. Qualitative responses to supervisor’s degrees and languages in which forensic interviews are conducted were grouped and recoded for quantitative entry. “Other” responses for types of abuse and forensic interviewer role were placed into the appropriate pre-existing response choices. Alphabetic characters used where numeric responses were necessary in hours worked per week, average forensic interviews conducted in a week, approximate number of hours of training, and total forensic interviewers on staff were replaced with numeric characters. Years
and months under current supervisor, as a forensic interviewer, at the CAC, and in the child welfare field were converted into total in months. Year obtained highest degree was converted into total years since the degree was attained. Data were rechecked by a graduate student colleague in 100% of the cases to ensure accuracy.

Data were reverse-coded as instructed by scale designers for various questions on three subscales. Four questions on the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support, eight on the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory, and one item on the Job Satisfaction Subscale were reverse-coded.

**Missing Data**

The subscales were assessed for missing data, which ranged from none missing in three subscales to participants skipping an entire subscale. The issue with the subscale, Survey of Perceived Organizational Support, which eight participants did not complete, was somewhat anticipated. One of the CAC directors/coordinators who reviewed the survey prior to providing the forensic interviewers’ contact information did not feel the questions were applicable since her organization was a prosecutor’s office, not a formal CAC. I agreed that she could tell her forensic interviewers to skip these questions. This led to the removal of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support from the model post-hoc, as the survey may not have assessed the construct properly because “children’s advocacy center” was used in the questions. Other participants who are not employees of CACs may also have felt the questions were not relevant.

A two-way imputation was used to adjust for missing data on five of the scales. Berbaards and Sijtsma (2000) found this data-imputation procedure to be the most effective as it adjusts for both person and item effects. Since each of the subscales had less than nine items, if a participant skipped one item on a scale, the missing response was imputed. If a participant
skipped two or more items, they were subsequently dropped from analyses involving that scale. Data were imputed for 13 participants’ missing data in one or more scales. Two participants skipped two or more items on the Social Support Subscale. Composite scores for each subscale were subsequently calculated. The data set was run with the imputed and non-imputed data and no significant differences were noted in hypotheses testing.

Descriptive statistics were run as a way to assess for errors or missing data in other items. “No” responses were recoded as zero to provide dummy coding of yes/no response sets. The mean was used to substitute missing data in five questions related to MDT satisfaction, support, and stress, average hours worked per week, and average number of forensic interviews conducted per week.

**Verification**

**Internal Validity**

The internal reliability for all of the subscales was calculated and found to be consistent with previous research. See Table 3.5 for psychometric properties of major study variables measured by preexisting scales. The reliability for the JCQ was reported to be good with the Cronbach’s alpha for each subscale ranging from .69 to .85 (Karasek et al., 1998). The internal reliability for the Skill Discretion Subscale was modest in this study with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .60. One question, asking about repetitive work, was not a strong contributor with this sample. I made the decision to remove the question after assessing the repetitiveness of the forensic interview position. As each child abuse case involves a different child, alleged perpetrator, and case details, the work is not repetitive in the same manner as someone working on an assembly line. The item was removed resulting in an increased coefficient alpha of .73. This also resulted in the removal of the item from the Decision Latitude Subscale, which
combines the Skill Discretion and Decision Authority Subscales. With the repetitive work item, the alpha was .74 for the Decision Latitude Subscale; after removing the item the alpha was .80. The internal reliability for the other JCQ subscales used in this research continued to be good with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of .84 for the Decision Authority Subscale, .91 for the Supervisor Support Subscale, .88 for the Coworker Support Subscale, and .85 for the Social Support Subscale.

In some instances the alpha levels were found to be higher in the current research. The reliability for the External Job Support Subscale was reported to be good with an alpha of .77 (Horwitz, 2006). The internal reliability of the External Job Support Subscale was found to have a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .84 in this study. The OLBI-English version’s alphas ranged from .74 to .83 for the subscales. The internal reliability of the OLBI continued to be good in the current study with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of .77 for the Disengagement Subscale, .80 for the Exhaustion Subscale, and .89 for the combined Burnout Scale. The Job Satisfaction Subscale’s reliability was reportedly good with a coefficient alpha of .84 (Bowling & Hammond, 2008). The internal reliability continued to be good with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .86 in the current study.

**Table 3.5**

*Psychometric Properties of Major Study Variables Measured by Preexisting Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision Latitude (Control)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>69.82 (3.47)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>22-88</td>
<td>38-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>25.44 (3.78)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>8-32</td>
<td>12-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Job Support</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>23.90 (4.42)</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>5-30</td>
<td>11-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>17.91 (3.49)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3-21</td>
<td>3-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>36.00 (6.45)</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>16-64</td>
<td>20-57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Differences in sample size are due to missing data.
Two global item questions were used in this study as validity checks to assess whether the correct constructs were being measured. A majority (88%) of respondents indicated they were satisfied with their work as forensic interviewers. A third (29%) of respondents indicated they were experiencing burnout as a result of their work as forensic interviewers. See Table 3.6 for responses to global items. Internal validity was also supported by qualitative findings supporting quantitative findings in a number of areas.

Table 3.6

*Response to Global Items*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my work as a forensic interviewer</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>130 (88%)</td>
<td>14 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of my work as a forensic interviewer, I am experiencing burnout</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>43 (29%)</td>
<td>101 (71%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External Validity**

The high response rate (75%; 67% usable data) in this study was impressive. There are several suggested reasons for such response. First, as advised by Dillman and associates (2009), multiple points of contact were utilized to develop the sample list and recruit participants. Second, both CAC directors/coordinators and forensic interviewers were contacted via postal mail and email, in addition to the directors/coordinators being contacted by phone. Third, the survey recruitment model was adapted for use in electronic recruitment. As such, the use of the $2 bill was used as a physical incentive for participants. The directors/coordinators were also informed that they would receive a copy of the study results upon completion of the research. Fourth, the recruitment materials sent to CAC directors/coordinators and forensic interviewers emphasized shared group membership, as I am a former CAC program director and forensic
interviewer. As the CAC model is a rather new approach and represents a small group of workers in the child welfare and forensic social work fields, such shared membership may have been influential in encouraging individuals to participate. Fifth, all communication to CAC directors/coordinators and forensic interviewers stated that the research was for my doctoral dissertation. Providing such information may have appealed to a desire to help another person. Sixth, given the limited research on forensic interviewers, especially in the area of burnout and job satisfaction, the uniqueness of the request for participation may have also encouraged participation. Finally, when outreach was made to CAC directors/coordinators, I suggested they tell their forensic interviewers about the research and encourage their participation. Such a direct request may have also proven influential.

A high response rate, such as obtained in this research, allowed for confidence in generalizing the findings to the general population of forensic interviewers in the Northeast region of the United States. Yet, there were two limitations in this generalization. First, the size and description of the entire population of forensic interviewers in the Northeast region was not known precisely. The sample studied here was the most comprehensive list of the group and largest number studied in the region. Yet, there were still an unknown number of forensic interviewers not included in this sampling frame as some CAC directors/coordinators did not provide the requested information or never responded to my outreach efforts. Second, little was known about the percentage of the sample who did not participate in the survey. Due to this lack of information, no conclusions were made about similarities or differences between those who responded and those who did not.
Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics and statistical analyses were computed utilizing SPSS. Correlation was used to assess significant relationships between study variables measured by preexisting scales. See Table 3.7 for correlation matrix. Independent-samples t-tests were used ex post facto to assess any significant differences in various dichotomous variables with respect to burnout and job satisfaction. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were used post hoc to assess significant differences between group means with respect to burnout and job satisfaction. Multivariate regression analyses allowed for exploration of the influence of and interaction among multiple correlates and highlighted the amount of variance attributed to selected variables. The SPSS macro PROCESS was used to test for the presence of moderated and mediated relationships (Hayes, 2013). Qualitative responses from the open-ended question at the end of the survey were analyzed for themes.

Table 3.7

Correlation Matrix of Study Variables Measured By Preexisting Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Decision Latitude Subscale</th>
<th>Social Support Subscale</th>
<th>External Job Support Subscale</th>
<th>Burnout Inventory</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction Subscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision Latitude Subscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support Subscale</td>
<td>.298*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Job Support Subscale</td>
<td>.345*</td>
<td>.327*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout Inventory</td>
<td>-.397*</td>
<td>-.505*</td>
<td>-.414*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction Subscale</td>
<td>.437*</td>
<td>.557*</td>
<td>.424*</td>
<td>-.693*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Hypotheses Testing

H1: Forensic interviewers who report higher job demands will report higher levels of burnout.

To test hypothesis 1, correlation was used to analyze the degree of relationship between the Independent Variable (IV), job demands, and Dependent Variable (DV), burnout, both continuous variables. A one-tailed test was run as the hypothesized relationship is directional (positive). A multiple linear regression was used to predict the value of burnout given the value of job demands. Job demands were made up of the four composite measures identified as demands associated with being a forensic interviewer. Burnout was measured by the OLBI.

H2: Forensic interviewers who report higher job demands will report higher job satisfaction.

To test hypothesis 2, correlation was used to analyze the degree of relationship between the IV, job demands, and DV, job satisfaction, both continuous variables. A one-tailed test was run as the hypothesized relationship is directional (positive). A multiple linear regression was used to predict the value of job satisfaction given the value of job demands. Job satisfaction was measured by the JSS.

H3: Forensic interviewers who report higher job satisfaction will report lower levels of burnout.

To test hypothesis 3, correlation was used to analyze the degree of relationship between the IV, job satisfaction, and DV, burnout, both continuous variables. A one-tailed test was run as the hypothesized relationship is inverse. A linear regression was used to predict the value of burnout given the value of job satisfaction.

H4: The relationship between job demands and burnout is mediated by job satisfaction.

Baron and Kenny (1986) stated that "mediators explain how external physical events take on internal psychological significance" (p. 1176). To test hypothesis 4, the degree to which job satisfaction mediated the relationship between demands and burnout, a mediation analysis was
conducted. The mediation analysis used ordinary least squares path analysis to test effects (Hayes, 2013).

H5: Forensic interviewers who report more control will report higher levels of job satisfaction.

To test hypothesis 5, correlation was used to analyze the degree of relationship between the IV, control, and DV, job satisfaction, both continuous variables. A one-tailed test was run as the hypothesized relationship is directional (positive). A linear regression was used to predict the value of job satisfaction given the value of control. Control was measured by the JCQ Decision Latitude Subscale.

H6: The relationship between job demands and job satisfaction is moderated by control.

Baron and Kenny (1986) described a moderator as a "variable that affects the direction and/or strength of the relationship between an independent or predictor variable and a dependent or criterion variable" (p. 1174). To test hypothesis 6, the degree to which job demands’ effect of job satisfaction is dependent on control, a moderation analysis was conducted. The moderation analysis tested for statistical interaction using multiple regression (Hayes, 2013).

H7: Forensic interviewers who report higher levels of support will report lower levels of burnout.

To test hypothesis 7, correlation was used to analyze the degree of relationship between the IV, support, and DV, burnout, both continuous variables. A one-tailed test was run as the hypothesized relationship is inverse. A multiple linear regression was used to predict the value of burnout given the value of support. Support was made up of the social and external support subscales and factor composite identified as support.

H8: The relationship between job satisfaction and burnout is moderated by support.

To test hypothesis 8, the degree to which job satisfaction's effect on burnout is dependent on support, a moderation analysis was conducted.
Finally, the overall moderated mediation model was tested to identify multiple pathways through which the IVs affect the DVs (Hayes, 2013). See Figure 3.1 for path diagram of the hypothesized model. Such a model resulted in a more complete analysis (Hayes, 2013; Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007). A moderation mediation analysis, also known as a conditional process analysis, was conducted. The first and second stage moderation model used a series of multiple regression models to test if job demands' effect on job satisfaction was moderated by control and job satisfaction’s effect on burnout was moderated by support. The conditional indirect effects were tested to examine if job demands on burnout was mediated by job satisfaction at each level of the two moderators, control and support (Hayes, 2013).
Ethical Considerations

A number of steps were taken to ensure the protection of human subjects. Approval from the University of Connecticut's IRB was obtained prior to initiating the research. An information sheet that explained the risks and benefits of the research was used as opposed to a signed consent form as a way to ensure the confidentiality of the participants as this is a rather small, specialized population with potential professional risk if participants were identified. See Appendix C for information sheet.

A potential risk associated with participation was identified as participants recalling any incidents of clients’ abuse or their own recollection of personal abuse. Participation may also
have caused a respondent to think about and evaluate whether they were experiencing burnout. Although there was no anticipated serious or lasting harm as a result of participation, safeguards were put into place. Contact information for national hotlines, such as Mental Health America (MHA), and statewide mental health resources, such as MHA Connecticut, were included at the end of the survey and in the thank you message in case any participants experienced distress. There was no risk for forensic interviewers who choose not to participate.

The confidentiality of participants was protected to encourage the participants to be as open and honest as possible. Participants’ contact information was not associated with their survey answers within the database. Participants who had concern that employers could access their responses were informed that they could forward the link to their personal email accounts or request a paper version of the survey. Any personal information used to contact participants was kept separate from their responses. All data downloaded from the Qualtrics Survey Software did not contain any identifying information. All computer files were secured with password protection on a password protected computer in my personal office. In addition, all files will be destroyed within seven years of the completion of the research as allowable by law.

**Summary**

This chapter provided an overview of the methodologies employed in this research. A cross-sectional electronic survey design gathered information on organizational factors, burnout, and job satisfaction from forensic interviewers. Multiple points of contact were made with CAC directors/coordinators to develop the first comprehensive list of forensic interviewers in the Northeast region of the United States. An electronic survey consisting of 108 questions was used to measure the independent and dependent variables in eight hypotheses and an overall
moderated mediation model. Multiple points of contact with forensic interviewers resulted in a 75% response rate, of which 67% of the responses were usable.
Chapter Four: Results

The final sampling frame in this study was 222 forensic interviewers. Out of the 167 participants who began the survey, 19 were dropped due to insufficient completion, resulting in a usable sample of 148 and 67% response rate. This chapter provides an overview of the results, including: (a) sample description, (b) organizational factors, (c) burnout, (d) job satisfaction, (e) findings related to each hypothesis, and (f) themes discovered in the open-ended question.

Sample Description

Descriptive data of the Children’s Advocacy Centers (CAC) and forensic interviewers were collected. The 148 respondents represented forensic interviewers associated with CACs located in the Northeast region of the United States. Data are also provided to describe the organizational characteristics of the CACs.

Children’s Advocacy Centers

Forensic interviewers who participated in this study came from all nine states in the Northeast region. The proportion of the sample from each state closely mirrored the proportion of forensic interviewers from each state as represented in the sampling frame. One forensic interviewer responded from Rhode Island; this is the only interviewer known for the entire state and is shared between the two CAC sites in the state. See Table 4.1 for a comparison of respondents and forensic interviewers identified for the sampling frame.
Table 4.1
Respondents by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Respondents (%)</th>
<th>Sampling Frame (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 148)</td>
<td>(N = 222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>13 (9%)</td>
<td>14 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>12 (8%)</td>
<td>18 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>11 (7%)</td>
<td>14 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>23 (16%)</td>
<td>43 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>48 (32%)</td>
<td>69 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>29 (20%)</td>
<td>48 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>8 (5%)</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  
<sup>a</sup>Forensic interviewer is shared among sites

Respondents were affiliated with CACs at both levels of National Children’s Alliance (NCA) accreditation status. A vast majority (78%) of respondents were affiliated with NCA-accredited CACs, which represented 71% of CACs in the region. The remaining 22% of respondents were connected to NCA-associate/developing member CACs, which made up 28% of the CACs in the region. See Table 4.2 for a comparison of CAC settings for the region and the respondents’ affiliation.

Table 4.2
Respondents by National Children’s Alliance Accreditation Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCA Accreditation Status</th>
<th>Respondents (%)</th>
<th>CACs in Region (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 148)</td>
<td>(N = 114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Member</td>
<td>116 (78%)</td>
<td>82 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/Developing Member</td>
<td>32 (22%)</td>
<td>32 (28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were affiliated with CACs that represented a variety of organizational structures. Most respondents (44%) were associated with CACs classified as independent agencies, described as stand-alone organizations often classified as private 501(c)3 not-for-profit
social services agencies. A quarter (24%) of respondents were affiliated with CACs under the organizational umbrella of prosecutors’ offices. Respondents connected to hospital-based CACs made up 14% of respondents. Respondents affiliated with CACs operating under the auspices of a social service program made up 12% of respondents. Five percent of the respondents worked through CACs organizationally affiliated with child protective services. Only two respondents (1%) were associated with CACs in a law enforcement agency. One forensic interviewer was part of a public government-based, independent program. See Table 4.3 for a comparison of CAC settings for the region and the respondents.
Table 4.3  
*Respondents by Organizational Structures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of CAC</th>
<th>Respondents (%)</th>
<th>CACs in Region (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n = 148 )</td>
<td>( N = 114 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Agency (a stand-alone organization often classified as a private 501(c)3 not-for-profit social services agency)</td>
<td>65 (44%)</td>
<td>46 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital-based (functions as a program of a larger hospital organization)</td>
<td>21 (14%)</td>
<td>21 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operates under the organizational umbrella of a social service program</td>
<td>17 (12%)</td>
<td>20 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public social service operates under the organizational umbrella of a prosecutors’ office</td>
<td>35 (24%)</td>
<td>15 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public social service operates under the organizational umbrella of child protective services</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public social service operates under the organizational umbrella of a law enforcement agency</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public social service operates under the organizational umbrella of county government</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/private partnership</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-disciplinary Team only</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One model of CACs is to co-locate members of the Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) – who may be employed by agencies as described above – in the same building. Nearly half \( n = 66 \) of the respondents reported being associated with co-located CACs. The largest group (77%) reported being housed with law enforcement. Respondents reported commonly being co-
located with child protective services (64%), mental health (59%), and medical (58%) MDT members. Forensic interviewers were also housed with victim advocacy programs (52%) and prosecutors (50%). The total percentage equaled more than 100% because co-located programs may include two or more members of the MDT at one location. See Table 4.4 for respondents associated with co-located programs.

Table 4.4

*Respondents Associated with Co- Located Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-Located Program</th>
<th>Number of Respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Protective Services</td>
<td>42 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>51 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>38 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>39 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutor</td>
<td>33 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocacy</td>
<td>34 (52%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The total percentage adds up to more than 100% because co-located programs often include two or more members of the MDT at one location.

Respondents were associated with CACs that served a variety of populations. Urban populations were served by 60% of the CACs; suburban populations by 49%, and rural populations by 45% of the CACs. The total percentage added up to more than 100% because CACs may serve more than one type of population. See Table 4.5 for the populations CACs serve.
Table 4.5

*Population Type Served by Children’s Advocacy Center*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number of Respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>88 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>73 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>67 (45%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The total percentage adds up to more than 100% because a program often serves more than one type of population.

As expected, there was a range in the total number of individuals conducting forensic interviews within a single CAC. Ten respondents (7%) reported they were the only forensic interviewer at their CACs. The most frequent response was two forensic interviewers (21%) within a CAC, followed by three individuals conducting forensic interviews (16%). The average was six forensic interviewers, much higher than the national average of 2.73 interviewers found by Jackson (2004), but she specified forensic interviewers on-site at the CAC. The current study also sought out law enforcement and child protective services workers who conducted forensic interviews at NCA-member CACs. This was also much higher than the number provided by the CAC directors/coordinators while developing the sampling frame for this study. Such discrepancies may have been due to respondents counting all co-workers trained in forensic interviewing, while CAC directors/coordinators were asked to provide information for those currently conducting forensic interviews at the CACs. The CAC directors/coordinators may not have been aware of all law enforcement and child protective services workers who conducted forensic interviews off-site.
Forensic Interviewers

**Education.** Respondents presented with a range of educational backgrounds. Over a third (36%) of respondents had an undergraduate degree as the highest degree. Over half (53%) held a graduate degree. Two respondents (1%) had a doctorate. The remaining respondents reported some college (6%) or a high school degree or general educational development (GED) (1%).

A third (33%) of the respondents identified social work as the field of their highest degree. Almost a quarter (20%) reported criminal justice as the field of their highest degree. The third most reported field of study was psychology (12%). Other commonly reported fields of study included sociology (5%), mental health/counseling (5%), human development and family studies (3%), education (3%), and business (3%). A few reported degrees in history, leadership, law, and rehabilitation/therapeutic services. One respondent reported in each of the following fields of study: biology, communication, general studies, international relations, justice studies, medical, political science, public administration, and social sciences. See Table 4.6 educational background of respondents.
Table 4.6

Respondents’ Educational Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
<th>Respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate or GED</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>9 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
<td>53 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>79 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Five Fields of Study of Highest Degree</th>
<th>Respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>49 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>29 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>18 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>8 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health/Counseling</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents reported a wide range of time since attaining their highest degree. The most recent graduate was within the past year while the earliest was 41 years ago. The average was 13 and a half years since respondents graduated with their highest degree.

**Employers.** While all participants in this study were affiliated with CACs, they represented a mix of CAC employees and employees of MDT agencies. The largest group of participants (36%) was employed by CACs. The second largest group (24%) was employed by law enforcement agencies. There was close to equal representation from employees of prosecutors’ offices (13%) and child protective services (12%). This represented half of the survey participants being law enforcement, prosecution, and child protective services representatives. Small groups of respondents were contracted employees (6%), hospital employees (4%), and employees of mental health programs (2%). Two respondents were split
between CACs and prosecutors’ offices. One respondent identified as an employee of a social service agency and another respondent identified as a volunteer. See Table 4.7 for respondents’ employer.

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Advocacy Center</td>
<td>53 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>36 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution</td>
<td>19 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protective Services</td>
<td>17 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Employee</td>
<td>9 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecution and Children’s Advocacy Center</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service Agency</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>1 (&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training. Respondents reported a variety of training specific to the techniques of forensic interviewing and the dynamics of child abuse. Respondents accumulated from four to approximately 1,000 hours of training with the average being 151 hours. Over half of respondents (61%) reported attending National Children’s Advocacy Center (NCAC) Forensic Interviewing of Children training. The second most frequent training (39%) was CornerHouse Child Sexual Abuse Forensic Interview Training: RATAC. A third (35%) of respondents reported attending NCAC Advanced Forensic Interviewing of Children training. Nearly a quarter reported attending NCAC Extended Forensic Interview Protocol training (23%) and Finding Words/ChildFirst Interview training (23%). Training reported in this study supported MRCAC’s (2011) finding that a majority of forensic interviewers are trained in NCAC and
CornerHouse models. Given that the NCAC and CornerHouse are located a distance from the Northeast region, forensic interviewers are committed to traveling to be trained in forensic interviewing best practices. A number of respondents (15%) also reported being trained in state-specific models. Other training included American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children (APSAC) Child Forensic Interview Clinic (10%), National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Protocol training (4%), and the San Diego International Conference on Child and Family Maltreatment (2%). Respondents also reported attending training through the Federal Bureau of Investigations, First Witness, National Child Protection Training Center, National District Attorney Association, and training specific to interviewing people with disabilities. Three respondents (2%) reported the only training they had was in-house by a senior staff member. The total percentage added up to more than 100% because forensic interviewers were commonly trained in more than one model of interviewing (Midwest Regional Children’s Advocacy Center [MRCAC], 2011). See Table 4.8 for respondents’ training in forensic interviewing.

Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Model</th>
<th>Respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Children’s Advocacy Center Forensic Interviewing of Children</td>
<td>90 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CornerHouse Child Sexual Abuse Forensic Interview Training: RATAC</td>
<td>57 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Children’s Advocacy Center Advanced Forensic Interviewing of Children</td>
<td>51 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Children’s Advocacy Center Extended Forensic Interview Protocol</td>
<td>34 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding Words/ChildFirst Interview</td>
<td>34 (23%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The total percentage adds up to more than 100% because forensic interviewers are often trained in more than one type of model.
Training is especially important given that respondents estimated they have interviewed from three to approximately 5,000 children. On average, respondents have conducted 527 forensic interviews. This calculated to 78,000 children interviewed by the respondents in this study.

**Professional identity.** Like the variety of work settings and the diverse educational training of the respondents, the profession with which they identified was assorted as well. The largest group of respondents (40%) reported forensic interviewing to be the professional background with which they identified. This aligned with Leith’s (2010) finding that there appeared to be a trend for NCAC training participants to describe their role as "child forensic interview specialist," instead of law enforcement, child protection, or social worker. The next largest group (32%) identified as law enforcement. The third most reported professional background was social work (30%). Others identified their professional background as child protection (16%), mental health (9%), prosecution (3%), and medical (3%). Other professions with which respondents identified include: criminal law, non-profit, professor, sociology, and victim advocacy. The total percentage added up to more than 100% because some respondents identified with more than one professional background. See Table 4.9 for professional background with which respondents identified.

See Table 4.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Identity</th>
<th>Respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Interviewing</td>
<td>59 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>48 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>44 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>24 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>13 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The total percentage adds up to more than 100% because respondents were able to choose more than one profession identity.
Tenure. Respondents demonstrated their commitment to the field through employment tenure. On average, respondents had been forensic interviewers for over five years, with the range being from just starting within the past month to 28 years. On average, respondents reported being a forensic interviewer at their current CAC for just over four years, with the same range of just starting to 28 years. More impressive was the length of time working in the child abuse/child welfare field with an average of over nine years; the range being between just starting within the past month to 38 years. The average tenure of nine years in the field was found to be higher than previous research on workers in child welfare. The Annie E. Casey Foundation (2003) found the average tenure of workers within public agencies to be seven years and three years in private agencies. See Figure 4.1 for respondents’ average of years in the field.

![Figure 4.1](image_url)

*Figure 4.1. Respondents’ average years in the field.*

Income. Given that forensic interviewers are employed by a variety of organizational types, from non-profit to public to for-profit private organizations, there was a wide range of annual salaries. The lowest annual salary reported was $10,000; the highest reported salary was $127,000. The average reported salary for respondents was $55,434 (SD 24,512). This was found to be higher than the average salary of $42,500 for forensic interviewers in the Northeast
reported by Midwest Regional Children’s Advocacy Center (MRCAC, 2008). An increase was expected given the time that has passed since MRCAC’s survey, five years prior to the current study. The average salary found in this study was also higher than the average salaries nationally of entry- and senior-level forensic interviewers of $37,442 and $46,377, respectively (MRCAC, 2013). This difference could be due to the inclusion of forensic interviewers employed by other MDT-member agencies and MRCAC only surveyed salaries of CAC-employed forensic interviewers. Additionally, nearly a quarter (21%) of respondents worked more than one job.

**Personal information.** Additional personal information was collected from respondents. Not only did forensic interviewers work with children, but half (50%) of the respondents had children under the age of 18 years old. Females made up a large portion of survey respondents (78%).

The racial/ethnic background of participants was fairly homogenous. A vast majority (81%) identified as white/Caucasian. The next largest group (11%) was Hispanic/Latino-a. Others identified as African American/Black (1%), Asian/Asian American (1%), and multi-racial (1%). One participant each identified as Cape Verdean and Native American/Alaska Native.

Respondents ranged across age groups. The youngest respondent was 23 years old and the oldest was 69 years of age. The average age of respondents was 40 years old (SD 9.83).

**Organizational Factors**

Responses from participants were also used to understand organizational factors specific to CACs. Although all forensic interviewers in this study were affiliated with CACs, respondents were employees of CACs, law enforcement agencies, prosecutors' offices, child protective services, hospitals, and mental health programs. A variety of differences were found among respondents given the various organizations where they were employed.
Types of Abuse

The primary function of forensic interviewers is speaking with children about alleged crimes. Respondents primarily interviewed children regarding allegations of sexual abuse, which made up an average of 78% of forensic interviews. The next most common type of abuse was physical, making up an average of 13% of interviews. Interviews regarding child pornography and exposure to pornography represented an average of four percent of interviews. On average, four percent of interviews focused on child witnesses to crime, such as domestic violence, homicide, and drug endangerment. A small portion of interviews were conducted for human trafficking and other types of crime. See Figure 4.2 for the types of abuse for which forensic interviews were conducted.

![Figure 4.2. Types of abuse for forensic interviews.]

**Number of Forensic Interviews**

A range existed in the average number of forensic interviews conducted per week by respondents. On average, respondents conducted 3.78 forensic interviews per week, with the median being 3 forensic interviews. The highest average was 15 forensic interviews per week.
Judicial Responsibilities

Testifying in court proceedings is also part of forensic interviewers’ job responsibilities. A majority (83%) of respondents have testified as part of their responsibilities. Of those who have testified \((n = 123)\), 88% provided testimony in criminal courts, 72% in child protective services courts, and 59% in juvenile courts. Some forensic interviewers also testified in family courts, grand jury proceedings, civil courts, and municipal courts. The total percentage added up to more than 100% because some forensic interviewers have testified in more than one type of court. See Figure 4.3 for types of courts where respondents testified.

![Figure 4.3. Types of court where forensic interviewers testify (%).](image)

*Note.\(\ n = 123\). The total percentage adds up to more than 100% because respondents may testify in more than one type of court.*

Forensic interviewers provided a range of testimony when called as witnesses. Of those who testified \((n = 123)\), 89% of respondents provided testimony on the protocol used to conduct forensic interviews. Most respondents (86%) also provided testimony about facts of the case. Less than half (44%) of respondents have given testimony regarding their impression of the child. Some respondents provided testimony on research specific to forensic interviewing (26%) and the dynamics of abuse (18%). Only 20% of respondents provided an opinion about the
likelihood of child maltreatment while testifying. The total percentage added up to more than 100% because forensic interviewers may have provided more than one type of testimony. See Figure 4.4 for testimony provided by respondents. Only 42% of respondents were declared expert witnesses in their jurisdiction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fact</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facts of the case</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol used to conduct the interview</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression of the child</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on the dynamics of abuse</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on forensic interviewing</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion about the likelihood of maltreatment</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.4.** Types of testimony provided by respondents (%).

*Note. n = 123. The total percentage adds up to more than 100% because respondents may testify in more than one area.*

**Interview Documentation**

A common way to preserve children’s statements has been to video record forensic interviews. A majority (76%) of respondents indicated that the CACs where they conduct forensic interviews do record videos of the interviews. The MRCAC (2011) found that 94% of CACs recorded interviews, putting northeast CACs behind national norms.

In addition to video documentation, reports are also commonly generated. A majority (62%) of respondents have written reports after completing forensic interviews. Of those who wrote reports (*n* = 91), 74% produced multiple page summaries. Just under a quarter (22%) of
respondents generated one-to-three-page fact sheets and nine percent provided verbatim transcriptions. Other written documentation included investigative reports, checklists, database entry forms, and progress notes. The total percentage added up to more than 100% because forensic interviewers may have provided more than one type of written report. See Figure 4.5 for types of reports respondents produced. Only 21% provided an opinion about the likelihood of child maltreatment in reports.

![Figure 4.5. Types of reports produced by respondents (%).](image)

*Note. n = 91. The total percentage adds up to more than 100% because respondents may write more than one report.*

**Benefits**

Employers provided respondents with a variety of benefits. A majority of respondents received health insurance (80%) and paid time off (86%). A third (31%) of respondents received tuition reimbursement. Other types of benefits respondents received through their employers included 401A and 403B plans, dental insurance, flex/compensation time, overtime pay, life insurance, pension and retirement savings, and travel reimbursement.
There were also a range of indirect benefits that employers have offered in which some respondents have participated. A majority (76%) of respondents participated in on-going training specific to forensic interviewing techniques. Almost half (46%) participated in debriefing after forensic interviews. Over half (66%) participated in peer-review processes. The MRCAC (2011) found that 94% of CACs participated in forensic interview peer reviews, putting northeast CACs behind national norms.

Respondents were also aware of the need to care for themselves. Some respondents (18%) took personal days off if emotionally affected by forensic interviews. Eight percent attended confidential counseling or some form of therapy (traditional and alternative) offered through their employer.

**Multi-Disciplinary Teams**

In accordance with the CAC model, forensic interviewers worked in conjunction with MDTs made up of representatives from prosecution, law enforcement, child welfare, medical, mental health, and victim advocacy. On average, respondents reported to working with 3.8 MDTs. A third (32%) of respondents facilitated the meetings for the MDT they worked with most often. A majority (81%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the MDTs they work with most often provided them with support. Respondents also reported they were satisfied (64%) or very satisfied (25%) with the MDTs that they worked with most often. However, a third (33%) of respondents also agreed or strongly agreed that the MDTs they work with most often caused them stress. See Table 4.10 for responses to MDT-related questions.
Table 4.10

*Responses MDT-Related Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The MDT that I work with most often provides me with support</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>24 (17%)</td>
<td>90 (64%)</td>
<td>25 (18%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MDT that I work with most often causes me stress</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
<td>40 (29%)</td>
<td>71 (51%)</td>
<td>23 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate your satisfaction with the MDT that you work with most often</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>35 (25%)</td>
<td>90 (64%)</td>
<td>15 (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mentoring**

Mentoring seemed to be common among forensic interviewers. Almost a quarter (23%) of respondents had a mentor who was a senior forensic interviewer at the time of the survey. A majority (62%) of respondents provided mentoring to co-workers new to forensic interviewing at the time of the survey.

**Supervision**

Respondents with a direct supervisor made up a large proportion of respondents (86%). Of those with a direct supervisor ($n = 127$), half (52%) participated in regularly scheduled supervision meetings. On average, respondents had been supervised by their supervisor for two and a half years, with the range being from just started within the past month to 15 years under their supervisor at the time of the survey. Supervisors were predominantly female (60%).
Supervisors held degrees in a variety of fields of study. While not all respondents knew what degree(s) their supervisors held \((n = 87)\), the following information did provide some insight into the background of supervisors. The most frequently held undergraduate degrees were in criminal justice, social work, and sociology. The most common graduate degrees held by supervisors were social work, criminal justice, and business. Two respondents reported their supervisors held doctorates in education and psychology. See Figure 4.6 for most commonly known undergraduate and graduate degrees for supervisors.

![Figure 4.6. Most common known degrees for supervisors.](image)

**Note.** Undergraduate degree \(n = 32\). Graduate degree \(n = 55\).

Supervisors had a range of experience in forensic interviewing. While not all respondents knew their supervisors’ experience in forensic interviewing \((n = 84)\), the following information was reported. Slightly more than a quarter of respondents \((28\%)\) indicated their supervisors had no training in forensic interviewing. Respondents reported that 18\% of supervisors were trained in forensic interviewing but had never conducted interviews. Sixteen
percent of respondents indicated that their supervisors previously conducted forensic interviews, but did not at the time of the survey; while 22% reported that their supervisors conducted forensic interviews at the time of the survey. See Figure 4.7 for supervisor’s experience in forensic interviewing.

![Figure 4.7. Supervisors’ experience in forensic interviewing (%).](image)

Note. $n = 84$.

A quarter (26%) of respondents were also in supervisory positions at the time of the survey. Respondents supervised up to 24 people, including those other than forensic interviewers, with an average of 4.26 supervisees. Respondents supervised an average of 2.36 forensic interviewers, with the maximum reported to be 11 forensic interviewer supervisees.

**Other Roles and Responsibilities**

In addition to conducting forensic interviews, 74% of respondents held a host of other roles at their organizations. Among those with multiple roles ($n = 110$), the most commonly held other position among respondents was detective/investigator (42%). Seventeen percent of respondents were also the CAC program directors or coordinators. Just over ten percent also served as therapists (11%). Less than ten percents were also victim advocates (9%) or executive
directors (8%). Respondents who were also child protective services workers served as ongoing (8%) and intake caseworkers (7%). Other roles of respondents included case coordinators, assistant directors, supervisors, fundraising/grants, management, MDT liaisons, advocates, group workers, and nurses. See Table 4.11 for other roles respondents held at their organizations.

Table 4.11

*Top Five Other Roles Respondents Hold at their Organization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Role</th>
<th>Respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detective/Investigator</td>
<td>46 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director or Coordinator</td>
<td>15 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist</td>
<td>12 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim Advocate</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPS Ongoing Caseworker</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents spent their time in various job related duties. On average, conducting forensic interviews took up the greatest percentage (33%) of respondents’ time. Paperwork and computer work took up an average of 17% of respondents’ time. Other duties related to forensic interviewing, such as writing reports, staffing cases, and attending MDT meetings took up an average of 16% of respondents’ time. Respondents also spent time providing supervision (7%), community-related activities (4%), court-related responsibilities (3%), and management duties (3%). Other responsibilities (10%) included child protection services and law enforcement investigations, group work, fundraising, grant writing, and organizational support. See Figure 4.8 for an average of respondents’ time. Respondents worked an average of 39 hours per week with a range from three to 70 hours per week.
Only 19 respondents (13%) stated that they conducted forensic interviews in languages other than English. Of those who conducted forensic interviews in other languages, all but one interviewed in Spanish, with the remaining one conducting interviews in Portuguese. This was surprising given that the sample population were located in cities of high immigrant concentration, such as New York, Boston, and Hartford. New York had the most respondents conducting bi-lingual interviews ($n = 6$). There were five bi-lingual interviewers in New Jersey and four in Connecticut; two in Massachusetts and one each in Pennsylvania and Vermont.

A majority of respondents (89%) conducted forensic interviews on-site at the CACs. A third (32%) of respondents conducted interviews at other locations. The total percentage added up to more than 100% because respondents may conduct interviews both on-site and off-site. Common off-site locations included law enforcement offices, schools, prosecutors' offices, hospitals, satellite CAC locations, and at homes or group homes. Respondents indicated that the location of the forensic interview was often based on the needs of the child.
Job Satisfaction

A vast majority (88%) of respondents positively responded to being satisfied with their work as forensic interviewers. An independent-samples t-test found a statistically significant difference in job satisfaction between those who stated they were satisfied with their work as forensic interviewers ($M = 18.32, SD = 2.86$) and those who stated they were not satisfied ($M = 15, SD = 5.76$); $t(18) = -2.4, p < .001$. Those who stated they were satisfied with their work as forensic interviewers reported significantly higher job satisfaction, as measured by the Job Satisfaction Subscale (JSS) ($p < .05$). The results of the t-test for this global item confirmed the correct construct of job satisfaction was being assessed. See Table 4.12 for group statistics for the job satisfaction global item and independent-samples t-test.

Table 4.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am satisfied with my work as a forensic interviewer</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>18.32 (2.86)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.00 (5.76)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * $p < .05$.

An independent-samples t-test found a statistically significant difference in job satisfaction between those who took personal days off when emotionally affected by forensic interviews ($M = 19.22, SD = 1.53$) and those who did not take days off ($M = 17.62, SD = 3.74$); $t(102) = -3.57, p = .001$. Those who indicated that they took days off when emotionally affected experienced higher job satisfaction, as measured by the JSS.

An independent-samples t-test found a statistically significant difference in job satisfaction between those who conducted forensic interviews off-site ($M = 16.50, SD = 4.7$) and
those who did not conduct forensic interviews off-site ($M = 18.59, SD = 2.5$); $t(60) = 2.89, p = .005$. Those who indicated that they did not conduct forensic interviews off-site experienced higher job satisfaction, as measured by the JSS.

An independent-samples t-test found a statistically significant difference in job satisfaction between those whose highest degree was in social work ($M = 18.63, SD = 2.4$) and those whose highest degree was in another field of study ($M = 17.56, SD = 3.9$); $t(137) = -2.06, p = .041$. Those who indicated that their highest degree was in social work experienced higher job satisfaction, as measured by the JSS.

A one-way between subjects Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test supported statistically significant differences in the level of mean job satisfaction for MDT support [$F(3, 144) = 6.01, p = .001$]). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated the mean score for the disagree group ($M = 15.64, SD = 5.38$) was significantly different than the agree ($M = 18.15, SD = 2.91$) and strongly agree ($M = 19.46, SD = 1.56$) groups. Those who felt supported by the MDT they work with most frequently had higher job satisfaction as measured by the JSS.

**Burnout**

Almost a third (29%) of respondents self-reported that they were experiencing burnout as a result of their work as forensic interviewers. An independent-samples t-test found a statistically significant difference in burnout between those who reported they were burned out with their work as forensic interviewers ($M = 41.4, SD = 5.93$) and those who reported they were not burned out ($M = 33.79, SD = 5.25$); $t(146) = -7.69, p < .001$. Those who reported they were burned out with their work as forensic interviewers experienced significantly higher burnout, as measured by the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI). The t-test finding for this global item
confirmed the correct construct of burnout was being assessed. See Table 4.13 for group statistics for the burnout global item independent-samples t-test.

Table 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Burnout Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD) (n = 148)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| As a result of my work as a forensic interviewer, I am experiencing burnout | Yes 41.40 (5.93)** | No 33.80 (5.25)**

Note. ** p < .001.

Independent-samples t-tests found differences in burnout between those who received certain benefits through their employers. A statistically significant difference was found between those who received health insurance (M = 36.85, SD = 6.03) and those who did not receive health insurance through their employer (M = 32.51, SD = 7.03); t(146) = -3.07, p = .001. Forensic interviewers who received health insurance through their employer experienced significantly higher burnout, as measured by the OLBI. A statistically significant difference was found between those who received paid time off (M = 36.81, SD = 5.93) and those who did not get paid time off through their employer (M = 31.15, SD = 7.42); t(24) = -3.32, p < .003). Forensic interviewers who received paid time off through their employers experienced significantly higher burnout, as measured by the OLBI.

An independent-samples t-test found a statistically significant difference in burnout between those who held multiple roles (M = 37.10, SD = 6.24) and those who did not hold multiple roles at their organization (M = 34.03, SD = 6.39); t(146) = -2.85, p < .01. Those who indicated that they held multiple roles at their organization experienced significantly higher burnout, as measured by the OLBI.
A one-way between subjects ANOVA test found statistically significant differences in the mean level of burnout for MDT satisfaction \([F(2, 144) = 6.68, p = .002]\). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated the mean score for the strongly agree group \((M = 32.84, SD = 5.96)\) was significantly different than the disagree \((M = 38.13, SD = 7.15)\) and strongly disagree \((M = 36.95, SD = 6.05)\) groups. Those who reported satisfaction with the MDT they worked with most frequently had lower burnout as measured by the OLBI.

A one-way between subjects ANOVA test supported statistically significant differences in the mean level of burnout for MDT support \([F(3, 144) = 4.13, p = .008]\). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated the mean score for the disagree group \((M = 39.04, SD = 7.02)\) was significantly different than the strongly agree group \((M = 32.8, SD = 6.9)\). Those who felt supported by the MDT they worked with most frequently had lower burnout as measured by the OLBI.

A one-way between subjects ANOVA test found statistically significant differences in the level of mean burnout for MDT stress \([F(3, 144) = 4.47, p = .005]\). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test found significant differences existed between the strongly disagree response group \((M = 31.99, SD = 7.42)\) and all of the other response groups, with the greatest difference noted with the strongly agree group \((M = 40.33, SD = 6.15)\). Those who felt the MDT they worked with most frequently caused them stress had higher burnout as measured by the OLBI.

**Findings Related to Hypotheses**

**Findings Related to Hypothesis 1**

H1: Forensic interviewers who report higher job demands will report higher levels of burnout.
To test hypothesis 1, a multiple linear regression was used to predict the value of burnout given the value of job demands (using the four factors composites of court-based dissemination demands, opinion-based dissemination demands, expert-based dissemination demands, and supervisory demands). Assumptions for multiple regression were satisfied. Statistical significance was not found in the regression model, therefore, the hypothesis was not supported \((F = .575, \text{n.s.})\). When controlling for age, gender, children under the age of 18 years old, and tenure as forensic interviewer, at current CAC, and in child welfare field, no significant relationships were found. Post-hoc simple linear regression models for each of the four factors individually also produced non-significant findings.

**Findings Related to Hypothesis 2**

H2: Forensic interviewers who report higher job demands will report higher job satisfaction.

A multiple linear regression was used to predict the value of job satisfaction given the value of job demands to test hypothesis 2. Assumptions for multiple regression were satisfied. Statistical significance was not found in the regression model, therefore, the hypothesis was not supported \((F = 1.08, \text{n.s.})\). When controlling for age, gender, children, and the three questions related to tenure, no significant relationships were found. Post-hoc simple linear regression models for each of the four factors individually also produced non-significant findings.

**Findings Related to Hypothesis 3**

H3: Forensic interviewers who report higher job satisfaction will report lower levels of burnout.

To test hypothesis 3, a linear regression was used to predict the value of burnout given the value of job satisfaction. Assumptions for simple regression were satisfied and the null hypothesis was rejected. Job satisfaction significantly predicted burnout scores, \(\beta = -1.28, t(135) = -11.61, p < .001\). Job satisfaction also explained a significant proportion of variance in OLBI
scores, $R^2 = .48$, $F (1, 146) = 134$. Hypothesis 3, forensic interviewers who reported higher job satisfaction reported lower levels of burnout, was supported with 48% of variance in burnout explained by job satisfaction. When controlling for age, gender, children, and the three tenure questions, no additional significant relationships were found.

A post-hoc independent-samples t-test also found a statistically significant difference in job satisfaction between those who self-reported they were experiencing burnout and those who did not self-report burnout, $t(146) = 5.25$, $p < .001$. Those who stated they were not experiencing burnout as result of their work as forensic interviewers had higher job satisfaction as measured by the JSS. See Table 4.14 for group statistics for burnout, self-reported job satisfaction, and independent-samples t-test.

Table 4.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction Subscale</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>15.74 (4.56)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of my work as a forensic interviewer, I am</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.80 (2.47)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiencing burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** $p < .001$.

Findings Related to Hypothesis 4

H4: The relationship between job demands and burnout is mediated by job satisfaction.

To test hypothesis 4, a simple mediation model was used to test for the presence of a mediator. From the mediation analysis using ordinary least squares path analysis, there was no support to suggest that job satisfaction indirectly influenced the relationship between job demands and burnout. A bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval for the indirect effect ($ab = -0.073$) based on 1,000 bootstrap samples included zero (-0.220 to 0.047), therefore, the
hypothesis was not supported. See Table 4.15 for model coefficients and Figure 4.9 for the simple mediation model.

Table 4.15

Model Coefficients for the Mediated Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Consequent</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X (Job Demands)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>c'</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (Job Satisfaction)</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>-1.293</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>i₁</td>
<td>17.399</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>i₂</td>
<td>59.391</td>
<td>2.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = 0.0137 \]
\[ F(1, 142) = 1.833, p = .178 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.482 \]
\[ F(2, 141) = 65.495, p = < .001 \]

Note. \( n = 144 \). Values represent selected output provided by the Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro.

Figure 4.9. Simple mediation model in statistical form.

Note. \( n = 144 \). Values represent selected output provided by the Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro.
Findings Related to Hypothesis 5

H5: Forensic interviewers who report more control will report higher levels of job satisfaction.

A linear regression was used to predict the value of job satisfaction given the value of control to test hypothesis 5. Assumptions for simple regression were satisfied and the null hypothesis was rejected. Control significantly predicted job satisfaction scores, $\beta = .44$, $t(34) = 5.87$, $p < .001$. Control also explained a significant proportion of variance in JSS scores, $R^2 = .19$, $F(1, 146) = 34$. Hypothesis 5, forensic interviewers who reported more control reported higher levels of job satisfaction, was supported with 19% of variance in job satisfaction explained by control. When controlling for age, gender, children, and the three tenure questions, no additional significant relationships were found.

Findings Related to Hypothesis 6

H6: The relationship between job demands and job satisfaction is moderated by control.

To test hypothesis 6, an interaction test was applied to assess whether job demands’ effect on job satisfaction depended linearly on control. Using the Johnson-Neyman technique, there were no statistically significant transition points within the observed range of the moderator. Visual representation of the data also showed no interaction point. See Figure 4.10 for estimates of job satisfaction for various combinations on job demands and control. Results did not suggest that the effects of job demands were moderated by control; therefore, the hypothesis was not supported.
Figure 4.10. Visual representation of estimates of job satisfaction for various combinations on job demands and control.

Note. $n = 148$. No interaction observed. Values represent selected output provided by the Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro.

Findings Related to Hypothesis 7

H7: Forensic interviewers who report higher levels of support will report lower levels of burnout.

A multiple linear regression was used to predict the value of burnout given the value of support (using the social and external support subscales and indirect support factor composite) to test hypothesis 7. Upon examination of the correlation matrix, a weak correlation ($r = .008$, n.s.) was noted between burnout and indirect organizational support (Factor 4), therefore indirect organizational support was removed from the model post-hoc. Using social and external job support as the independent variables, assumptions for multiple regression were satisfied and the null hypothesis was rejected. Support significantly predicted burnout scores, $\beta = -.41, t(34) = -3.83, p < .001$. Support also explained a significant proportion of variance in OLBI scores, $R^2 = .32, F (1, 143) = 34$. Hypothesis 7, forensic interviewers who report higher levels of support
report lower levels of burnout, was supported with 32% of variance in burnout explained by social and external support. When controlling for age, gender, children, and the three tenure questions, no additional significant relationships were found.

**Findings Related to Hypothesis 8**

H8: The relationship between job satisfaction and burnout is moderated by support.

To test hypothesis 8, an interaction test was applied to assess whether job satisfaction’s effect on burnout depended linearly on support. Using the Johnson-Neyman technique, there were no statistically significant transition points within the observed range of the moderator. Visual representation of the data also showed no interaction point. See Figure 4.11 for estimates of burnout for various combinations on job satisfaction and support. Results did not suggest that the effects of job satisfaction were moderated by support; therefore, the hypothesis was not supported.
Findings Related to Moderated Mediation Model

The moderated mediation model was tested to identify multiple pathways through which the independent variables affected the dependent variables (Hayes, 2013). The first and second stage moderation model used a series of multiple regression models to test if job demands’ effect on job satisfaction was moderated by control and job satisfaction’s effect on burnout was moderated by support. The conditional indirect effects were tested to examine if job demands on burnout was mediated by job satisfaction at each level of the two moderators, control and support. After estimating the coefficients in the statistical model, the interaction between job demands and control was found not to be statistically significant and the interaction between job satisfaction and support was found not to be statistically significant. A bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval for the conditional indirect effect based on 10,000 bootstrap samples.
included zero (-0.463 to 0.188). See Table 4.16 for model coefficients, Figures 4.12 and 4.13 for the indirect and direct effects of control and support, and Figure 4.14 for the statistical diagram of the moderated mediated model. Therefore, results did not suggest the existence of moderated mediation occurring as the model was proposed.

Table 4.16

*Model Coefficients for the Moderated Mediated Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$W$</th>
<th>$V$</th>
<th>$\omega = (a_1 + a_3W)b$</th>
<th>95% Bias-Corrected Bootstrap CI</th>
<th>$\Theta_{x\rightarrow y} = c_1' + c_3'W$</th>
<th>$se_{\Theta_{x\rightarrow y}}$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>-0.339 to 0.099</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-0.297 to 0.078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>-0.211 to 0.066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>56.63</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.181 to 0.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.198 to 0.188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $n = 146$. Bootstrap $N = 10,000$. Control ($W$) and Support ($V$) are reported at the 10th, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 90th percentiles. Values represent selected output provided by the Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro.
Figure 4.12. Visual representation of the conditional indirect and direct effects of burnout as a function of control (W).

Note. $n = 146$. Values represent selected output provided by the Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro.
Figure 4.13. Visual representation of the conditional indirect and direct effects of burnout as a function of support (V).

Note. $n = 146$. Values represent selected output provided by the Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro.
Figure 4.14. Moderated mediation model in statistical form.

Note. *n* = 146. Values represent selected output provided by the Hayes (2013) PROCESS macro.

**Open-Ended Question**

As a final question, respondents were asked to provide any additional thoughts about their experience as forensic interviewers, in regard to engagement, satisfaction, or burnout. The responses to this open-ended question provided great detail and important insight. A content analysis of the 70 qualitative responses resulted in a list of themes. Responses were coded into two broad thematic categories related to burnout and job satisfaction. Subcategories within each theme were then further defined.

**Burnout Theme**

Responses to the open-ended question suggested that respondents were aware of the potential for burnout due to the demands of being forensic interviewers. As one respondent
stated, “I know that if I remain in this unit burnout is an inevitable consequence” (33).

Respondents expressed experiencing burnout at the time of the survey or having experienced burnout in the past. Even those who did not acknowledge any personal experience with burnout stated they could understand why forensic interviewers experienced burnout. Respondents also identified feelings of anxiety and stress and changes in themselves as result of the work.

The qualitative responses indicated that burnout was due to a variety of causes. Most frequently cited was a lack of supervision or supervisors’ lack of understanding of the forensic interview position. Lack of support or isolation within the organization was also discussed, especially among those who are the only forensic interviewer in their organizations. One respondent stated,

I do work alone. I am the only forensic interviewer and have no supervisor other than the agency director. Although she is concerned about me and my work, she is so busy and preoccupied with the rest of the programs that I sometimes feel neglect (45).

General demands associated with being a forensic interviewer were also causes of burnout. The number of interviews expected to be conducted in one week was cited in regard to feeling burned out at different times. One respondent stated, “conducting more than two interviews in a day really drains me” (12). Respondents also related burnout to specific types of child abuse, poor training, and a lack of acknowledgement of burnout among supervisors.

A few respondents acknowledged they might be in need of a break from forensic interviewing to address burnout while others specifically stated their intent to leave the position. One respondent stated, “I am currently in the process of rectifying this and hopefully will not be here much longer” (69). Respondents suggested possible time limits to being a forensic interviewer and part-time work as ways to address the demands of the job.
**Burnout not related to forensic interviewing.** Written responses suggested that burnout is also related to other aspects of their work. The reality of working in a “broken” system was frequently cited as a cause of burnout. One respondent stated,

Then there’s the legal system that just doesn’t work, especially with the younger victims, honestly, the system gives too many rights to the perpetrators. You give your all and then some only to hear there isn’t enough to make the criminal charges stick, or worse yet, the District Attorney’s Office offers a plea bargain for a much lesser charge to avoid a trial (25).

Respondents were also aware of the realities of the world. One respondent described, “Over the last 15 years of being a police officer/detective I have experienced periods of burnout. Not just from child abuse, but also from witnessing society’s under belly ALL the time” (26).

Lack of respect by administrators, co-workers, and the MDTs was cited as a common cause of burnout. One respondent illustrated this point, “I feel like my position as an interviewer is not valued, respected, and often misunderstood by some CAC staff as well as my own employer” (20). This quote also reflected what some respondents cited as burnout due to working within large umbrella organizations, where the CAC is just one of a number of programs. One respondent related this to the need to advocate on behalf of the needs of forensic interviewers. Other respondents cited investigative protocols not being followed as a cause of burnout. Respondents also related burnout to their salary, commute, the turnover of other workers, and working at small organizations.

**Burnout due to other roles.** Responses also suggested that burnout is due to holding dual roles within the organization. One respondent who was also a child protective services worker summed up this sentiment,
When the forensic interviewer role is paired with that of the CPS worker the risk for burnout is extremely high. I have worked both a dual role and the role of just the forensic interviewer and the differences in burnout and stress is astronomical. I feel this is likely due to attempting to gain authentic information from the child all the while posing a threat to the child and family. As a result, you are constantly faced with the decision of which role to play, at which point, and when (if at all) they can be combined for the best possible outcome. This creates a personal and professional type of stress that almost always leads to burnout in some form (22).

Burnout related to holding dual roles in law enforcement or administrative capacities was cited by respondents, as well as serving in the roles of MDT coordinator and mental health clinician.

**Preventing burnout.** Respondents provided insight on ways to actively prevent, or at least address, burnout. Respondents used terms such as "balance" and "creativity" in the ability to work through the emotional demands of the work. The importance of self-care was cited by a number of respondents who suggested that self-care is a personal responsibility; as one respondent stated, “we have to be responsible for checking in with ourselves” (8). Yet, the organization must also play an active role in promoting self-care. As one respondent stated, “My director is extremely health conscious (physically and emotionally) and we take self-care very seriously” (40). Maintaining interests separate from work, such as hobbies and exercise, was a way respondents cared for themselves. Respondents suggested that taking time off and vacations were also ways to actively address burnout.

Having a solid support system was frequently cited as an important resource for self-care. Most frequently, respondents specifically mentioned support from family members. One respondent stated, “The moment I am with [my children] I feel rejuvenated and energized. I
don’t take my work home with me and it’s easy to immediately focus my attention on them” (49).

Satisfaction Theme

Despite the potential for burnout, responses to the open-ended question suggested that respondents were satisfied with their work as forensic interviewers. Respondents used words such as “happy” and “enjoy” when describing their work. A number of respondents began the open-ended response by stating “I love my work as a forensic interviewer,” some emphasizing the word love in capital letters. Respondents described a passion and belief in the work, recognizing the importance and necessity of forensic interviewers in child abuse investigations.

Rewards. Respondents described their work as rewarding. As one respondent stated, “The work definitely can become difficult. However, the rewards far outweigh the frustrations” (9). One of the most frequently cited rewards of the position was the ability to help children. One respondent summed up this sentiment, “But even with these frustrating challenges, I am grateful every day that I get to meet the brave children I interview” (70). Some respondents even cited the challenges of the position as a reward. One respondent stated, “I am continually engaged and challenged in a positive way conducting forensic interviews” (44).

Another reward is the ability to hold offenders accountable. This was often cited as a reward among those who are also law enforcement officers. One respondent stated,

The satisfaction one gets from successful outcomes in the cases we deal with also keeps you engaged and keeps burnout from creeping in. Success breeds satisfaction, a job well done (and a little recognition) goes a long way to keep your head together (27).

In this area, law enforcement may have an advantage over other forensic interviewers. As one respondent illustrated, “I think as law enforcement we have a distinct advantage because we can
see a wrong and do something. We interview the child and if necessary we make an arrest. It is rewarding to know you can help a child” (58).

Respondents also described feeling effective and confident in their role as forensic interviewers. This contributed to the reward of being respected and supported by the MDT and other professionals within the field. One respondent illustrated this stating, “Most of our MDT members recognize forensic interviewing as a profession and me as a professional” (3).

**Supportive work environment.** Respondents cited the importance of having a supportive work environment as a contributor to satisfaction. The support came from supervisors and coworkers, as one respondent suggested,

The current office I work in is a highly supportive environment. Although we have continued to experience high turnover (and currently have two open investigative positions) the support from our supervisor and the relationships among the investigative team is necessary to do the work. We take care of each other, offer support and feedback and work together to get the job done. Without this support and the relational dynamics of our team, I’m not sure that I would be in the same place and would likely be experiencing significant burnout and stress (4).

Those in supervisory positions also recognized the role they play in addressing burnout. As one respondent stated, “Being an interviewer that has turned supervisor has allowed me to see when my interviewers need a break and to allow them opportunities to deal with their own burnout” (1).

In addition to support from people, respondents also cited organizational support as important. Respondents mentioned specific benefits, especially flexibility, as examples of
organizational support. One respondent suggested, “I have a lot of support at work and also a lot of flexibility which is one of the reasons I have stayed here so long” (16).

Respondents related their satisfaction to diverse job responsibilities as well. One respondent stated, “I not only do [forensic interviews], but also interview and investigate the entire case. This helps burnout, due to the diversity of my duties” (26). Respondents in a position of teaching forensic interview skills cited this as a satisfying part of their position. One respondent illustrated this stating, “Teaching forensic interviewing practice keeps me fresh” (44).

**Summary**

This chapter provided the results from an electronic survey investigating organizational factors affecting burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers. A description of the sample provided a wealth of information about respondents and their organizations. Findings related to burnout and job satisfaction supported three of the proposed hypotheses. Themes from the open-ended question provided additional insight into burnout and satisfaction among respondents.
Chapter Five: Discussion and Implications

This chapter discusses the main findings from the analysis of the research question: What organizational factors are associated with burnout among forensic interviewers? This research contributes to a better understanding of forensic interviewers, creating a picture of who is doing this important work in addition to facilitating an understanding of the organizational factors that affect burnout and job satisfaction among this group of professionals. Suggestions are provided to increase job satisfaction and reduce burnout among forensic interviewers. While limitations are acknowledged, suggestions for future research will address such limitations and continue to build upon the results of this study. The chapter includes a discussion of: (a) forensic interviewers, (b) burnout and job satisfaction, (c) job demands-control (support) model, (d) qualitative themes, (e) policy and practice implications, (f) social work implications, (g) study limitations, and (i) future research.

Forensic Interviewers

Forensic interviewers in this study represent all nine states in the Northeast region, with a majority affiliated with National Children’s Alliance (NCA)-accredited Children’s Advocacy Centers (CAC); the remainder are affiliated with associate/developing members of NCA. Primarily middle-aged Caucasian females who hold a graduate degree, they are a homogenous group. While a third of forensic interviewers are employees of CACs, half are employees of law enforcement, prosecution, and child protective services agencies. Forensic interviewers have practiced in this specialized field for an average of five years, working with their current CAC for an average of four years, and in the child abuse/child welfare field for an average of nine years.
This study found only 13% of forensic interviewers conduct interviews in languages other than English. Considering that the research was conducted in the Northeast region of the United States, an area with cities populated with non-English speaking residents, concern is raised as to whether there is limited support in CACs for children and families who do not speak English. Investigation is necessary to answer the question as to why there are so few forensic interviewers conducting interviews in languages other than English in the Northeast region. The National Children's Advocacy Center (NCAC) previously offered training specific to conducting interviews in Spanish, but no upcoming trainings are listed on their website (www.nationalcac.org). A lack of training for interviewing in languages other than English is an issue that must be addressed. The limited number of bi-lingual interviewers also raises concern regarding the degree to which there is greater demand placed on forensic interviewers who conduct interviews in other languages. Further research is necessary to understand the experience of forensic interviewers expected to conduct interviews in multiple languages and the effect on burnout and job satisfaction.

As expected, allegations of sexual abuse are the primary focus of forensic interviews. The average number of interviews conducted being just under four per week was lower than expected. This seems like a reasonable number of interviews per week for employees who only function as forensic interviewers. An average of less than one interview per day allows time to process an interview and complete interview-related duties. For forensic interviewers who hold additional roles, such as law enforcement investigator or child protective services worker, having as many as four forensic interviewers per week in addition to other responsibilities related to a case is overwhelming (Atkinson-Tovar, 2002). Quantitative and qualitative findings in this study indicate that holding multiple roles within the organization is a contributor to burnout. Law
enforcement and public child welfare administrators, especially, should take this into consideration when assigning child abuse cases.

Most forensic interviewers testify in various courts as part of their responsibilities. Forensic interviewers provide a range of testimony on protocols used to conduct forensic interviews as well as the facts of a case. Yet, less than half of forensic interviewers are declared expert witnesses in their jurisdiction. This study found forensic interviewers are highly educated and well-trained in specific forensic interviewing techniques and the dynamics of child abuse. Not being declared an expert in court limits the value of forensic interviewers when their testimony is considered on the same level as a lay person, whereas an expert witness maintains higher regard. This limits the ability for forensic interviewers to provide testimony on research specific to forensic interviewing and the dynamics of abuse, important considerations for juries.

Findings indicate that all CACs still do not video record interviews. Forensic interviewers conducting non-recorded interviews are burdened with the additional stress of having to make note of specific details of children's disclosures, while at the same time maintaining a supportive focus on the children. This practice places too much confidence on notes and personal recollection of children’s statements during interviews. Forensic interviewers who have video recording will not experience as much work-related stress to recall all of the specific details or to rely strictly on notes – which may, in retrospect, fail to capture some important details. A video recording preserves children’s statements verbatim, allows interviewers to review cases in preparation for legal proceedings, and can be shown in court. Prosecutors who are afraid of “bad interviews” need more education on the benefits of using trained forensic interviewers. Research that compares case outcomes when video recording is used might shed light onto the benefits of utilizing this technology (Jones, Cross, Walsh, &
Simone, 2007). Resources should be put into educating MDT members, especially those with decision-making abilities in the judicial system, about the benefits of video recording and the expertise of forensic interviewers.

**Job Satisfaction and Burnout**

**Job Satisfaction**

This is the first study to investigate job satisfaction among forensic interviewers. Previous research investigated organizational satisfaction (Bonach & Heckert, 2012; Perron & Hiltz, 2006), which is conceptually different from job satisfaction. The quantitative and qualitative results of the current research show that forensic interviewers are satisfied with their work. The ability to take time off from work when emotionally affected by an interview, conducting interviews at the CAC, and Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) support are specific factors that contribute to job satisfaction.

When forensic interviewers are supported by the organization to take care of their emotional needs, they experience more job satisfaction. In fields such as forensic interviewing, workers are exposed to children’s personal stories of abuse. For even the most stoic person, such exposure will eventually have an impact. Significantly higher job satisfaction was found among forensic interviewers who take days off when emotionally affected by an interview. Being able to detach from work during days off has been shown to increase engagement on the job (Kuhnel, Sonnentag, & Westman, 2009). Giving forensic interviewers the ability to take time off to process through a particularly hard case benefits the worker and organization. This kind of relief reduces the likelihood that workers will seek other employment, as some participants indicated in the qualitative findings. Staff turnover is costly for organizations. Expanding this benefit even
to the extent of requiring forensic interviewers to take leave would result in cost savings for organizations.

Higher job satisfaction was found among forensic interviewers who only conduct forensic interviews on-site at the CAC. When conducting interviews at the CAC interviewers are familiar with the setting and equipment; there is comfort in knowing your surroundings and having control of the environment. When conducting interviews in the field, such as at schools, there are other factors to consider in regard to confidentiality, safety, and ability to record the interview. The additional burden of conducting interviews off-site limits satisfaction among forensic interviewers.

CAC are designed to enhance the response to child abuse by combining the wisdom and professional knowledge of various investigative agencies and other professionals. These coordinated efforts provide the knowledge, skills, and resources necessary to assist child abuse victims and their families (National Children’s Alliance [NCA], 2009). Forensic interviewers who report support from the MDT they work with most frequently also report higher job satisfaction. Forensic interviewers work closely with MDTs and in some instances may work more frequently with particular MDT members than coworkers within their organizations. Working with MDTs that bring together a range of skills for the benefit of abused children enhances one’s sense of professionalism and expertise both within the group and within the community. Therefore, it seems intuitive that feeling supported by the MDT will lead to job satisfaction as these are forensic interviewers’ peers.

**Burnout**

This research indicates that a significant proportion of forensic interviewers are experiencing burnout, as indicated by quantitative and qualitative findings. The
acknowledgement of the possibility or actual experience of burnout suggests forensic interviewers are aware of this potential ramification of the position. Full-time employment, serving in multiple job capacities, and MDT relationships are specific factors associated with burnout.

Forensic interviewers who receive health insurance and paid time off through their employers experience burnout. While this finding does not indicate that health insurance and paid time off are causes of burnout, it may be indicative of the difference in burnout between full-time employees, who typically receive health insurance and paid time off through their employers, and part-time or contract employees, who typically do not receive such benefits. Full-time forensic interviewers conduct more forensic interviews and workers who hold multiple roles within organizations have more job responsibilities which may in turn lead to more burnout. Such findings suggest that further research may be productive in specifying the precise nature of the relationship between these variables.

The relationships between the interviewers and the MDTs with which they work most frequently also impact burnout. Forensic interviewers who report a lack of support and satisfaction, as well as, stress from the MDTs they work with most frequently experience burnout. These findings indicate the relationships between forensic interviewers and MDT members are an important factor in the development of burnout. Historical turf issues, egos, and interpersonal conflicts may contribute to limited supportive relationships among members (Newman, Dannenfelser, & Pendleton, 2005). Steps should be taken to develop MDTs as functional teams that work to support each other in addition to abused children. These steps may involve trainings specific to the functions of MDT agencies and child abuse protocols, invitations to attend events of partner agencies, and informal gatherings such as meals together.
Job Demands-Control (Support) Model

The job demands-control (support) (JDC(S)) model provides the theoretical framework for this study. The JDC(S) model posits that demands placed on an employee and how much control is given to meet such demands have an effect on the individual (Karasek, 1979), with support moderating high demands and lack of control (Van Der Doef & Maes, 1999). The current study indicates forensic interviewers enjoy learning, developing skills, and benefit from social support, common characteristics of workers in active jobs; that is jobs with high demand and control. Support was found for the JDC(S) model’s notion that control and support, without accounting for job demands, can reduce work-related stress.

The proposed moderated mediation model with eight hypotheses was theoretically driven with three of the hypotheses supported. Two independent variables were hypothesized to be related to job satisfaction: job demands and control. Three independent variables were hypothesized to be associated with burnout: job demands, job satisfaction, and support. Job satisfaction was hypothesized to mediate the relationship between job demands and burnout. Control was hypothesized to moderate the relationship between job demands and job satisfaction, while support was hypothesized to moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and burnout. Briefly, control has a positive relationship with job satisfaction. Having a flexible schedule and developing skills in supervision and training junior forensic interviewers are ways to provide interviewers with control. Job satisfaction and support both have inverse relationships with burnout. Flexibility, in addition to relationships with supervisors and coworkers, are suggested as ways organizations provide a supportive work environment. This study supports the effect of control and support in relation to job satisfaction and burnout.
Job satisfaction and burnout are linked to job demands and decision latitude (control). Satisfaction is highest in jobs with high demand and control; while exhaustion, a measure of burnout, is related to high demands (Karasek, 1979). As suggested by the JDC(S) model, the findings in this study indicate that forensic interviewers who reported more control have higher levels of job satisfaction. This study did not produce any statistically significant findings to suggest that forensic interviewers who report higher job demands have higher levels of job satisfaction or burnout. Given that none of the hypotheses with job demands as the independent variable, nor the overall moderated mediation model produced significant results, the way job demands were measured may not have been valid. Variance with the job demands items, an indication that respondents interpreted items differently, may have been an issue as 12 of the 34 items did not load on any job demands factors.

Job satisfaction is negatively related to burnout (Federici & Skaalvik, 2012; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2008) and can buffer occupational stress (van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek, & Frings-Dresen, 2003). The findings in this study support prior research as forensic interviewers who report higher job satisfaction have lower levels of burnout. Also in line with the JDC(S) model, statistical significance indicates that forensic interviewers who report higher levels of support have lower levels of burnout. Support, both within and outside the workplace, reduces levels of burnout. This makes administrative attention to issues of job support and satisfaction very salient. When satisfaction declines, burnout is likely to follow. When burnout is present, forensic interviewers are likely to become less effective, or worse, to leave their positions. Worker turnover, and the associated costs, justifies serious attention and it would be worthwhile for administrators and supervisors of forensic interviewers to identify ways to reduce worker turnover.
This study, guided by the JDC(S) model, highlights the importance of organizational factors in promoting job satisfaction and buffering burnout. Forensic interviewers with more control are more satisfied; increased job satisfaction and support can reduce the potential for burnout. CAC administrators can actively work towards promoting job satisfaction as a way to encourage a stable workforce.

**Qualitative Findings**

The qualitative data provides additional insight into burnout and satisfaction among forensic interviewers, in many instances supporting the quantitative findings. Considering the length of the survey, the wealth of rich responses to the final open-ended question was unexpected.

Forensic interviewers acknowledge the potential for burnout associated with their positions. Lack of support from supervisors is a common cause of burnout, supporting the inverse relationship of support and burnout found in the quantitative findings. Forensic interviewers recognize that no matter how well they do their job, sometimes the “system” fails abused children. Such a reality impacts feelings of burnout as do other job-related responsibilities. Holding dual roles as forensic interviewer and child protective services worker is also a contributor to burnout, whereas being a law enforcement officer in addition to forensic interviewer seems more empowering. Forensic interviewers acknowledge the need to actively work towards the prevention of burnout in terms of positive self-care.

In spite of the potential for burnout, forensic interviewers overwhelmingly report satisfaction with their role. Forensic interviewers cite the many intrinsic rewards they receive as part of their job and find satisfaction in knowing they have the ability to help children and hold offenders accountable. Forensic interviewers believe in the work and how such a position
benefits abused children. Forensic interviewers deserve the respect that the position demands so they can continue to do this important work. CAC administrators play an integral role in facilitating such support from within and outside the workplace.

Forensic interviewers provide a valuable service to abused children, MDT members, and the public. The position provides both satisfaction and the potential for burnout. The richness of the qualitative responses suggest that forensic interviewers are deeply committed to their work and are willing to provide more detailed answers than what can be gathered through quantitative methods.

**Policy and Practice Implications**

The suggested policy and practice implications will enhance organizational support, increase job satisfaction, and reduce burnout which will in turn lead to a stronger workforce. Such implications impact children – and in the largest sense, society as a whole – as forensic interviewers will be more effective. Providing forensic interviewers with control and support are areas where CAC administrators must be mindful when considering the forensic interviewer position.

**Control**

Findings in this study indicate that the more control forensic interviewers have the higher their job satisfaction. Training and decision-making are important areas for CAC administrators to consider. Forensic interviewers need the ability to develop their skills, be creative, and have a variety of things to do on the job. As the people with the most direct experience in the actual conduct of the work, they should be empowered to “speak truth to power” in making recommendations to supervisors about things that may improve the quality of the work. In turn, such control will lead to being more satisfied with the job.
As discussed previously, a majority of forensic interviewers in the Northeast region are trained in NCAC models of forensic interviewing. While the findings do not specify that NCAC models in particular lead to higher job satisfaction, NCAC is a well-respected leader in the field of forensic interviewing. Forensic interviewers trained in best practices are more confident in their abilities and in turn are more satisfied with the job.

Organizational policies and resources related to ongoing training are necessary for forensic interviewers to maintain the high level of skill required for the position. During times of fiscal conservancy, travel budgets related to training are often cut. This has been exacerbated in recent years by the current economic crisis which has resulted in a decrease in social service funding (Gais, 2009). Policies should be put into place to make resources consistently available for forensic interviewers to attend advanced training. Training grants, such as the one offered through the NCA, can help alleviate the financial burden associated with training.

Forensic interviewers need the authority to make decisions related to their work without fear of repercussion from CAC administrators or MDT members. No two cases will ever be the same; therefore, forensic interviewers need the ability to do the work in the best way they know how. The issues related to training discussed above support this logic. Forensic interviewers should be given the ability to use their judgment and expertise during interviews to make modifications in the best interest of the child. Forensic interviewers should be in control of the interview process including the length of the interview and the questions asked, with input from the MDT. This may require conducting an interview at a slower or quicker pace or modifying the typical interview procedure in order to accommodate the needs of the child. Recognizing that each jurisdiction has specific procedures agreed upon by the MDT, the forensic interviewer should act within the limits of local child abuse investigation protocols. Because forensic
interviewers may be the only specially-trained interviewers in some organizations, the organizations and MDTs are reliant on their skills, but may not understand the interview process or specific techniques. Forensic interviewers’ skills and expertise should be respected in addition to their decision-making abilities. Supportive policies allow forensic interviewers to apply their specialized knowledge in an effort to best serve abused children.

Child abuse protocols should designate the use of CACs as the primary location to conduct forensic interviews, with the caveat that alternative locations be used when deemed necessary. Not only are forensic interviewers who exclusively conduct interviews on-site more satisfied with their job, but CACs are physically and socially designed specifically to meet the needs of abused children. CACs are set-up to be child-friendly from the waiting areas to the forensic interviewing rooms.

**Support**

Supervisor, coworker, and external job support were all found to reduce burnout in this study. Supervisors, coworkers, family and friends, clients, the public, and other professionals all play a key role in support for forensic interviewers.

**Supervisor support.** Supervision plays a significant role in support for forensic interviewers, as indicated by findings throughout the survey in quantitative and qualitative results. Therefore, the supportive nature of supervision is as important as having access to supervision. Supervisors must be aware of the potential perception of lack of support or isolation especially when there is only one forensic interviewer in the organization. While this study did not look specifically at the amount of supervision forensic interviewers receive, Barth, Lloyd, Christ, Chapman, and Dickinson (2008) suggest a minimum of two hours of supportive supervision per week in the child welfare field, especially in urban settings. Regularly scheduled
supportive supervision portrays respect and value within the organization. The use of reflective supervision is gaining support as an avenue to prevent burnout in the child welfare field (Lietz, 2010; Osofsky, 2009). Supervisors should take time to discuss how the position is emotionally affecting forensic interviewers. Supervisors should encourage forensic interviewers to take time off to process a particularly hard case if necessary. Kuhnel, Sonnentag, and Westman (2009) suggest short respites, two to four days, from work encourage recovery and increase job engagement upon return to work. Other organizational support mechanisms can be put into place to prevent burnout, including regularly scheduled vacations, promotion of self-care through exercise and healthy eating, and education on recognizing and addressing feelings of burnout. Supervisors must play an active role in educating forensic interviewers about the potential for burnout and ways to lessen the emotional stressors of the job.

**Coworker support.** Coworker support is also beneficial for forensic interviewers in terms of reducing burnout. While CAC administrators cannot predict how co-workers will get along, they can provide a model for facilitating supportive relationships. Engaging workers in celebrations is a way to build relationships; informal celebrations can include personal recognitions, birthdays, and community holidays. Coworker support is especially important for forensic interviewers in isolated positions in rural communities or small organizations with few staff who have similar job responsibilities. Organizational policies and practices that promote collegial support will reduce burnout.

**External support.** External job support from family, friends, clients, the public, and other professionals also reduces burnout. While CAC administrators cannot control the support a forensic interviewer receives outside the organization, they can take steps to encourage support from the community. Forensic interviewers should be encouraged to maintain relationships with
family and friends. Given that half of the forensic interviewers in this study have children under the age of 18 years old, policies supportive of work-life balance are necessary. Providing family-supportive policies and benefits, such as flextime for appointments and events related to employees’ children and discount passes to family-oriented activities, are some examples of ways to encourage a healthy work-life balance.

Forensic interviewers provide a unique service to children and families when there are allegations of abuse. Unfortunately, when a family is in crisis, they may project their feelings of anger and frustration on to the forensic interviewer. CAC administrators should actively promote the forensic interviewer position among clients, the public, and with other professionals. Provide non-offending caregivers with information about what forensic interviewers do and how they care for children to help dispel any uncertainty about the role of the interviewer. Educate the public and other professionals about the service forensic interviewers provide and the benefits of utilizing the CAC model. Establish relationships with local news networks as a cost effective way to disseminate information through press releases and local programming (see Stevens, 2008 for an example). Public awareness about such benefits contributes to external job support for forensic interviewers which will lead to less burnout.

There are significant relationships between job satisfaction, burnout, and support, satisfaction, and stress related to MDTs. CACs often function as the hub of the MDTs, providing space to meet, in addition to being the central locale for interviews. Relationship-building among MDT members is a way to encourage supportive and satisfactory relationships while reducing stress and burnout. Training focused on the dynamics of team-building and conflict resolution in addition to strategies for case review may be a mechanism for team
development. CAC administrators and MDT facilitators must actively foster the relationships among MDT members as a way to increase support for forensic interviewers.

**Social Work Implications**

This research contributes to social work by investigating burnout and job satisfaction among a specific group of workers within the child welfare field, a field historically led by social workers. This study is the first to quantify the number of social workers practicing as forensic interviewers in the Northeast region; this is also the first known study to document that social workers supervise a substantial proportion of forensic interviewers. Given that social workers are practicing as forensic interviewers and hold supervisory positions, social workers affiliated with CACs are well-positioned to incorporate the findings of this study into practice to benefit forensic interviewers and the clients they serve. Beyond CACs, social workers can be found in many of the MDT-member organizations, frequently in administrative positions, where recommendations will benefit other professionals working with abused children. Increasing social workers’ knowledge about organizational factors that affect burnout and job satisfaction will reduce the incidence of burnout, creating a more stable workforce.

The discovery that social workers make up a large proportion of forensic interviewers and supervisors of forensic interviewers, more than any other fields of study, is exciting. In organizations staffed predominantly by social workers, administrators and front line workers have similar practice backgrounds and share professional values and perspectives. The finding that forensic interviewers whose highest degree is in social work are more satisfied begs for further investigation. Barth and associates (2008) suggest social workers have a commitment to the values of the profession and a greater understanding of the complexities of child abuse and child welfare policies as a result of their education. The current study's finding indicates that
social workers are using their skills and knowledge as forensic interviewers. Social workers are well-equipped to specialize in forensic interviewing as they possess many of the skills necessary to interview, represent, and advocate for the needs of abused children. Specific social work skills, such as problem-solving, empathy, and active listening, are key to the practice of forensic interviewing. In addition, the process of the forensic interview is similar to the social work interview already taught in schools of social work (Lau & Treacy, 2009; Maschi & Killian, 2009).

There are also implications for social work education with the most basic use of this research raising awareness among social work educators about the potential for their students to go into forensic interviewing as a specialty practice. More important though, is the integration of education on forensic interviewing, child advocacy centers, skills for interviewing, and awareness for burnout into social work curriculum, particularly in practice and child welfare courses. Social work students commonly intern in a variety of field settings that work with abused children. Having an increased understanding of forensic interviewing will increase their ability to advocate for and provide services to abused children.

Social workers are also ideal partners for CACs. Social workers can be brought in to provide staff training on self-care as a way to prevent burnout. Social workers can work with MDTs to facilitate team-building exercises and mediate conflicts. Schools of social work and social work conferences can offer continuing education on topics related to forensic interviewing techniques, dynamics of child abuse, professional self-care, and supervisory skills. Social workers are well-poised to influence the field of forensic interviewing in the areas of research and practice.
An aim of this research is to advance forensic interviewing as a quintessential social work field of practice. Social workers must take the lead in developing best practices to support forensic interviewers and reduce work-related stress through policy at multiple levels. This research will inform social work educators, practitioners, and researchers and promote discussion about forensic interviewing.

**Study Limitations**

The definition used for forensic interviewers may have been a limitation in this study. Forensic interviewers were defined as individuals identified as CAC employees, contractors, or other personnel affiliated with CACs who are authorized to conduct forensic interviews. A discrepancy arose when examining the number of interviewers identified for the sampling frame by CAC directors/coordinators and the number of forensic interviewers at the CACs with which they are affiliated as reported by respondents. The difference may be due to respondents counting all co-workers who are trained in forensic interviewing, while CAC directors/coordinators provided information for those currently conducting forensic interviews at the CACs. The CAC directors/coordinators may not be aware of all law enforcement and child protective services workers who do not conduct forensic interviews at the CACs but who have been trained to do so.

The question regarding the total number of MDTs in which respondents participate may have also caused some confusion. One respondent illustrated this point, “[It] was difficult to answer the question about "how many MDT's I work with." It's just one [District Attorney’s] office/CAC but 47 different towns and 3 different [Department of Children and Families] offices so it's always a different team” (35). Such a statement raises concern that others may have been confused over the best way to respond to the question. The purpose of MDTs is to facilitate
shared case decision-making and information dissemination among the various agencies investigating abuse allegations. MDTs are often structured based on the needs of the community and availability of resources. By not mandating one consistent MDT model, the hope is that each MDT will fit the needs of its community (Lalayants & Epstein, 2005). Further research is necessary to conceptualize the functions of MDTs versus investigative teams.

The Survey of Perceived Organizational Support was eliminated from analysis as a result of eight respondents skipping the entire scale. The questions specified “children’s advocacy center” in the wording which may not have been relevant for forensic interviewers employed by other organizations (64% of respondents). The survey measures how the employee views the organization’s value of their contribution and well-being (Baran, Shanock, & Miller, 2012; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). If forensic interviewers are not employees of CACs the scale may not have accurately assessed perceived organizational support.

There were also discrepancies noted in the indirect benefits question (#27). The question was presented as a matrix with one statement requiring the participant to indicate whether their employing organization “offered” and if they “participated” in eight indirect benefits. Discrepancies were noted when the number of those who “participated” in an indirect benefit was greater that the number of organizations “offering” the benefit.

Job demands in this study were conceptualized as unique expectations specific to the forensic interviewer position, such as report writing and testifying in court. While Van Der Doef and Maes (1999) suggested job specific demands could be beneficial when testing the JDC(S) model, none of the hypotheses with job demands produced significant results, suggesting that the way job demands were measured in this study may not be valid. Karasek’s (1979) conceptualization of job demands involves the psychological aspects of managing work
expectations. The Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ) contains a validated subscale used to measure job demands. Future research should include the JCQ job demands subscale as an alternative or validate a scale to measure the specific demands of forensic interviewers.

While four of the five hypotheses found to be non-significant included the job demands variable, three of the five found to be non-significant tested for the presence of a moderator or mediator. A smaller sample size can be a limitation when using higher level statistical models, such as when attempting to detect a mediation effect (Fritz & MacKinnon, 2007). Expansion of this research with larger samples will help alleviate this limitation.

This study was reliant on volunteer participants. The use of non-randomized sampling limits the ability to generalize findings to the entire population of forensic interviewers. Respondents were fairly homogenous, primarily middle-aged, highly educated, Caucasian females. There was limited representation from traditionally marginalized racial/ethnic groups and forensic interviewers who conduct interviews in languages other than English. Possible reasons for the lack of representation in the sample may be related to bi-lingual interviewers experiencing more job-related demands and persons from traditionally marginalized groups being mistrustful of research. Given the high response rate and assuming there are no major differences among those who participated in the survey and those who did not, it is reasonable to suggest the findings can be extrapolated to the population of forensic interviewers in the Northeastern region of the United States.

The findings are also limited in the generalizability beyond forensic interviewers associated with NCA-member CACs. It is likely that forensic interviewer and organizational characteristics of CACs in the Northeast not currently members of NCA are similar to those represented in this study as non-NCA member CACs are assumed to be working toward NCA
accreditation. CACs not currently members of NCA may find these results helpful in understanding burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers, especially given that this is the first study to specifically look at organizational factors.

**Future Research**

This study will contribute to the forensic interviewing, child welfare, and burnout literatures; yet there are additional areas for future inquiry to expand the empirical picture of burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers. This study was limited in its sampling frame of forensic interviewers in the Northeastern region of the United States. Future research should be expanded to other regional and national levels. Former forensic interviewers, who may have changed jobs due to burnout, as well as any interviewers at CACs not currently members of NCA were excluded from the study. As there is no known literature on such groups, these are also areas for future research.

The desire to know more about social workers who practice as forensic interviewers is predicated on the thought that social workers have the necessary education and skills that enable them to be qualified interviewers. This research establishes that social workers are doing the work; future research can investigate whether this assumption regarding education and skills is true. Future research can examine differences that exist between forensic interviewers trained in social work versus other disciplines. Specifically in relation to burnout, does social work education provide a buffer for the development of burnout? If so, what social work skills or education are necessary for the prevention of burnout? Potential differences may be related to social work education that focuses on self-care and reflection, required practicum experiences, and strengths in problem-solving, communication, and listening skills.
In addition, more research is necessary to understand what led social workers to forensic interviewing practice. Since forensic interviewing as a specialty practice is relatively new, understanding why social workers chose this field as opposed to other positions that work with abused children has implications for advising students. Research specifically related to the content of social work education that forensic interviewers find helpful in their position will help shape curriculum related to child welfare and social work practice. Research should also examine whether more exposure to the practice of forensic interviewing results in more social workers going into this field of practice.

The current research found a variety of fields of study in higher education among forensic interviewers. Social work was the most common field of study and a degree in social work seems appropriate for the necessary skills required for the position. It is unknown how many social work programs offer courses with forensic interviewing in the curriculum. More research in this area could enable social work to take the lead in forensic interview training and practice.

Continued research on forensic interviewers will expand the basis of the profession. Given the number of participants who provided responses to the open-ended question, qualitative methods seem to be an appropriate approach for future research. Yet, considering the high response rate obtained in this study, electronic surveying is also appropriate for this professional population. Building upon these results will contribute to further understanding of organizational factors affecting job satisfaction and burnout among forensic interviewers.

**Summary**

This chapter discussed the conclusions and implications drawn from the data collected for this study. Qualitative responses support quantitative findings to suggest that overall, forensic interviewers are satisfied with their work, but are prone to experience burnout. This study
contributes to the empirical understanding of organizational factors that impact burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers.

Conclusion

Forensic interviewers perform an important function in the child welfare and criminal justice systems. These professionals are exposed in varying degrees to detailed, graphic accounts of child maltreatment as narrated by children. Due to the nature of their work, forensic interviewers are experiencing burnout, yet feel a great deal of satisfaction in their work. This research contributes to the literature on burnout among forensic interviewers and addresses a specific gap in the literature by focusing on organizational factors. This study also begins a line of inquiry on job satisfaction among forensic interviewers.

The NCA and all CAC program directors/coordinators in the Northeast region of the United States will receive a summary report of the findings. Such dissemination addresses the concern of one participant who stated, “This survey, like all surveys, will be used by a few Professors sitting in an office attempting to get themselves a higher paid position” (43). Providing the NCA and CAC program directors/coordinators with an executive summary will be the most effective way to disseminate the information to direct practitioners in the forensic interviewing field. This will contribute to the implementation of the policy and practice recommendations. The research will also be submitted for presentation at national conferences and publication in social work journals. Dissemination through these avenues will raise awareness about organizational factors that affect burnout and job satisfaction among forensic interviewers throughout the social work and research communities. This will hopefully have an impact in social work education and research leading more social workers to practice and research in this field.
Child welfare is historically a field of practice dominated by social workers and forensic interviewing is a growing specialty. Therefore, social work must take the lead in understanding the various dimensions of this work, including burnout and job satisfaction. The results of this research not only illustrate who is doing this important work, but have implications for future research and social work practice focused on forensic interviewing and the professionals dedicated to helping abused children.

This dissertation began with my experience of burnout, which influenced my research focus. I can relate this to one respondent who summed up,

I was the forensic interviewer at this CAC years ago and left the job due to [burnout] symptoms. I have since returned and I am now the director. My goal is to create an environment that will not have the same outcome happen to my staff. I learned so much from my experiences and would not trade them for anything. My journey, however painful at times has made me a better supervisor/teacher/director/therapist (67).

My experience as a forensic interviewer who experienced burnout makes me a better researcher. My goal in conducting and disseminating this research is to help create a better work environment for forensic interviewers, which will in turn support forensic interviewers to provide the best services for abused children.
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Survey Instrument
As part of the University of Connecticut's School of Social Work Doctoral Program, I am researching the effects of burnout among forensic interviewers. Exhaustion and disengagement are key indicators of burnout. This study will evaluate what organizations are doing to assist forensic interviewers in dealing with the demands of the position and to prevent burnout. Thank you for your time in completing this survey. All responses will be kept confidential.

Please provide an average percentage of the types of abuse for which you conduct forensic interviews (percentages should total 100%):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Abuse</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse/Assault</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness to Crime (i.e. domestic violence, homicide, drug endangerment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Trafficking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pornography/Exposure to Pornography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listed below are statements that represent possible opinions that YOU may have about working at a children's advocacy center. Please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement that best represents your point of view about the children's advocacy center. Please choose from the following answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Slightly</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The children’s advocacy center values my contribution to its well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The children’s advocacy center fails to appreciate any extra effort from me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The children’s advocacy center would ignore any complaint from me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The children’s advocacy center really cares about my well-being.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if I did the best job possible, the children’s advocacy center would fail to notice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The children’s advocacy center cares about my general satisfaction at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The children’s advocacy center shows very little concern for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The children’s advocacy center takes pride in my accomplishments at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please answer the questions on a 4 point scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My job requires that I learn new things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job involves a lot of repetitive work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job requires me to be creative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job requires a high level of skill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get to do a variety of things on my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job allows me to make a lot of decisions on my own.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On my job, I am given a lot of freedom to decide how I do my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a lot to say about what happens on my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is concerned about the welfare of those under him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor pays attention to what I am saying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is helpful in getting the job done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is successful in getting people to work together.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People I work with are competent in doing their jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People I work with take a personal interest in me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People I work with are friendly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People I work with are helpful in getting the job done.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please choose the option that best reflects your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family members support the work I do.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends support the work I do.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My clients support the work I do.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The public supports the work I do.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professionals and agencies support the work I do.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please choose the one response for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All in all I am satisfied with my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I don't like my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I like working here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In what state do you conduct forensic interviews?

☐ Connecticut
☐ Maine
☐ Massachusetts
☐ New Hampshire
☐ New Jersey
☐ New York
☐ Pennsylvania
☐ Rhode Island
☐ Vermont
☐ Other (please specify):

Do you testify in court proceedings as part of your role as a forensic interviewer?

☐ Yes
☐ No

In what type of court do you testify? (please check all that apply):

☐ Criminal Court
☐ Child Protective Services Court
☐ Juvenile Court
☐ Other (please specify):

☐ Other (please specify):
When testifying in your role as a forensic interviewer, what type of testimony do you provide? (please check all that apply):

☐ Facts of the case
☐ Protocol used to conduct the interview
☐ Impression of the child
☐ Research on the dynamics of abuse
☐ Research on forensic interviewing
☐ Opinion about the likelihood of maltreatment
☐ Other (please specify):

When testifying in your role as a forensic interviewer, are you declared an expert witness in your jurisdiction?

☐ Yes
☐ No
What is the setting of the CAC where you conduct forensic interviews?

- Independent agency (a stand-alone organization, often classified as a private 501(c)3 not-for-profit social services agency)
- Hospital-based (functions as a program of a larger hospital organization)
- Operates under the organizational umbrella of a social service program
- Public social service operates under the organizational umbrella of a prosecutor's office
- Public social service operates under the organizational umbrella of a law enforcement agency
- Public social service operates under the organizational umbrella of child protective services
- Other (please specify):

- Unknown

Is the CAC you are associated with co-located (housed) in the same building as other Multi Disciplinary Team (MDT) members?

- Yes
- No

What MDT members are co-located with the CAC? (please select all that apply):

- Child Protective Services
- Law Enforcement
- Medical
- Mental Health
- Prosecutor
- Victim Advocacy
- Other (please specify):

What type of population does the CAC primarily serve? (please check all that apply):

- Urban
- Suburban
- Rural
What is the National Children's Alliance accreditation status of the CAC?

- Full Member
- Associate/ Developing Member
- Not a member of NCA
- Unknown

Please indicate the total number of individuals conducting forensic interviews at the CAC with which you are affiliated (including yourself):

_____

Does the CAC where you conduct interviews record forensic interviews on video?

- Yes
- No

Do you write a report after completing a forensic interview?

- Yes
- No

Please indicate the type of report you generate after a forensic interview (please check all that apply):

- 1-page fact sheet
- Multiple page summary
- Verbatim transcription
- Other (please specify):
  

Does the report include an opinion about the likelihood of maltreatment?

- Yes
- No
As a forensic interviewer, I am a:

- Employee of a Children's Advocacy Center
- Contracted Employee
- Employee of a Multi-Disciplinary Team agency - Police Department
- Employee of a Multi-Disciplinary Team agency - Child Protective Services
- Employee of a Multi-Disciplinary Team agency - Prosecution
- Other (please specify):

What benefits do you receive through your employer? (please check all that apply)

- Health insurance
- Paid time off
- Tuition reimbursement
- Other (please specify):

Which of the following does your agency **provide** for forensic interviewers and in which do you **participate**? (please check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offered</th>
<th>I participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-going training specific to forensic interviewing techniques</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing after an interview</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-review process</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal days off if emotionally affected by a forensic interview</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidential counseling or therapy (on or off-site)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement for alternative therapy (i.e. massage, yoga, meditation)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring from a senior forensic interviewer (on or off-site)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly scheduled supervision meetings (on or off-site)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How many Multi Disciplinary Teams (MDT) are you part of?

Please rate your satisfaction with the Multi Disciplinary Team (MDT) that you work with most often.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MDT that I work with most often provides me with support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MDT that I work with most often causes me stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you facilitate the meetings for the MDT you work with most often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you have a direct supervisor?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

How long have you been supervised by your current supervisor?

[__________] Years
[__________] Months

What is your current supervisor's experience as a forensic interviewer?

- [ ] Currently conducts forensic interviews
- [ ] Previously conducted forensic interviews, but does not currently conduct interviews
- [ ] Trained in forensic interviewing, but has never conducted interviews
- [ ] No training in forensic interviewing
- [ ] Unknown

If possible, please list the academic degree(s) of your current supervisor.

Bachelor's Degree Major

Master's Degree

PhD

What is your current supervisor's gender?

- [ ] Male
- [ ] Female
- [ ] Transgender
Do you provide mentoring to co-workers who are new to forensic interviewing?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Do you currently supervise anyone?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

How many people do you supervise?

[ ]

How many forensic interviewers do you supervise?

[ ]
In addition to your role as a forensic interviewer, do you have any other roles at your agency? (please check all that apply)

- [ ] Executive Director
- [ ] CAC Program Director or Coordinator
- [ ] Prosecutor
- [ ] Detective/Investigator
- [ ] Nurse
- [ ] Child Protective Services Intake Case Worker
- [ ] Child Protective Services Ongoing Case Worker
- [ ] Victim Advocate
- [ ] Therapist
- [ ] Other (please specify): 

On average, how many hours do you work per week?

What is the average percentage of time that you devote to the following (the total should equal 100%):

Conducting forensic interviews

Other duties related to forensic interviewing (i.e. writing reports, staffing a case, MDT meetings)

Supervision/Consultation/Training

Management/Planning/Evaluation/Research

Community Organization/Advocacy/Education

Paperwork/Computer Work

Court Preparation/Time in Court

Other (please specify):

Total
Do **you** conduct forensic interviews in any languages other than English?
- Yes
- No

Please list the language(s) other than English in which **you** conduct forensic interviews:


Where do **you** conduct forensic interviews? (please check all that apply)
- At the CAC on-site
- Off-site (please specify where):

What is the average number of interviews **you** conduct in a week?

Approximately how many total forensic interviews have **you** conducted to date?

Approximately how many hours of training, specific to forensic interviewing and the dynamics of child abuse, have you had?

What type of training have **you** received in forensic interviewing? (please check all that apply):
- CornerHouse Child Sexual Abuse Forensic Interview Training: RATA
- National Children's Advocacy Center Forensic Interviewing of Children Training
- National Children's Advocacy Center Advanced Forensic Interviewing of Children Training
- National Children's Advocacy Center Extended Forensic Interview Protocol Training
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Protocol Training
- Finding Words/ChildFirst Forensic Interview Training
- APSAC Child Forensic Interview Clinic
- First Witness Forensic Interview Training
- Child Advocacy Studies (CAST)
- Other (please specify):
What is the **highest** level of education you have so far?
- [ ] High school graduate or GED
- [ ] Some college
- [ ] Undergraduate degree
- [ ] Graduate degree
- [ ] Doctorate

What year did you earn your highest degree?

[ ]

In what **field of study** is your highest degree?
- [ ] Criminal Justice
- [ ] Law
- [ ] Psychology
- [ ] Social Work
- [ ] Sociology
- [ ] Other (please specify):

In what **professional background** do you identify?
- [ ] Child Protection
- [ ] Forensic Interviewing
- [ ] Law Enforcement
- [ ] Medical
- [ ] Mental Health
- [ ] Prosecution
- [ ] Social Work
- [ ] Other (please specify):

[ ]
What is your **annual** salary?

$ 

Do you work more than one job?

☐ Yes  
☐ No 

How long have you been a **forensic interviewer**?

Years 
Months 

How long have you been a forensic interviewer at this **children's advocacy center**?

Years 
Months 

How long have you worked in the **child welfare/child abuse** field?

Years 
Months 

How old are you?

What is your gender?
- Male
- Female
- Transgender

Do you have any children under the age of 18 years old?
- Yes
- No

What is your race/ethnicity? (Please check all that apply)
- African American/Black
- Asian/Asian American
- Hispanic/Latino-a
- Multi-racial
- Native American/Alaska Native
- White/Caucasian
- Other (please specify):
I am satisfied with my work as a forensic interviewer.

☐ Yes
☐ No

As a result of my work as a forensic interviewer, I am experiencing burnout.

☐ Yes
☐ No

Please use the space below to write any final thoughts about your experience as a forensic interviewer (i.e. in regard to engagement, satisfaction, burnout).
THANK YOU for participating in my survey on organizational factors that affect burnout among forensic interviewers!

Completing this survey may have prompted you to recall incidents of a client's abuse or your own recollection of personal abuse. Participation may also cause you to think about and evaluate whether you are experiencing burnout. Although there is no anticipated serious or lasting harm as a result of participation in this survey, you may want to talk with someone if you experience any type of distress.

Mental Health America Hotline
1-800-273-TALK (8255)

Mental Health America of Connecticut Hotline
860-529-1970 or 1-800-842-1501

Maine
1-800-969-6642 (Mental Health America Information Center)

Massachusetts
1-800-969-6642 (Mental Health America Information Center)

New Hampshire
1-800-969-6642 (Mental Health America Information Center)

Mental Health America in New Jersey Hotline
973-571-4100

Mental Health Association in New York State Hotline
518-434-0439 or 1-800-766-6177

Mental Health America in Pennsylvania Hotline
717-346-0549 or 1-866-578-3659

Mental Health America of Rhode Island Hotline
401-726-2285

Mental Health Association for Vermont Hotline
802-223-6263 or 1-800-639-4052
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Informational Consent Sheet
Principal Investigator: Waldo Klein, PhD

Student: Christina M. Chiarelli-Helminiak, MSW

Title of Study: Organizational Factors Affecting Burnout Among Forensic Interviewers

You are invited to participate in this survey on burnout among forensic interviewers. As part of my graduate studies at the University of Connecticut School of Social Work, I am investigating what organizational factors affect burnout among forensic interviewers.

Your participation in this study will require completion of a survey which should take approximately 20 minutes. Your participation and responses will be kept confidential. Your contact information will not be associated with your survey answers within the database in order to assure confidentiality. Your contact information will only be used to eliminate you from receiving follow-up reminders upon the return of your completed survey. The only risks associated with this research would be the possibility of you recalling any incidents of a client's abuse or your own recollection of personal abuse. However, the benefits of your participation may impact the profession by helping increase knowledge about organizational factors that affect burnout among forensic interviewers.

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. You do not have to answer any question that you do not want to answer for any reason. If you have questions about this project or have a research-related problem, you may contact me at 717-816-3840 or christina.chiarelli@uconn.edu, or my advisor, Dr. Waldo Klein, at 860-570-9154. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the University of Connecticut Institutional Review Board (IRB) at 860-486-8802. The IRB is a group of people who review research studies to protect the rights and welfare of research participants.

Thank you in advance for your participation!
Appendix D

Recruitment Materials sent to Children’s Advocacy Center Directors/Coordinators
Christina Chiarelli-Helminiak, a doctoral candidate at the University of Connecticut's School of Social Work and former Children's Advocacy Center program director and forensic interviewer, is conducting a regional survey to research the effects of burnout among forensic interviewers. She is particularly interested in the organizational factors that affect burnout. Although burnout has been studied extensively among child welfare workers and other professionals, there are only two studies found in the literature about burnout among forensic interviewers.

As there is currently no database listing all of the forensic interviewers, Ms. Chiarelli-Helminiak is requesting CAC Directors and Coordinators in the Northeast region provide the name and email address of any forensic interviewer(s) who currently conduct interviews at your CAC. She will then be contacting each individual forensic interviewer in August and September with an online survey packet. If your CAC currently does not provide forensic interviews, please also respond with that information as well in order to avoid receiving follow-up contact.

Please be assured that confidentiality will be respected and all responses will be presented in aggregate form. This research has been reviewed and approved by the National Children's Alliance as well as the University of Connecticut Institutional Review Board. As a way of showing her appreciation, Ms. Chiarelli-Helminiak will provide all CAC directors in the Northeast Region with a summary report of the results.

Please encourage your forensic interviewers to participate in this important survey as the research has the potential of helping CACs understand and prevent burnout among forensic interviewers. Gaining such an understanding of the organizational factors that affect burnout
among forensic interviewers has implications not only for the employees, but also for the quality of services provided by the organization and the prosecution of cases of suspected abuse.

To enter the name and email address of any forensic interviewer(s) who currently conduct interviews at your CAC, please click or copy and paste the link below:

https://uconn.co1.qualtrics.com/WQRQualtricsSurveyEngine/?SID=SV_aYkhUkfLqvJ6bhb&RID=MLRP_2fM66Xwq9UP5RoF&_=1

If you have any questions or comments about the research, please contact Ms. Chiarelli-Helminiak at christina.chiarelli@uconn.edu. Thank you for your assistance!
Advance Notice Letter to Children’s Advocacy Center Directors/Coordinators

Director
Child Advocacy Center
123 Main St.
Someplace, New York 12345

July 15, 2013

Dear Ms. Director,

Earlier this month you may have received an email from the National Children’s Alliance regarding research I am conducting as part of the University of Connecticut’s School of Social Work Doctoral Program. This regional survey will research the affects of burnout among forensic interviewers. As a former CAC program director and forensic interviewer myself, I am particularly interested in the organizational factors that affect burnout.

In order to collect a representative sample of forensic interviewers, I will be emailing you in the next week to obtain the name and email address of any individual(s) who conducts forensic interviews at your CAC (employee, contractor, or affiliated personnel). A current list of forensic interviewers does not exist, so I am depending on directors, such as you, to create a list in order to contact forensic interviewers in the northeast region of the country.

This research has been reviewed and approved by the National Children’s Alliance. I ask that you encourage your forensic interviewer(s) to participate in this important survey as the research has the potential of helping CACs understand and prevent burnout among forensic interviewers. Please be assured that confidentiality will be respected and all responses will be presented in aggregate form. As a way of thanking you for your assistance in getting in contact with the forensic interviewers, all CAC directors will receive a summary report of the results. The findings from this research are important to the field of forensic interviewing and potentially helpful to you.

Thank you for your dedication to serving child victims of abuse. I realize your time is valuable and I appreciate your assistance! If you have any questions or comments about my research, please feel free to contact me at christina.chiarelli@uconn.edu.

Sincerely,

Christina M. Chiarelli-Helminiak, MSW
Doctoral Candidate
Greetings,

A few days ago, you should have received a letter telling you about my research on organizational factors that affect burnout among forensic interviewers as part of the University of Connecticut's School of Social Work Doctoral Program. As a former CAC program director and forensic interviewer myself, I am particularly interested in the organizational factors that affect burnout.

One of my first tasks in the research is to develop a sample list of forensic interviewers as a current database does not exist. I am depending on directors, such as you, to develop this list. Please respond to this email with the name and email address of any individual(s) who conducts forensic interviews at your CAC (employees, contractors, or multi-disciplinary team members). If your CAC currently does not provide forensic interviews, please respond with that information as well in order to avoid receiving follow-up contact.

Follow this link to enter the name and email address of your forensic interviewer(s):
${l://SurveyLink?d=Click%20to%20enter%20FI%20Information}

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

If you choose not to respond via email, I will contact you by telephone during the week of July 29.

This research has been reviewed and approved by the National Children's Alliance. I ask that you encourage your forensic interviewers to participate in this important survey as the research has the potential of helping CACs understand and prevent burnout among forensic interviewers. I have included a sample email below that you can send to your interviewers letting them know about the survey coming their way in August. Please be assured that confidentiality will be respected and all responses will be presented in aggregate form. As a way of thanking you for your assistance, all CAC directors will receive a summary report of the results. The findings from this research are important to the field of forensic interviewing and potentially helpful to you.

Thank you for your dedication to serving child victims of abuse. I realize your time is valuable and I appreciate your assistance! If you have any questions or comments about my research, please feel free to contact me at christina.chiarelli@uconn.edu.
Sincerely,

Christina M. Chiarelli-Helminiak, MSW
Doctoral Candidate
University of Connecticut, School of Social Work

********

Sample email for you to send to your interviewers

Dear Forensic Interviewer,

I have received a request from a University of Connecticut doctoral candidate, Christina Chiarelli-Helminiak, who is conducting research on organizational factors affecting burnout among forensic interviewers. She will be contacting you in the next few weeks to complete a brief on-line survey about your experiences. This research has been reviewed and approved by the National Children's Alliance. The findings from this research are important to the field of forensic interviewing and potentially helpful to our organization. I encourage you to complete the survey.

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${1://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}$
Script for Follow-up Phone Call to Children’s Advocacy Center Directors/Coordinators

Hello. My name is Christina Chiarelli-Helminiak. I am a graduate student at the University of Connecticut School of Social Work. As a former CAC program director and forensic interviewer myself, I am interested in the organizational factors that affect burnout among forensic interviewers. As you may know, there is currently no database listing all of the forensic interviewers associated with children's advocacy centers. So, I am calling up CAC Directors and Coordinators, such as you, to ask for the name and email address of any forensic interviewers who currently conduct interviews through CACs. If you provide me with the information today, I will be contacting each individual at their email address with an on-line packet that will include a brief survey. Please be assured that confidentiality will be respected and all responses will be presented in aggregate form. This research has been reviewed and approved by the National Children's Alliance.

What are the names and email addresses of the forensic interviewers associated with your CAC?

I ask that you encourage your forensic interviewer(s) to participate in this important survey as the research has the potential of helping CACs understand and prevent burnout among forensic interviewers.

Thank you for your dedication to serving child victims of abuse. I realize your time is valuable and I appreciate your assistance!
Appendix E

Recruitment Materials for Expert Pilot Testing
Recruitment Email Posted to American Professional Society in the Abuse of Children
Forensic Interviewer Supporter Special Interest Listserv

Hi everyone~

As I may have mentioned before on the listserv, I am completing my dissertation on organizational factors that affect burnout among forensic interviewers. I am getting ready to launch my survey in the next month, but would like to get feedback from some of you before I send it out. I am looking for a few volunteers to review the survey, which should take around 30 minutes depending on how much feedback you are willing to provide.

If this sounds like something you would be interested in assisting me with, please respond back, just to me, at t.uconn@yahoo.com. I will then send you a copy of the survey in a separate email.

Thank you!!

:)  
Tina Chiarelli-Helminiak, MSW  
University of Connecticut  
School of Social Work, Doctoral Candidate  
Human Rights Institute, Graduate Assistant

You are receiving this e-mail because you are subscribed to the APSAC Forensic Interview Supporter Elist (listserv). If you would like to unsubscribe, login to www.apsac.org, go to the Members Only, select My Profile and then visit the Elist setup in the My Features section. You can also review the APSAC Listserv, Circles, Bulletin Board and Broadcast E-mail Rules and Etiquette document by selecting the Special Interests Group tab in the Members Only area.
Hi ~

Thank you so much for being willing to review my survey! The purpose of the survey is to gather information about organizational factors that affect burnout among forensic interviewers. Your feedback will assist me in ensuring I am asking the right questions!

The best way to review the survey is to act as if you are actually taking it. Please take your time in looking over the questions. Let me know if there are any questions you found hard to understand or seem to be missing an answer choice. If you think there is a question that should be asked, but is not included, please let me know that as well.

I have included the survey as a Word document with the Track Changes feature turned on so you can write any notes directly on the survey and email it back to me. The actual survey will be distributed online using Qualtrics Survey Software.

Thank you!

:)  
Tina Chiarelli-Helminiak, MSW  
University of Connecticut  
School of Social Work, Doctoral Candidate  
Human Rights Institute, Graduate Assistant
Response to Other Potential Pilot Reviewers

Thank you for your offer to review my survey. The response to my posting on the APSAC listserv was overwhelming! I have enough reviewers for this initial review. If it's okay with you, I would like to keep your email address to have you review the on-line survey once I am ready to launch it, which should be within the next few weeks.

Thanks again!
Response to Pilot Reviewers
Qualtrics Version

Thank you so much for being willing to review my survey! The purpose of the survey is to gather information about organizational factors that affect burnout among forensic interviewers. Your feedback will assist me in ensuring I am asking the right questions!

The best way to review the survey is to act as if you are actually taking it. Please take your time in looking over the questions. Let me know if there are any questions you found hard to understand or seem to be missing an answer choice. If you think there is a question that should be asked, but is not included, please let me know that as well. On each page of the survey, you will find a space for you to write in your questions, comments, and suggestions.

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

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

Thank you so much!
:
Tina Chiarelli-Helminiak, MSW
University of Connecticut
School of Social Work, Doctoral Candidate
Human Rights Institute, Graduate Assistant

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

Recruitment Materials sent to Forensic Interviewers
Advance Notice Letter

Forensic Interviewer
Child Advocacy Center
123 Main St.
Someplace, New York 12345

August 19, 2013

Dear Forensic Interviewer,

As part of the University of Connecticut's School of Social Work Doctoral Program, I am researching the effects of burnout among forensic interviewers. As a former forensic interviewer and Children’s Advocacy Center program director, I am particularly interested in organizational factors. This research has the potential of helping CACs understand and prevent burnout among forensic interviewers and has been reviewed and approved by the National Children's Alliance.

You are receiving this letter because you have been identified as a forensic interviewer associated with a CAC in the Northeast region of the United States. Next week, you will receive an on-line survey packet requesting your participation in the study. The survey will be sent to name@email.org. If this email address is incorrect or if you would like to receive a paper copy of the survey, please contact me at christina.chiarelli@uconn.edu or 717-816-3840.

Please be assured that confidentiality will be respected and all responses will be presented in aggregate form. If you have any concerns regarding completing the survey at work, you may forward the link to a personal email account or request a paper version of the survey.

By now you may have noticed the $2 bill in the envelope, this is my way of saying thank you in advance for your participation in the survey! I realize your time is valuable and I appreciate your participation in my research and your dedication to serving children.

Sincerely,

Christina M. Chiarelli-Helminiak, MSW
Doctoral Candidate
Advance Notice Email

Dear Forensic Interviewer,

A few days ago, you should have received a letter about my research on organizational factors that affect burnout among forensic interviewers. This email is to confirm the email address to which I will be sending the on-line survey packet. Please confirm your email address by following this link:

${l://SurveyLink?d=Confirm%20email%20address}$

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

If this email address is incorrect or if you would like to receive a paper copy of the survey, you can also use the link above to enter the correct information. Or you can contact me at christina.chiarelli@uconn.edu or 717-816-3840.

The survey is being conducted using Qualtrics Survey Software, an external site managing the database to ensure your confidentiality. No identifying information will be linked to survey responses and all resulting information will be presented in aggregate form. This research has been reviewed and approved by the National Children's Alliance.

Thank you for your dedication to serving child victims of abuse. I realize your time is valuable and I appreciate you participating in my survey.

Sincerely,

Christina M. Chiarelli-Helminiak, MSW
Doctoral Candidate
University of Connecticut, School of Social Work

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click%20here%20to%20unsubscribe}$
Link to Confirmation of Email Address

My email address is correct.

☐ Yes

☐ No (Please enter your correct email address):

I would rather complete a paper version of the survey.

☐ Yes (Please enter the address where you would like the survey sent):

☐ No

Thank you! You will receive the survey packet the week of September 2.

Have a great Labor Day weekend!
Dear Forensic Interviewer,

As part of the University of Connecticut's School of Social Work Doctoral Program, I am researching the affects of burnout among forensic interviewers. As a former forensic interviewer and CAC program director, I am particularly interested in the organizational factors that affect burnout.

Please click on the link below to begin the survey. The survey should take approximately 20 minutes.

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

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

The survey is being conducted using Qualtrics Survey Software, an external site managing the database to ensure your confidentiality. No identifying information will be linked to survey responses and all resulting information will be presented in aggregate form. If you have any concerns regarding completing the survey at work, you may forward the link to your personal email account or request a paper version of the survey. This research has been reviewed and approved by the National Children's Alliance.

If you would like to receive a paper copy of the survey, please contact me at christina.chiarelli@uconn.edu or 717-816-3840.

Thank you for your dedication to serving child victims of abuse. I realize your time is valuable and I appreciate your participation.

Sincerely,
Christina M. Chiarelli-Helminiak, MSW
Doctoral Candidate
University of Connecticut, School of Social Work

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

THANK YOU once again for participating in my survey on organizational factors that affect burnout among forensic interviewers! This research has the potential of helping CACs understand and prevent burnout among forensic interviewers. All CAC directors will receive a summary report of the results.

Just as a reminder, the survey was conducted using Qualtrics Survey Software, an external site managing the database to ensure your confidentiality. No identifying information will be linked to survey responses and all resulting information will be presented in aggregate form. This research has been reviewed and approved by the National Children's Alliance.

Thank you for your dedication to serving child victims of abuse. I realize your time is valuable and I appreciate your participation in my survey.

Sincerely,
Christina M. Chiarelli-Helminiak, MSW
Doctoral Candidate
University of Connecticut, School of Social Work
Follow-Up Reminder Email

A few days ago, I emailed you a survey on burnout among forensic interviewers for research I am conducting as part of the University of Connecticut's School of Social Work Doctoral Program. As a former forensic interviewer and CAC program director, I am particularly interested in the organizational factors that affect burnout. The research has the potential of helping CACs understand and prevent burnout among forensic interviewers.

Please click on the link below to begin the survey. The survey should take approximately 20 minutes.

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

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

The survey is being conducted using Qualtrics Survey Software, an external site managing the database to ensure your confidentiality. No identifying information will be linked to survey responses and all resulting information will be presented in aggregate form. If you have any concerns regarding completing the survey at work, you may forward the link to your personal email account or request a paper version of the survey. This research has been reviewed and approved by the National Children's Alliance.

If you would like to receive a paper copy of the survey, please contact me at christina.chiarelli@uconn.edu or 717-816-3840.

Thank you for your dedication to serving child victims of abuse. I realize your time is valuable and I appreciate your participation.

Sincerely,
Christina M. Chiarelli-Helminiak, MSW
Doctoral Candidate
University of Connecticut School of Social Work

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

I need your help!

I recently sent you a survey on burnout among forensic interviewers. I have noted that you have not participated in the survey. Your participation is very important, as there is currently little research on burnout among forensic interviewers.

I am conducting this research as part of the University of Connecticut's School of Social Work Doctoral Program. I am trying to achieve a 70% response rate - I am almost there and you can help by responding today.

As a former forensic interviewer and CAC program director, I am particularly interested in the organizational factors that affect burnout. The research has the potential of helping CACs understand and prevent burnout among forensic interviewers.

Please click on the link below to begin the survey. The survey should take approximately 20 minutes.

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

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

The survey is being conducted using Qualtrics Survey Software, an external site managing the database to ensure your confidentiality. No identifying information will be linked to survey responses and all resulting information will be presented in aggregate form. If you have any concerns regarding completing the survey at work, you may forward the link to your personal email account or request a paper version of the survey. This research has been reviewed and approved by the National Children's Alliance.

If you would like to receive a paper copy of the survey, please contact me at christina.chiarelli@uconn.edu or 717-816-3840.

Thank you for your dedication to serving child victims of abuse. I realize your time is valuable and I appreciate your participation.

Sincerely,
Christina M. Chiarelli-Helminiak, MSW
Doctoral Candidate
University of Connecticut School of Social Work

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