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VARIABLES ASSOCIATED WITH BURNOUT AND TURNOVER INTENTIONS AMONG CASE MANAGERS IN COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH

Abstract

by

BARBARA KATZ EPSTEIN

This research tested a number of hypotheses relating to variables in case managers’ work environment. All nine of these hypotheses were found to be supported at the significance level of p<.001. The study also tested a model of turnover intentions that included the variables of role strain, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, burnout, and turnover intentions. As a result of the findings of path analysis, the model was revised and one of the variables, organizational commitment, was excluded because of the fact that it was found to not explain a significant amount of variance in turnover intentions, the dependent variable, over that which was explained by the other independent variables in the model.
Role strain was found to significantly affect a number of variables in the model, above that which was initially hypothesized, as it had an indirect effect, as well as a direct effect on several of the variables in the model. Role strain was found to have both a direct and an indirect effect on job satisfaction. In addition, role strain was found to affect burnout indirectly through three different paths. Role strain was also found to have a total of five indirect paths to turnover intentions.

This research also found job satisfaction to be of considerable importance. It had the largest direct effect on turnover intentions.

The findings of this research did not support the position that had been advanced that case managers have high turnover intentions. Despite the high actual turnover among case managers in the past, only moderate turnover intentions were found among the case managers in this sample.

The case managers in this sample expressed a number of common concerns and dissatisfactions. Among these were low pay, excessive paperwork, lack of resources in the community, especially housing, with which to link up their clients, and unrealistic role demands. In spite of these dissatisfactions, case managers report that they like working with their clients and helping them to improve their lives.

Case managers also report considerable dissatisfaction with the pay that they receive, and, to a lesser extent, dissatisfaction with opportunities for promotion.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

An estimated 2.8 million adults in the United States suffer from psychiatric illness that has persisted or is likely to persist over a long period of time (National Institute of Mental Health, 1989).

Although case management has emerged as an important service delivery model in community mental health, there exists a very high incidence of staff turnover. Champney (1989) reports an annual turnover rate of between 40% to 60% among case managers in the state of Ohio. Fee (1991) has found an annual turnover rate among case managers of about 30% at one large inner-city community mental health center.

There are a number of serious consequences of high turnover among case managers. As Fee (1991) suggests, it takes about six months for many severely mentally disabled persons to form a meaningful and trusting relationship with a case manager. Because this bonding between a severely mentally disabled client and his or her case manager is so critical, Fee maintains that the frequent turnover of case managers is disastrous in terms of effectiveness of service. Fee (1991) also asserts that dissolving this relationship can sometimes have serious results for a person who is severely mentally disabled, the most extreme result being when the severely mentally disabled person deals with the loss by committing suicide. It is also
expensive to train new case managers, costing $6,000 to $7,000, including time to post a position, interview prospective case managers, place newspaper advertisements, and provide orientation and training to the new employee (Fee, 1991). In addition, when staff turnover is high, supervisory or other staff are spending time performing these activities to recruit, orient, and train new staff that could be spent in other productive activities.

Burnout has been found to be a serious concern in the human service professions. Burnout is the negative response to working with people over time (Maslach, 1982a). Case managers are likely to experience a high degree of burnout because of the nature of their job situation. Case managers in community mental health engage clients, help them to make plans to improve their lives, provide crisis intervention, broker for and link clients up with services in the community, advocate on their behalf, and monitor their progress. Because of the nature of the job situation of case managers, including working with clients who are often quite needy and with whom it is sometimes difficult to work, dealing with bureaucratic systems, and trying to secure resources for clients that are often quite scarce, they are at considerable risk of experiencing burnout.

In many models of the variables associated with employee turnover, a significant correlation has been found between intention to leave one's job and actual turnover (Blau & Boal, 1989; Steele & Ovalle, 1984; Mobley, Horner & Hollingworth, 1978). As will be considered, there are reasons to consider turnover
intentions themselves. Intention to quit has been associated with negative behaviors on the job, even among those employees who do not actually leave. Therefore, because case managers experience high turnover, and because the consequences of this turnover have a number of serious implications, this research examined the variables related to turnover intentions of case managers. Although the relationships among a number of the variables in the model were examined, the relationship between the variables and burnout was particularly considered.

Summary of Research

This research tested a model of turnover intentions of case managers who work in community mental health centers. Of the variables that have been associated with voluntary employee turnover, intention to leave one’s job has been consistently found to be associated with turnover. In addition, there are important reasons to study turnover intentions themselves. It is hypothesized that role strain, felt stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment contribute to both burnout and intention to quit among case managers. A number of studies have found a high incidence of burnout among social service workers. It is not known how many workers who experience high burnout leave their jobs. Perhaps in addition to the large percentage of case managers who do quit their jobs, others experience high burnout but remain at their jobs for any number of reasons, such as the lack of perceived alternatives to their present employment situation. Many of the same variables are associated with both burnout and turnover intentions.
Historical Background

In the 1950s, the United States began a massive reform in the delivery of mental health services through the advent of deinstitutionalization. This movement toward community-based care for persons with long-term mental illness grew out of the belief that long-term hospitalization isolates people and tends to foster the very behaviors, dependence, and difficulties in living in normal society that it was supposed to correct. At about this same time, new psychotropic drugs that helped to control the symptoms of mental illness appeared. As a result of these two phenomena, many thousands of persons were released from mental institutions to be rehabilitated within their own communities.

In 1963, Congress passed the Community Mental Health Centers Act which resulted in the creation of more than 700 community mental health centers. The concept of community mental health implied a dual promise: treatment and rehabilitation of the severely mentally disabled within the community, and the promotion of mental health generally.

The quantitative goal set for deinstitutionalization process was a 50 per cent reduction in the patient population of state hospitals for the mentally ill within two decades. This goal was achieved and surpassed. Between 1955 and 1980, the number of occupied beds in public mental health hospitals was reduced by 75% (National Institute of Mental Health, 1980).
Success has not been so easily achieved in the community services that were to be provided to the deinstitutionalized person. As put forth in the 1963 legislation, and made more explicit in an amendment in 1975, the deinstitutionalized patient was to be supported by a wide range of aftercare services, to be coordinated by the local community mental health center. These services were to include therapeutic residential centers, foster care arrangements, halfway houses, and day treatment programs. Although a number of these services have been developed, many patients have not received the services that they need. As a result, the deinstitutionalization movement has been the subject of widespread debate and criticism. Many have judged deinstitutionalization to be a dismal and shameful failure (Libassi, 1988; Miller, 1981; Turner & TenHoor, 1978). The severely mentally disabled have been referred to as an "abandoned population" (Abandoned, 1986).

In 1977, the National Institute of Mental Health initiated its Community Support Program in order to improve community care to severely mentally disabled persons. The Community Support Program was initially designed as a pilot program to stimulate and assist states and communities in improving opportunities and services for severely mentally disabled persons. The Community Support Program specified ten components necessary for adequate care. These components consist of (1) identification of the target population and outreach to offer service, (2) assistance in applying for entitlements, (3) crisis stabilization services, (4) psychosocial rehabilitation services, (5) supportive services, (6) medical and mental health care, (7)
backup care to significant others, (8) involvement of community members, (9) protection of client rights, and (10) case management.

The function of case management is to ensure that the other nine components of the Community Support model are accessible to and provided for the severely mentally disabled person in a timely manner. Case management is generally now considered to be an essential component of an effective community support system (Rife, First, Greenlee, Miller, & Feichter, 1991).

**Conceptual Framework**

The community support system, the case management approach to delivering service, and the work situation of the case manager can all be appropriately conceptualized within the ecological or systems theoretical approach. The ecological model, which is a form of general systems theory, considers a variety of dimensions and their interrelationship, as well as interconnections between settings in terms of knowledge, communication, and the network member linkages (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). The ecological perspective purports to understand events and behavior in the context of the many influences and variables that impact upon and have a part in the production of those events and behavior (Hartman, 1979). This framework incorporates understanding of an individual as a biopsychosocial system interacting with a network of individuals and social systems (Northern, 1982). Not only do environments influence people, but people act upon their environment as well.
This biopsychosocial view of the individual as a society is a basic tenet of social work and supports the idea that the individual must be understood in relation to his or her environment (Segal, 1987). A change in any part of the person-environment transactional unit influences changes in other parts. Ecological social work practice is concerned with the growth, development, and potentialities of human beings and with the properties of their environments that support or fail to support the expression of human potential. By clarifying the structure of the environment and the nature of its adaptive influence, the ecological perspective is well-suited to developing action principles for intervening in the environment. According to a human ecology perspective, mental health may be considered to be a congruent relationship between persons and surrounding environment and systems (Wilkinson & O'Connor, 1982).

Systems approaches and ecological models have been replacing simple causal explanations of social phenomenon (Lehman, 1982). The medical model, which prevailed for some time, has been criticized as inadequate for dealing with mental health issues (Lehman, 1982). As Jeger and Slotnick (1982) purport, the community mental health movement requires an alternate conceptualization to the medical model. Within the ecosystems approach, human interactional phenomenon are not viewed or explained in the context of pathology or taxonomically appropriate labels; instead, broader environmental approaches are called for (Miller & Solomon, 1979). The ecological or systems models suggest that case management is best conceived as a system of interrelated components. The absence or poor functioning of any
component affects the operation of the whole system. In order for the case management system to function properly, there needs to be distinct and observable procedures and activities. As O'Connor (1988) purports, the ecological systems perspective that underlies case management directs the case manager's attention to the transaction of person to environment and requires the development and elaboration of environmental intervention techniques.

As Swenson (1979) asserts, the ecological approach to practice establishes the person as an adapting and coping creature, striving for growth, mastery, and interaction with his or her environment. Helping relationships are based on a concept of the client as an active participant in progressive change, and of the worker as catalyst. Within this framework, the objective of the case manager in working with a client includes providing an environment where the person's inherent abilities are encouraged and supportive qualities of the environment are enhanced. Clients are met within their own environment, and that environment is adjusted for their client's best functioning without the stigma of being a mental health client.

With regard to the situation of the case manager, the ecological perspective considers the employee and his or her interaction with the work environment. The ecological approach encompasses the study of communities, environments, and social systems (Jeger & Slotnick, 1982), all of which the case manager encounters in providing service for clients. Central to the ecological perspective is the reciprocal impact that the individual and his or her environment have upon one another. The
timing, manifestation, and consequences of stress and burnout depend both on the individual and on the environment in which the individual works. An examination of the person, his or her environment, and the reciprocal impact of the two are necessary to an understanding of the case manager’s work situation. Carroll and White (1980) assert that a number of environmental variables must be taken into account. Since environmental settings other than the work environment can generate stress and frustrate important needs, their influence on the case manager’s perceptions of the work situation need to be considered. Efforts to ameliorate stress and its consequences must therefore take these ecosystems into account.

Libassi (1992) suggests that from the ecologic perspective emerge approaches to practice that are useful in work with clients with psychiatric disabilities. This involves a redefinition of client and practitioner roles. Clients are viewed as resources and partners in the helping process. They are encouraged to actively participate in assessment, goal formulation, and selection of intervention strategies (Maluccio, 1981).

**Overview of the Study**

This research of a sample survey design in which a questionnaire was given to the case managers in two counties. Both are large metropolitan areas in northeast Ohio. One difference between the two counties is that one has "decentralized case management," with eight different community mental health centers located in different neighborhoods throughout the county, some of which have more than one
site. These community mental health centers differ in their organization, types of services offered, and client population. For example, some of these centers provide other social services in addition to case management, while some are exclusively community mental health centers. In contrast, the other county operates under a centralized case management model in which all case managers are located at one facility.

The questionnaire was developed by incorporating a number of attitude scales that have been utilized by other researchers. With the exception of one of the study variables, each scale measures one of the variables of the study. The exception is job satisfaction, which is measured by three scales, each of which measures one component of job satisfaction, as conceptualized by the study. This study incorporates variables and their measurement from the field of organizational behavior, as well as those from the social sciences. By integrating relevant concepts from a variety of disciplines, this researcher hoped to develop a useful model of turnover intentions of case managers, as well as to utilize the most appropriate scales to measure the variables under consideration. Most of the scales utilized in this research have been used extensively, and have demonstrated reliability and validity.

One important limitation of many sample survey research studies is sampling bias. That is, because in many studies a relatively small number of the persons in the sampling frame participate in a study, there is likely to be bias based upon the particular subjects who participate in the study. This research attempted to limit this
sampling bias by making considerable effort to include as many potential subjects in the study as possible. This researcher traveled to each of the 14 work sites where case managers are employed, after arranging a meeting time that was convenient to the case managers. This researcher explained the nature of the study to the subjects, including that while the main purpose of the research was for the completion of a dissertation, that a general report of the research findings would be shared with the both the community mental health agencies and the two community mental health boards. This general report will be made in exchange for the boards and agencies agreeing to allow their case managers to participate in this research, as well as to elicit case manager’s cooperation, by providing an additional incentive for them to complete the questionnaire -- i.e., that their attitudes will shared with others (in a general way that does not reveal the identity of any individual case managers) who can make policy and initiate change. Aggressive follow-up was made in order to elicit the participation of case managers who either were not present at the time that this researcher met with most of the case managers from their agency, or who were unable to complete the questionnaire during the time of this researcher’s visit.

Justification for and Nature of the Study

Because of the serious consequences of burnout and turnover among case managers that have been considered, this research was conducted in order to obtain a better understanding of the variables that contribute to their incidence.
Based upon these considerations, a model of turnover intentions was developed that included a number of causal relationships. It was theorized that role strain contributes to felt stress. Felt stress contributes to job satisfaction and organizational commitment, both of which contribute to burnout. Both job satisfaction and organizational commitment, as well as burnout, were hypothesized to contribute to turnover intentions of case managers (see Figure A). These variables were chosen on the basis of previous research and theory development, as considered in detail in Chapter Two.

Because of the scope of the research, the sample survey design seems to be the most appropriate and expedient way to obtain information from a number of case managers. In addition, a questionnaire that accessed the attitudes of case managers seemed most relevant, as it is their perceptions of the situation that are important. That is, rather that some objective consideration of caseload size or salary, for example, it is the case manager’s perceptions of their employment environment that are particularly relevant to a consideration of the burnout that they experience and of their turnover intentions.

Limitations of the Study

In spite of these important reasons to conduct this research, there are several important limitations of this research. Because a convenience sample is utilized, the sample is not necessarily representative of all case managers, as case management is practiced differently in different community mental health centers, in different
FIGURE A. ORIGINAL CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF TURNOVER INTENTIONS
counties, and in different states. Community mental health centers themselves differ, as do each agency’s employees and each community’s resources. Thus, the results of this research are limited in their generalizability. This is a threat to the study’s external validity.

A further limitation is due to the nature of the research design. Because it consists of a scale that is administered at one point in time, the responses obtained are influenced by how the particular respondent feels on that particular day, and whatever may be happening at the agency on the day that the scale is being completed. In addition, a limitation of any study of turnover intentions is the prevailing economic conditions at the time that the research is conducted. That is, an examination of turnover intentions as a dependent variable must take into consideration that, in addition to such variables as felt stress, role strain, and the other organizational variables that are included in this research, the variation in turnover intentions is influenced by economic circumstances that are beyond the scope of the organization.

**Importance of the Study**

In spite of these limitations, the study has considerable merit. By obtaining a better understanding of the variables associated with burnout and turnover intentions, as well as the relationship between these two variables, appropriate interventions can be designed and implemented to reduce their incidence. In some instances, some of the information obtained by the study might be intuitively "known," and, thus, the research findings might provide justification for what positions and changes that have
already been advocated. It is hoped that the ecological theoretical framework that has been considered will be useful in better explaining the situation, as perceived by the case manager. For example, while it is readily apparent that there is considerable stress in the case manager’s work situation, how that stress is felt or experienced, the extent to which job satisfaction is influenced by both role strain and felt stress, the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment, how all of these factors contribute to burnout, and the role burnout plays in case manager’s turnover intentions, are all questions that can be best understood within an ecological orientation.

Because there are no reported studies of either burnout or turnover intentions among case managers in community mental health, this research is an important first step in obtaining an understanding of these variables within this work context. As Jayaranthe and Chess (1984a) assert, determinants of job satisfaction, burnout and turnover intentions vary by the particular field of practice within the social services. They suggest, therefore, that a universal approach aimed at increasing job satisfaction and reducing burnout is likely to be of minimal value. Rather, they argue, interventions must be conducted within each setting, and must attend to the idiosyncracies of each group of workers. Consequently, interventions must be situation specific in order to be most effective. Dalessio, Silverman, & Schuck (1986) also suggest that since the turnover process differs for different types of employees, it is important to understand role strain, felt stress, job satisfaction, organizational
commitment, burnout, and turnover intentions as they specifically relate to the situation of the case manager in community mental health, in order to develop interventions and modify policy to address the specific work situation of case managers.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Review of the Literature

Turnover

Employee turnover is an area that has received widespread attention within organization theory (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986). Over ten years ago Muchinsky and Morrow (1980) estimated that over 1500 articles had been written on the topic in this century. Both positive (Dalton & Todor, 1979; Dalton, Todor & Krachardt, 1982; Hollenbeck & Williams, 1986) and negative aspects of turnover have been studied. While some turnover in organizations is normal and even considered important for the long-range health and viability of an organization (Dalton & Todor, 1979), there are many serious problems with high turnover, as have already been considered.

A considerable amount of the research on turnover has been conducted in the for-profit sector. The great majority of studies of turnover and turnover intentions that have been conducted within the human service field has been directed toward nurses (Abelson, 1989; Curry, Wakefield, Price, Mueller, & McCloskey, 1985; Kosmoski & Calkin, 1986; Parasuraman, 1989; Price & Mueller, 1981; Presthold, Lane, & Mathews, 1987; Wandelt, Pierce, & Widdowson, 1981). These studies of turnover among nurses are reported both in the organizational psychology as well as in the
nursing literature. The second most frequent group upon which turnover research has been conducted is teachers (Chapman & Hutcheson, 1982; Li & Turk, 1985; Seyforth & Bost, 1986). Relatively few studies have focused on employee turnover within the social services, although the incidence is high among this group of human service workers as well.

Most research on the psychology of turnover has aimed at understanding the turnover decision process of job incumbents. March and Simon (1958) were among the first researchers to identify the complex psychological processes associated with organizational withdrawal. Early research was univariate in nature, focusing on the relationship between one variable and turnover. Relatively simple prediction models followed (Mowday, Koerg, & McArthur, 1984). In the last ten years there has been a trend toward more sophisticated and comprehensive research on turnover. This trend has been influenced by reviews of the turnover literature, which concluded that there is a need to move beyond simple job attitude-turnover relationships to examine more complex processes associated with the decision to leave an organization (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand & Meglino, 1979; Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1973; Porter & Steers, 1973). Over the past three decades, several comprehensive research reviews and conceptual models of employee turnover have appeared (March and Simons, 1958; Mobley, 1977; Mobley et al., 1979; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Porter & Steers, 1973; Price, 1977; Rosse, 1987; Steers & Mowday, 1981). These various conceptual models attempt to explain the processes which influence employees’
decisions about whether to stay at or leave an organization. While there are differences among the models, they all indicate, in some form, significant relationships between levels of employee job dissatisfaction, counterproductive job attitudes, employee intentions to quit or stay, the evaluation of alternative job opportunities, work adaptation strategies, and eventual turnover.

A number of variables have been associated with turnover among employees including job satisfaction, felt stress, organizational commitment, employee attitudes, absenteeism, and job knowledge. Early research tended to focus on job satisfaction as the key attitude related to employee behaviors such as job performance and turnover. Locke’s (1976) review concluded that while the reported correlations have been consistent and negative, they have usually been less than .40. Arnold and Feldman (1982), in their multivariate analysis of the determinants of job turnover, found age, tenure in the organization, overall job satisfaction, organizational commitment, perceived job security, and intention to search for an alternative position to all be significant predictors of turnover.

Recent research has investigated organizational commitment as an important attitudinal predictor of employee behavior and intentions (Mowday et al., 1982). Organizational commitment has been operationally defined in many ways, but one major stream of current research (Angle & Perry, 1981; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979) has viewed this construct as multidimensional in nature, involving an employee’s loyalty to the organization, willingness to exert effort on behalf of the
organization, and degree of goal and value congruency with the organization (Porter, Crampon, & Smith, 1976; Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974). It is this third dimension in particular that is consistent with the ecological orientation advanced herein. Porter et al. (1974) suggest that general attitudes toward the organization may have a greater impact on the decision to remain with the organization than more specific attitudes toward the job. A number of studies have reported a significant association between organizational commitment and turnover and/or turnover intentions (Clegg, 1983; Ferris & Aranya, 1983; Hom, Katerberg, & Hulin, 1979; Mowday et al., 1979; Stumpf & Hartman, 1984).

An important factor in any consideration of an employee’s voluntary decision to leave an organization is the extent to which alternative occupational roles are available, and/or are perceived to be available in the environment (Dreher & Dougherty, 1980). Several theories and considerable labor market data emphasize the availability and attractiveness of alternative positions and opportunities in determining whether to remain with an organization. March and Simon’s (1958) model of organizational withdrawal specified that decisions to terminate employment in an organization are partly a function of perceptions of the ease of termination, which is itself a function of the number of extraorganizational alternatives perceived. Perceptions of extraorganizational alternatives are in turn related to the business activity level, the number of other organizations in the immediate environment, and personal characteristics of the participant. Miller, Katerberg, and Hulin (1979) tested
the usefulness of perceived alternative job opportunities as a predictor of individuals decisions to reenlist in the National Guard. They found modest correlations between perceived job opportunities and reenlistment. However, as Hulin, Roznowski, and Hachiya (1985) assert, a general problem in this research area is that national or even local labor markets, may be poorly related to the relevant labor market for a given individual.

**The Relationship Between Turnover Intentions and Actual Turnover**

It is turnover intentions rather than actual turnover behavior that was the dependent variable in this research. As such, it is a model of the relationship of a number of variables to turnover intentions of case managers that was tested. It is voluntary turnover by employees that was considered, that is, when employees terminate their employment by their own volition. The term turnover intentions is considered to include all attitudes and behaviors that relate to intending to leave one's job. The decision to leave a job is often a time-consuming process that includes thinking about leaving, intention to conduct a job search (for those persons who need to have another job before they voluntarily leave the one that they have), a generation of alternatives, and the decision to quit or stay (Carsten & Spector, 1987; Mobley, Horner, & Hollingworth, 1978). All these variables are pertinent to a consideration of turnover intentions.
Prestholdt et al. (1987) are among those who have suggested that the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Fishbein, 1980) seems well suited as a conceptual base for turnover research. This theory was designed to provide an understanding of complex decision-making processes (Prestholdt et al., 1987). The theory assumes that people use available information in a reasonable and rational way to arrive at a behavioral decision such as withdrawal (Fishbein, 1980). Specifically, the process is conceptualized as a hierarchical sequence leading from beliefs, through attitudes and social norms, to intention, and finally, to behavior. According to this theory, a person's behavioral intention to perform (or not to perform) a specific behavior is the immediate determinant of the behavior. Turnover intentions was the dependent variable of the study, both because a high correlation between turnover intentions and turnover has been found in numerous studies, as well as because of the value of studying turnover intentions in and of themselves.

The vast majority of researchers who have studied turnover intentions have investigated the cognitions associated with turnover behavior. These withdrawal cognitions, identified by Mobley and his associates (Mobley, 1979; Mobley, 1982; Mobley et al., 1981), have been utilized to operationalize turnover intentions by many researchers (Dalessario et al., 1986; Hom, Griffeth, & Sellaro, 1984; Mowday et al., 1984). While the vast majority of researchers who have investigated the relationship between turnover intentions and turnover have studied employees' intentions to leave
their job, several have focused on intention to remain or stay on one's job instead (e.g., Kosmoski & Calkin, 1986).

Beginning in the 1970s a number of investigations of the relationship between a number of variables and turnover have been conducted. Mobley (1977) has developed a model of turnover that has been considered, tested, and modified by a number of researchers, including Mobley himself. Following the earlier theoretical work of both March and Simon (1958) and Fishbein and Ajzen (1975), Mobley (1977) made several general predictions. One of these is that job attitudes should be most directly related to withdrawal cognitions, and only indirectly related to actual turnover behavior. Moreover, the best predictor of turnover should be the employee's behavioral intention to leave the organization. This model considers intention to quit as the immediate precursor of turnover. Thoughts of quitting precede assessment of alternatives, which precede intention to quit. Hom et al., (1984) investigated Mobley's original model on hospital personnel. Five significant predictors of turnover were found: thoughts of quitting ($r = .23$); expected utility of searching and of quitting ($r = .28$); intention to search ($r = .31$); search behavior ($r = .30$), and intention to quit ($r = .28$). Michaels and Spector (1982) tested a simplified version of Mobley et al.'s (1979) more comprehensive turnover model. In addition to finding that the most direct predictor of turnover was the intention to quit, they found that the influences of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on turnover were indirect, through the relationship of these variables to behavioral intentions.
Parasuraman (1982) also found that variables such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment influence turnover indirectly through turnover intentions.

Steele and Ovalle (1984) conducted an extensive review and meta-analysis of the relationship between behavioral intentions and turnover by undertaking an exhaustive search to locate research reporting the relationship between these two variables. Their investigation of 34 articles that they found, calculated a weighted average correlation of .50 between behavioral intentions and employee turnover. Intentions were found to be more predictive of attrition than overall job satisfaction, satisfaction with the work itself, or organizational commitment.

Research conducted since the time of the articles reviewed by Steele and Ovalle (1984) also have found significant correlations between various definitions of turnover intentions and turnover. As has been previously considered, more recently the construct of job withdrawal cognitions has been utilized to include the various steps involved in thinking about quitting and intending to quit one’s job. Blau and Boal (1989) use this construct in their model which considers the effect of the interaction of job involvement and organizational commitment in predicting employee turnover. They measured job withdrawal cognitions using three items theorized by Mobley (1977) and found (Miller et al., 1979) to be important precursors of turnover: thinking about quitting, intention to search, and intention to quit. A correlation of .49 (p<.01) was found between job withdrawal cognitions and turnover.
Dallessio et al. (1986), in their re-analysis and review of existing data on the Mobley, Horner, and Hollingsworth (1978) turnover model, found intention to quit as the immediate precursor of turnover. They also maintain that the turnover process differs for different types of employees. They suggest that in future research that more attention be given to the direct and indirect influences of variables on intention to quit, as opposed to the actual act of turnover. These authors assert that from the employer's standpoint, intention to quit may be a more important variable than the actual act of turnover. That is, if the precursors to intention to quit were better understood, the employee could possibly institute changes to affect this intention. However once an employee has quit, there is little the employer can do, except assume the expense of hiring or training another employee. Seybolt (1986) also argues for the value of investigating turnover intentions. He suggests that focusing on turnover intentions of present employees may help curb unwanted turnover. Since various models agree that turnover intentions is the best single predictor of actual turnover, in a practical way, it makes sense to examine turnover intentions of present employees and the predictor of those intentions, thus dealing with those predictors to stem the tide of turnover (Seybolt, 1986).

This research, in which turnover intentions is the dependent variable, is consistent with a number of other studies that have been conducted in recent years. Turnover intentions now play a significant role in turnover research (Hinsz & Nelson, 1990). Researchers now encourage the examination of turnover intentions as one of
the critical concepts in the development and testing of models of the turnover process (Cotten & Tuttle, 1986; Mobley et al., 1979). Ferris and Rowland (1987) investigated the effect of tenure as a moderator of the absence-intent to leave relationship. Walsh, Ashford, and Hill (1985) considered the influence of the information environment on turnover intentions. They assert that their research complements the ideas of Price (1977) and extends the work of Mobley et al. (1979). Fimian, Fastenau, and Thomas (1988) investigated the relationship of stress and turnover intentions among nurses. A number of other researchers have investigated turnover intentions as well (Hinsz & Nelson, 1980; Kosmoski & Calkin, 1986; Sherman, 1989; Shore & Martin 1989; Steel, Shane, & Kennedy, 1990; Ward, 1988).

Thompson and Perpening (1983) examine job-type variations and antecedents to intention to leave. In their justification for studying intention to leave they suggest that intent to leave is, in some instances, more revealing than actual turnover data itself, as actual turnover data can be contaminated by several factors not directly related to an active voluntary decision to quit.

Bowen (1982) considers some unintended consequences of intention to quit by analyzing the situation of employees who intend to quit but do not. Utilizing the theoretical premises of Mobley's models of the turnover process, he asks whether intention to quit can be a useful variable in explaining job behaviors other than quitting. Absenteeism and being fired are suggested as unintended consequences of intention to quit. He also suggests a possible relationship between these unintended
consequences and declining job performance. Bowen considers the examination by Steers and Mowday (1979) of "dissatisfied stayers" which purported additional unintended consequences, such as employees turning to forms of withdrawal such as drugs and alcohol when other means of withdrawal are unavailable. Bowen concludes that the intention to quit, itself, can provide useful clues as to how these employees will behave.

**Burnout**

In contrast to the relatively small amount of research on turnover and turnover intentions in the social science literature, the construct of burnout has been the subject of widespread attention in the social sciences in the last fifteen years and is considered to be a serious concern in the human services. Burnout is the negative response to the stress encountered from working with persons over time, and most usually refers to the situation of employees in the human services professions. Although a number of definitions of burnout have been advanced, there is no one agreed-upon definition of burnout. Definitions vary in range, inclusion or exclusion of behaviors as causes and/or effects, and descriptions of the concept as a state, syndrome, or process (Carroll & White, 1982; Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980; Farber, 1983; Kahn, 1978; Pines, Aronson, & Kafry, 1981; Suran & Sheridan, 1985). Maslach (1982a) suggests that there are common threads to the various definitions of burnout, with general agreement that burnout is a negative internal psychological experience involving feelings, attitudes, motives, and expectations. Matthews (1990)
suggests that definitions of burnout tend to embody a sense of frustration and futility that generalize widely to degrade professional behavior, expectations, and evaluation of self and others.

A somewhat different conceptualization of burnout considers it as behaviorally manifest emotional and physical exhaustion deriving from stressful situational events not adequately met by effective coping strategies (Farber, 1984; Hoover-Dempsey, 1982). This definition takes into account the relationship of burnout to both stress and coping. While the concept of burnout has been applied to other settings, it is most commonly employed with reference to the work environment (Maslach, 1982b).

Many researchers maintain that burnout is a serious concern for the human service professions and is a major contributor to the low morale, absenteeism, tardiness, and high job turnover that occurs. They argue that burnout can be very costly, both in wasted training for those who quit their jobs and in psychological terms for those who stay, as well as being costly to agencies and detrimental to clients (Carroll & White, 1982; Pines, & Aronson, 1988; Shinn, Rosario, Morch, & Chestnut, 1984; Sanow & Krahmer, 1983). Matthews (1990) found that of human service workers, those who work in the social services are at highest risk of experiencing burnout.

A number of psychological and behavioral problems, including absenteeism, tardiness, vague somatic complaints, intrastaff conflicts, requests for transfers to other work areas, and turnover are among those consequences attribute to burnout (Carroll
& White, 1982; Pines & Aronson, 1988; Shinn et al., 1984; Sanow and Krahmer, 1983).

Maslach (1976; 1978; 1982a; 1982b) and Maslach and Jackson (1982) have pioneered a great deal of work on burnout. They conceptualize burnout as a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do "people work" of some kind. It is a negative response to the chronic emotional strain of dealing with other human beings, particularly when they are troubled or having problems, and these manifestations of burnout are a way of coping with this emotional strain. These authors maintain that although burnout has some of the same deleterious effects of other stress responses, what is unique about it is that the stress arises from the social interaction between helper and recipient. They further argue that a pattern of emotional exhaustion is at the heart of the burnout syndrome.

Cherniss (1982) asserts that although burnout has always been a problem, the environment in which professionals work has changed dramatically in recent years. As a result of social, political, and economic trends, stress has increased and alternatives have decreased. Among these trends, Cherniss cites unemployment, long-term demographic shifts, and changes in public policy. As a result of these changing conditions, job mobility both within and outside of organizations has decreased dramatically. Cherniss maintains that these changes are likely to continue and to become stronger.
Savicki and Cooley (1987) investigated the relationship of work environment and client contact to burnout among mental health professionals. (This is one of the few studies that specifically addresses stress, burnout and/or turnover among workers in community mental health). Although a number of job titles were represented at several different mental health facilities, none appeared to function in a case management capacity, as well as none having the title of case manager. The study found that work environments associated with low levels of burnout were those in which workers were strongly committed to their work, co-worker relationships were encouraged, and supervisory relationships were supported. The authors report that their findings are consistent with those of others who have utilized different measures of similar concepts (Barad, 1979; Pines & Kanfry, 1978).

Snibbe, Radcliffe, Weisberger, Richards, and Kelly (1989) examined burnout among primary care physicians and mental health professionals in a managed care health setting. They found relatively high levels of burnout and suggest that managed health care providers may be more prone to burnout than fee-for-service providers. In this study, as well as the others that have been described involving employees in community mental health, no case managers were included.

**Stress**

A more thorough review of the concept of stress is important to understanding a number of variables included in this model. Although stress has been studied for many years, there is no consensus of its definition, as many authors have noted
(Alussi, 1982; Beehr & Newman, 1978; Cofer & Appley, 1964; Hogan & Hogan, 1982; Janis & Levanthal, 1968; McGrath, 1976; Schuler, 1980). McGrath's definition of stress, that utilizes an ecological framework, is one that is now accepted by many. According to this conceptualization, stress is a condition that results from the interaction of person and environment which forces on the person a demand, a constraint, or an opportunity for behavior. Common to current conceptualizations of stress is the interaction of the person with the environment (Dewe, 1989).

Consistent with this ecological approach to the study of stress, this phenomenon is considered to occur only when the person perceives an external demand as exceeding his or her ability to deal with it. As LaRocco, House, and French (1980) espouse, stress is the perceived incongruence or lack of fit between person and environment. It is the individual's personal evaluation of the nature of the demand, of the available resources and personal skills, and the presumed outcome will account for the stress experience (Menaghan, 1980).

The idea that external environmental changes can disrupt the internal stability of the individual found its earliest scientific expression in the work of a French physiologist, Claude Bernard (1867). Later work was done by the American physiologist, Walter Cannon, who showed that (in addition to stimuli of a physical nature) psychological stimuli also could activate the physiological system of an organism. Cannon used the term "homeostasis" to refer to the internal state of
balance, and the term "stress" to refer to those reactions that produced a collapse of homeostatic mechanisms (Cannon, 1935).

The modern concept of stress, however, was most profoundly shaped by the extensive work of the Canadian endocrinologist, Hans Selye, popularly known as the "father of stress" (Selye, 1936; 1946; 1950; 1974; 1976). Selye discovered that tissue damage could result from diverse stimuli (such as heat, cold, X rays, and exercise), and was thus a nonspecific bodily response to any demand placed upon the organism. These demands are considered to be stressors.

The work of Selye and his predecessors, although enormously influential, was constrained by the focus on physical stressors and physiological stress responses (Maslach, 1986). Their biological approach, which traditionally directed attention to the (mainly short term) somatic reactions of organisms to aversive stimuli, was strongly attacked by several investigators (Vinderhoets, 1985). This criticism of Selye's biological perspective led to further investigations of the phenomenon in nonbiological spheres. Current stress research places far greater emphasis on psychological stressors as well as on psychological and social responses to those stimuli. This expansion of the concept of stress has resulted in a proliferation of new definitions, which has resulted in considerable disagreement about what stress is.

As has been previously considered, stress is most often conceptualized as a negative phenomenon. However Selye addressed both the positive as well as the negative aspects of stress. External demands can be challenges as well as threats and
can stimulate creativity and self-improvement. It is, however, the negative aspects of stress that will be considered herein.

**Stress in the Workplace**

One of the results of the recent emphasis on improving employees’ quality of life is a widespread investigation of job stress. While stress has long been a popular topic of research and theorizing in the health sciences, it has only recently attracted the renewed attention of many behavioral scientists (Jamal, 1990). The study of job stress in the work domain has increased in significance as stress in organizations has become recognized as a pragmatic contribution to the success or failure of organizations. Researchers in occupational stress have identified several components that are related to high levels of stress in work (Beehr & Newman, 1978; Caplan, 1972; French & Kahn, 1962; Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek & Rosenthal, 1964). Role conflict, role ambiguity, job overload, weak group support system, and lack of decision-making authority are some of the factors that are mentioned often. In addition, several models of job stress have been proposed in order to identify important predictors of job stress, as well as consequences of the phenomenon (Frew & Bruning, 1987; Invacevich, Matteson, & Preston, 1982; Jamal, 1984; 1985; Mottowidlo, Packard & Manning, 1986; Richard & Krieshok, 1989).
The Situation of the Case Manager

Case management has been heralded by many as an effective way to deliver service to vulnerable populations. Case management has been offered as the means by which a better fit between a client’s needs and the resources available in the community can be achieved (Modricin, Rapp, & Poertner, 1988). Roberts-DeGennaro (1987) maintains that the concept of case management combines the best ideas of direct-service practice with the best ideas of community practice on behalf of a particular at-risk population.

In addition to the widespread praises of case management in the literature, are the many accolades that are used to depict the important role of the case manager in the case management system. O’Connor (1988) hails case management as an advanced form of professional casework practice and a required technology for practitioners in complex service delivery systems that exist in many fields. As such, he maintains that the incorporation of case management principles into social work practice can enhance the professional’s potential to make unique contributions in providing coordination and integration among complex service delivery across fields of practice.

Harris and Bergman (1986) suggest that case managers, because of their unique position as a bridge between client and community resources, have the power to structure or create environments for clients that will allow them opportunities for growth while at the same time buffering them from pressures and stressors that might
prove overwhelming. Mechanic (1987), however, takes issue with this optimistic view of the powerful position of case manager. He purports that case managers typically have neither the training and experience, control over resources, nor professional standing to command resources from other organizations, or even be persuasive within them.

Epstein (1990a), in her investigation of stress, coping, and burnout among case managers, found that case managers experience a considerable amount of stress in their jobs. These stressors related to the nature of the job of case manager itself, situations within their particular agencies, interpersonal conflict as well as stressors related to the helping role that they perform and to the clients they serve. In addition, these stressors also related to the case manager’s role of interacting with other aspects of the community mental health system, general social welfare system, and the general community. In particular, case managers identified their difficulty accessing community systems and the lack of coordination between these systems.

This writer maintains that another problematic situation for case managers is that while the emphasis in the social services is on professionalization, with almost all jobs involving social work or counseling requiring that an employee be licensed, case managers cannot use their work experience to obtain either a license as a LISW (Licensed Independent Social Worker) or as a LPCC (Licensed Professional Clinical Counselor). (The position of case manager is an exception to current policy in the state of Ohio, as one does not need a license to work as a case manager.) Therefore,
the job of case manager is a "dead end" job. It cannot be used to advance in a career line. To become a case management supervisor, which might seem to be a logical promotion for a case manager, one needs to have either a social work or a counseling license (unless one is licensed as a nurse, psychologist or psychiatrist). As case manager is an entry level position, it might be expected that many persons would not remain in this position indefinitely. However, if case managers could use their experience at their job to advance to a supervisory or administrative position at some time in the future, it is suggested by this writer that they would be likely to remain at their job longer, as they would perceive it as leading to further advancement.

An additional problematic situation for case managers is the fact that they are often paid low salaries. Although the salaries of case managers vary by the agency at which they are employed, it often starts around $14,000. In a study by Epstein (1990b), a number of case managers identified low salaries as a problem. Both the low salaries case managers receive, as well as the lack of further advancement afforded by one's experience as a case manager, are likely to contribute to job dissatisfaction, as these are two of the factors that are often considered to be a part of job satisfaction (Locke, 1976; Smith et al., 1969). Therefore, the case manager, in performing his or her job, must deal with many stressors on the job, often work with difficult clients, negotiate the bureaucratic social welfare system on behalf of his or her clients, but is not greatly compensated by either salary or opportunity for advancement.
As has been previously considered, job satisfaction has been found to be negatively correlated with turnover (Locke, 1976). Cherniss and Egnatious (1978) found considerable job dissatisfaction among employees of a community mental health center. Pines and Maslach (1978), while they did not investigate job satisfaction per se, found many factors in their work environment with which employees of community mental health centers were unhappy. Dawkins, Depp, and Selzer (1984) also found many sources of dissatisfaction among persons who worked at community mental health centers. Only the investigation of Pomeroy (1980) found community mental health center employees basically happy in their work situation. It should be noted that none of these investigations were reported to be conducted on case managers.

**The Role of Case Manager**

There exists considerable ambiguity over the role of case manager (Kurtz, Bagarozzi, & Pollane, 1984). Various conceptualizations exist in the literature, where there is little consensus concerning what the role of the case manager should be. The role of case manager may include diagnostician, counselor, planner, service expeditor and provider, record keeper, client advocate, caseload manager, and community organizer (Kempt, 1981). Bachrach (1989) asserts that despite an apparent consensus in the literature about aims and objectives, confusion and controversy surround the case manager role. Because much of the case management literature is written from the rather abstract perspective of the policy planner, it therefore focuses on the case
manager as an enabler, systems coordinator and service broker (Bachrach, 1989). In contrast to the "service broker" model of case manager is the "clinical case manager" conceptualization. The central tasks of the clinical case manager have been defined as developing a relationship with the client, being available as a model for healthy behaviors, and manipulating the client’s environment (Harris & Bergman, 1987).

Not even community mental health center administrators agree on what the role of a case manager should be, or the level of education necessary to perform these functions. Kurtz, Bagarozzi, and Pollane (1984), in their examination of how case managers’ educational level, professional identification, and demographic characteristics influence their performance of case management tasks, found that administrators of mental health centers failed to agree on the level of education needed by case managers. Some thought that a master’s degree was needed, while others perceived case manager as a role that did not require any formal training.

Cargonne (1980) found that the lack of case manager clarity regarding expected tasks and activities was related to a low incidence of case management activities. That is, when case managers did not have a clear sense of what they were supposed to be doing, they spent a significant amount of their time in offering direct services (e.g., counseling) to clients. Intagliata and Baker (1983) also suggest that lack of role clarity presents a problem for case managers, and assert that case managers need clarity regarding exactly what is expected of them. Dill (1987) suggests that there are several dilemmas inherent in the case manager role that she
attributes to its function as an intermediary between formal organizations and clients. She maintains that the differing roles compete for the case manager's time and priority; moreover the requirements and responsibilities of some roles conflict with those of others. Underlying the role conflicts faced by case managers are differing expectations regarding their activities held by their own organizations, by other service agencies, and by clients and their families (Harrol, 1986; Mueller & Hopp, 1987). While conflicts of interest may occur between (or even within) any of these constituencies, several issues arise specifically because case management is governed both by the standards of formal organizations and by the need to maintain primary-group ties to clients (Dill, 1987).

Dill (1987) identifies still another problematic aspect of the case manager's role—that of the case manager's use authority. She suggests that clients' perceptions of case managers' trustworthiness and personal dedication may be undermined when case managers act as agents of the mental health system—for example, by instituting involuntary commitment proceedings.

Epstein (1990a) also found that some case managers experience role ambiguity. That is, it is unclear to them how much they are supposed to "do" for their clients, as opposed to what they should expect clients to do for themselves. Case managers are supposed to be available to help clients with whatever they need in order to improve the quality of their lives. On the other hand, the emphasis is also supposed to be on helping clients to become more self-sufficient, and to involve them in the
helping process, as considered earlier (Maluccio, 1981). For example, case managers reported that they often transport clients whom they believe are able to get places on their own, because they think that they are expected to do so. Case managers report that this role ambiguity is stressful to them (Epstein, 1990a).

In addition, there is often ambiguity and conflict within an agency and within a community mental health system concerning the role of case manager. A main tenet of the case management system is a focus on the client’s strengths, rather than on his or her weaknesses. Therefore, in accessing a client’s situation, it is the client’s strengths that are primarily to be considered. However, as case managers have asserted, it is the client’s weaknesses that may have produced many of the problems that he or she has in the first place, and, in the opinion of many case managers, it is these weaknesses that have be addressed in order for the client to function more effectively. This situation produces role conflict for many case managers (Epstein, 1990b).

Intaglia and Baker (1983) also consider the difficult and stressful circumstances that case managers encounter in performing their job. They describe the role of case manager in a manner that, in this writer’s opinion, accurately portrays many of the activities that a case manager performs, and makes appropriate conclusions based upon this depiction:

According to the observation of a number of researchers at various CSS sites, case managers of the chronically mentally ill are responsible for 25 to 35 highly demanding clients, providing assessment, linkage to needed social
services, monitoring of the service provided, advocacy as needed, counseling and crisis stabilization. Case managers are responsible for extensive documentation, attendance at staff meetings and at supervisor sessions, if held. In addition, if other direct service support staff are unavailable, case managers may be responsible for training clients in personal hygiene skills or use of public transportation and for offering any other assistance the client might need such as help with moving from one residence to another. In some sites, case managers are also required to be "on call" 24 hours a day. In short, case management is an extremely demanding and potentially overwhelming job. [Underlining is this writer’s].

A Consideration of the
Variables in the Model

Role Strain

Role strain is the term that is used in the model to refer to the construct that encompasses both role conflict and role ambiguity. Klenke-Hamel and Mathieu (1990) use the term role strains (plural) to include both these role constructs. The two are both considered together by many researchers, most of whom merely use the term "role conflict and role ambiguity." Role conflict reflects incompatible expectations concerning the job role. Role ambiguity refers to the lack of predictability of the outcome of responses to one’s behavior. As such, role ambiguity is uncertainty regarding what is expected on one’s job. Although the two constructs are sometimes included in the definition of felt stress, they are considered separately in this investigation, as it is being hypothesized that the concept of role is especially problematic for case manager.

Recent years have seen an increased interest in the use of role theory to describe and explain the stresses associated with membership in organizations. Within
an organizational context, the term "role" can be defined as a set of expectations applied to the incumbent of a particular position by the incumbent, and by role senders within and beyond an organization's boundaries (Banton, 1965; Gross, Mason, & McEachern, 1968; Neiman & Hughes, 1951). Since the 1950s there has been a significant body of literature on role theory, especially the constructs of role ambiguity and role conflict (e.g., Gross et al., 1958, Kahn et al., 1964; Neiman & Hughes, 1951). Role theory states that, when the behaviors expected of an individual are inconsistent, he or she will experience stress, become dissatisfied, and perform less effectively than if the expectations imposed on the individual did not conflict (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970).

The use of role concepts suggests that job-related stress is associated with individual, interpersonal, and structural variables (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Whetten, 1978). Lichtman and Hunt (1973) propose that role conflict and role ambiguity occur both as objective characteristics of a role, and as perceptual reactions of the role incumbent, which may or may not correspond with the objective characteristics of the role.

Role theory likewise states (Kahn et al., 1964) that role ambiguity—lack of the necessary information available to a given organizational position—will result in coping behaviors by the role incumbent, which may take the forms of attempts to solve the problem, to avoid the sources of stress, or to use defense mechanisms which distort the reality of the situation. Thus, according to role theory, ambiguity should
increase the probability that a person will be dissatisfied with his or her role, will experience anxiety, will distort reality, and will thus perform less effectively.

Some researchers have found that role conflict so permeates large complex organizations that designing jobs to avoid it completely may be impossible (Paul, 1974). Harrison (1980), in his consideration of role strain among child protective service workers, suggests that much of the role strain associated with this work appears to originate from the difficulty connected with integrating the general social work roles of advocate, broker, and enabler, and the specific demands of a setting in which the social worker operates under the authority of law, usually with involuntary clients. The integration of policies and practices often produce a set of contradictory expectations which the worker is expected to fulfill simultaneously. Harrison’s depiction of the particular situation of the child protective service worker is consistent with the general conceptualization of the more general, organizational causes of role ambiguity advanced by Kahn et al. (1964). These researchers assert that role ambiguity results from organizational size and complexity which exceed the individual’s span of comprehension, rapid organizational growth which is usually accompanied by frequent reorganizations, frequent changes in technology which in turn require associated changes in social structure, and frequent changes in personnel which disturb interdependencies.

Role conflict has been found to produce job dissatisfaction and felt stress, but the relationship among these variables is varied and quite complex. The research of
Kahn et al. (1964) and a number of subsequent studies have supported the general hypothesis that role conflict and role ambiguity are associated with lower levels of job satisfaction. One of the most pertinent studies was conducted by Rizzo et al. (1970), who provided both a review of the literature and a psychometrically sound pair of scales to measure the role variables. In some studies based on the Kahn et al. (1964) theory, role conflict was found to be more closely associated with job satisfaction than was role ambiguity; in other studies, role ambiguity was the better predictor.

The best-documented outcomes of role conflict are job dissatisfaction and job-related tension, which have been isolated among a variety of occupational groups (Beehr, Walsh, & Taber, 1976; Brief & Aldag, 1976; Brief, Aldag, Van Sell, & Melone, 1979; Gross et al., 1958; House & Rizzo, 1972; Miles, 1976; Oliver & Brief, 1977-1978).

Like the research on turnover, the majority of studies investigating role ambiguity have focused on for-profit organizations (Abdel-Halim, 1982; Batlis, 1980; Drory, 1981; Kahn et al., 1964; Lyonski, 1985; Nicholson & Goh-Swee, 1983; Schuler, 1980). Empirical examinations of role ambiguity in public not-for-profit organizations agree with studies of for-profit organizations in identifying intra-agency causes as determining factors associated with role ambiguity. However, Jayaratne and Chess (1984a) assert that much of the research in this area concerns child welfare workers and is nonempirical (e.g., Barrett & McKelvey, Harrison, 1980; Perlman & Hartman, 1982). Jayaratne and Chess (1984a) conducted a national study of stress
and strain among social workers in which they compared job perceptions of family service workers, community mental health workers, and child welfare (protective service) workers. They found similarities in levels of job satisfaction, burnout, and intent to change jobs among all three groups of workers, although the determinants varied by field of practice. Erera (1989) examined the extent of role ambiguity in public welfare organizations. He found that supervisors experienced considerable role ambiguity. Drolen and Harrison (1990) found high role conflict and moderate role ambiguity among state hospital social work staff.

Experimental and longitudinal studies of the effects of role ambiguity reveal that lack of clarity about behavioral expectations causes a great concern with one’s own performance, lower job satisfaction, increased tension, anxiety, depression, and resentment (Caplan & Jones, 1975). Kemery, Bedian, Mossholder, and Touliatos (1985) also found that job satisfaction and what they term "propensity to terminate employment" were associated with role conflict and role ambiguity. Lyons (1971) found that perceived role clarity (the opposite of role ambiguity) was related negatively to turnover and propensity to leave, and positively to job satisfaction.

Jackson and Schuler (1985) conducted a meta-analysis and conceptual critique of role ambiguity and conflict in work settings. They conclude that the average correlations between many organizational and context variables and both of these role constructs are substantial and significantly increased when corrected for unreliability. In contrast, they find that individual characteristics are generally not strongly related
to role conflict and role ambiguity. Further, their results show that the average correlations using role ambiguity are greater than those using role conflict, and that role ambiguity and role conflict are not always associated with the same variables, whether organizational or individual.

Therefore, while the number of studies which document the dysfunctional outcomes of role stress is large, only in about the last dozen years has research focused on organizational factors which may cause role stress or moderate its effect.

**Felt Stress**

The construct of felt stress refers to the psychological response state of disturbed affect experienced by individuals in relation to various job demands and constraints encountered in the work environment (Parasuraman & Alutto, 1984). As previously considered, a number of stressors are present in the work environment that have potential for causing a stress reaction in an individual. Felt stress is the particular response of the individual to these potential stressors. Parasuraman and Alutto (1984) maintain that consistent with McGrath’s (1976) conceptualization of stress as a response state of arousal, felt stress was treated as a primary psychological outcome directly related to stressor conditions. Felt stress is merely the extent to which stress is experienced by the individual. It is the immediate manifestation of the perception and experience of the many stressors in the environment that impinge upon the individual. Norbeck (1985) uses the term "perceived stress" to describe this same construct. The experience of stress has been found to influence both one’s level of

Gupta and Beehr (1979) consider the relationship between job stress and both absenteeism and turnover, which they consider as both withdrawal behaviors. As they assert, stress, by definition, is extremely aversive to most employees, creating a noxious situation in the work environment. As a result, the employee will try to avoid it by being late, being absent, quitting, or behaving in some other negative way. Therefore the higher the stress, the more unpleasant the work situation will be, and the more the individual will try to escape it.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is most often defined as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences (Locke, 1976). Some theorists, adapting an ecological perspective, have argued that an individual’s affective reactions depend upon the discrepancy between what one’s environment offers or what one attains, and what one has adapted to or expects (Ilgen, 1971; McClelland, Atkinson, Clark & Lowell, 1953; Spector, 1956). Other theorists have considered job satisfaction from a needs perspective. According to this orientation, it is the degree to which the job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of the individual’s needs that determines one’s degree of job satisfaction (Lofquist & Dawis, 1969;
Morse, 1953; Porter, 1962; Schaffer, 1953; Wofford, 1971). Combining these expectancy and needs theories of job satisfaction, Locke (1976) suggests that job satisfaction results from the appraisal of one's job as attaining or allowing the attainment of one's important job values, providing these values are congruent with or help to fulfill one's basic needs. Therefore, job satisfaction results from the attainment of values which are compatible with one's needs.

Job satisfaction in turn affect other attitudes a behaviors. Since one's job is part of one's life, it is logical to expect job satisfaction to influence life satisfaction. Kornhauser (1965), Iris and Barrett (1972), and Weitz (1952) have found significant correlations between attitudes toward the job and attitudes toward life.

Reviews of the relationship between measures of job satisfaction and turnover (e.g., Porter & Steers, 1973) have indicated a rather consistent, but weak, relationship.

Some behavioral scientists have been concerned with overall job satisfaction, while others have focused on various facets of satisfaction with work. Some of these facets that have received attention are satisfaction with pay, co-workers, supervision, promotion, and satisfaction with the work itself. Overall job satisfaction is sometimes conceptualized as intrinsic satisfaction, while particular components comprise external satisfaction. Some theorists have considered that overall satisfaction is composed of the sum of the various facets (e.g., Conway, Williams, & Green, 1987), whereas others have considered overall job satisfaction to be different from the sum of the facet parts (Scarpello & Campbell, 1983).
This research is particularly concerned, along with overall job satisfaction, with two aspects of job satisfaction: satisfaction with pay, and satisfaction with promotion. (The low pay and lack of promotional opportunities for case managers have been previously considered.) Many researchers have included these two variables as part of job satisfaction (Hom et al., 1984; Waters, et al., 1976). Brief (1976), in his model of turnover among nurses, found that pay dissatisfaction was positively associated with turnover. Smith et al. (1969), who have developed a measure of job satisfaction that has been used in hundreds of studies (e.g., Bartol, 1979; Mobley et al., 1978; Peters, Bhagat, & O'Connor, 1981), utilize satisfaction with pay and satisfaction with promotion as two of their five subscales to measure job satisfaction. Gruneberg (1979) strongly asserts that pay is an essential aspect of job satisfaction. As he maintains, pay means more to individuals than just the potential of acquiring material goods. It can be an indication of achievement or recognition or, conversely, of failure. Gruneberg further suggests that money means different things to different groups, and is likely to have greater importance for individuals who cannot gain other satisfactions from their job.

Organizational Commitment

Recent years have witnessed a marked increase in interest by researchers in the concept of organizational commitment. This interest has been expressed in both theoretical efforts to explicate the construct and empirical efforts to determine the antecedents and outcomes of commitment (Buchman, 1974; Hall & Schneider, 1972;
Hrebinak & Alutto, 1972; Kanter, 1977; Mowday, Porter, & Dublin, 1974; Porter & Steers, 1973; Porter et al., 1974; Sheldon, 1971; Staw, 1976; Steers, 1977). Interest in organizational commitment has been stimulated largely by its demonstrated negative relation to turnover. This construct has most often been considered with regard to the for-profit organizational setting. One exception is the investigation of organizational commitment and its relationship to other variables among nurses, the one group of human service professionals that organizational behavioralists have investigated (e.g., Jamal, 1990; Parasuraman & Alutto, 1984; Parasuraman, 1989). Throughout the various studies, commitment has been repeatedly identified as an important variable in understanding the work behaviors of employees in organizations.

Although approaches to the definition of organization commitment may vary considerably (Becker, 1960; Brown, 1969; Buchanan, 1974; Grusky, 1966; Hall, Schneider, & Nygren, 1970; Hrebiniaik & Alutto, 1972; Kanter, 1968; Salacik, 1977; Sheldon, 1971; Weiner & Gechman, 1977), certain trends are evident. In particular, many of these definitions focus on commitment-related behaviors. A second trend that has emerged is to define commitment in terms of attitudes. That is, attitudinal commitment exists when "the identity of the person [is] linked to the organization (Sheldon, 1971, p. 143) or when "the goals of the organization and those of the individual become increasingly integrated or congruent" (Hall et al., 1970, p. 176). This latter definition encompasses an ecological perspective.
Porter et al. (1974) propose that general attitudes toward the organization may have a greater impact on the decision to remain with the organization than more specific attitudes toward the job. Wiener and Vardi (1980) suggest organizational attitudes should be more strongly associated with organization-oriented outcomes, such as turnover intentions, while the most likely behavior to be affected by job attitudes would be task-oriented, such as work effort or performance. In addition, Jackofsky and Peters (1983) suggest that job turnover should have a strong relationship with job satisfaction, whereas organizational turnover should be more highly related to organizational commitment. Their reasoning was also based on the notion that job attitudes should be linked with job outcomes, and that organizational attitudes should be linked with organizational outcomes. Hinsz and Nelson (1990), in their testing of four models of turnover intentions, found that attitudes toward leaving the organization and subjective norms regarding leaving the organization formed the basis of the most predictive model of turnover intentions. They suggest that perhaps organizational commitment should be considered partly as an attitude toward actions taken regarding the organization (McCaul, Hinsz, & McCaul, 1989) and partly as subjective norms toward actions taken regarding the organization (Reichers, 1985). Morrow and McElroy (1986) found organizational commitment to be distinct from job involvement, work ethic endorsement, and other forms of commitment.

Committed employees have been found to be less likely to leave an organization than those who are uncommitted (Angel & Perry, 1981; Porter et al.,
1974). As Porter et al. (1974) assert, individuals highly committed to an organization’s goals and willing to devote a great deal of energy toward those ends would be inclined to remain with the organization in an effort to assist in the realization of such highly valued objectives. There has been comparatively little research examining the link between organizational commitment and work-relevant behavior, other than turnover or turnover intentions (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989). Probably because most of the research on organizational commitment has occurred in the for-profit sector, there is no research of which this writer is aware that considers the relationship between organizational commitment and burnout.

**Turnover Intentions**

Intentions is conceptualized for purposes of this research to include both a cognitive representation of both the objective or goal one is striving for, and the action plan one intends to use to reach that goal, as suggested by Tubbs & Ekeberg (1991). Behavior intentions refers to a person’s intention to perform or not perform a specific behavior. As previously considered, the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Fishbein, 1980) asserts that a person’s behavioral intention to perform (or not perform) a specific behavior is the immediate determinant of the behavior. This theory was designed to provide an understanding of complex decision-making processes, and has been applied to many diverse settings.
Turnover is often conceptualized within the large classification of job withdrawal behaviors (Gupta & Beehr, 1979). These behaviors include being late to work and absenteeism, as well as quitting one’s job. In many instances absenteeism and quitting are considered together.

The Relationship Between Role Strain, Felt Stress, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, Burnout, and Turnover Intentions

As has been previously considered, the organization behavior literature has examined, considered, and researched the relationship between a number of variables and turnover and turnover intentions. This research has been conducted primarily both in the for-profit sector and with nurses. The human service literature has investigated the incidence of burnout among a variety of human service professionals, including nurses, teachers and other educators, and social service workers. Although some studies in the human service literature have considered both burnout and turnover and/or turnover intentions, there has been little to understand and link the relationship between these several concepts. Some studies use the term burnout, and then measure job satisfaction (e.g., Harrison, 1980). Some consider burnout, but then do not measure it adequately (e.g., Shinn et al., 1984). Maslach (1987) asserts that there are theoretical, sampling, and measurement shortcomings in burnout research. Few studies have linked the findings in the management literature on the variables associated with turnover and turnover intentions with the studies in the human service
literature on burnout. Few, if any, have considered the relationship between organizational commitment and burnout.

Peters et al. (1981) examined the independent and joint contributions of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on turnover intentions. They note that although job satisfaction may partially influence organizational commitment, it is conceptually distinct from it. These constructs differ not only with regard to the focus of the referent (the organization as whole versus specific job facets), but also with regard to their hypothesized stability over time. In this regard, commitment represents a more stable, slowly evolving attitude than does satisfaction, which reflects a more immediate and changeable evaluative reaction to particular aspects of the job (Mowday et al., 1979; Porter et al., 1974). As Mowday et al. (1979, p. 276) state, "Although day-to-day events in the workplace may affect an employee’s level of job satisfaction, such transitory events should not cause an employee to seriously reevaluate his or her attachment to the organization." Peters et al. (1981) found that organizational commitment had a significant and relatively strong relationship to employees’ intentions to quit their jobs. They further found that, beyond commitment itself, satisfaction had both an independent and an interactive effect on turnover intentions. They suggest that, under certain circumstances, measures of organizational commitment may be more effective predictors of turnover than job satisfaction. They cite as an example that while the individual may be dissatisfied with either his or her pay or supervisor, a high degree of commitment to the organization and its goals may
serve to override such dissatisfaction in the decision to continue participation in the organization. Arnold and Feldman (1982) also found that both work attitudes correlated significantly with turnover intentions, though organizational commitment showed the stronger relationship.

Other researchers have examined the relationship between particular facets of job satisfaction and other work-related variables. These studies of facet satisfaction also have reported significant correlations between turnover intentions and satisfaction with the work itself (Hom et al., 1979; Kraut, 1975; Waters, Roach, & Waters, 1976) and pay and promotion (Hom et al., 1979; Waters et al., 1976).

Several researchers have considered the relationship between job satisfaction and burnout. Job satisfaction, as an older construct, has been investigated much longer than has the construct of burnout. Research has found that job satisfaction and burnout are different but interrelated phenomena (Harrison, 1980; Jayarante & Chess, 1983; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Quattrochi-Tubin, Jones, & Breedlove, 1982).

In Erera’s (1989) examination of role ambiguity supervisors in public welfare organizations, he found that one of three coping mechanisms employed by these workers who experienced role ambiguity was establishing a psychological distance, or an attitude of detached concern. This depersonalization is one of the components of burnout, as it is most commonly conceptualized, including as it is conceptualized and measured in this research.
Morris and Steers (1980) are among the few theorists who consider the relationship between role ambiguity and organizational commitment, in their examination of structural influences on organizational commitment. One of the variables in their study was perceived formalization, the extent to which written rules and procedures were available concerning the respondent’s role. They suggest that since highly committed employees are, by definition, desirous of working hard to accomplish organizational goals, the presence of written rules and procedures may help to ameliorate otherwise ambiguous situations, and thereby provide means to achieve those goals.

The Relationship Between Worker Characteristics to Burnout and Turnover Intentions

Gender

In the investigation by a number of researchers of the relationship between specific characteristics of workers and burnout and turnover intentions, several variables have been found to be correlated. One important characteristic is gender. In a review of the previous 50 years of turnover research, Muchinsky and Tuttle (1979) argue that there is a need to separate criterion groups by gender. They base this conclusion on research which has demonstrated different rates of turnover for males and females in similar jobs (e.g., Killbridge, 1961) as well as differences in the predictability of turnover for men and women doing the same job (e.g., Shott, Albright, & Glennon, 1963). Muchinsky and Tuttle’s (1979) position suggests that
work and external-to-work factors may impinge upon voluntary turnover among women differently than they do among men. Among such factors are the possible secondary wage-earner role of women, albeit a factor of declining salience and empirically demonstrated validity in recent years (Lyle & Ross, 1973), the differential impacts of family responsibilities on men and women, and the stronger competing demands which are placed upon working women (e.g., Hall & Gordon, 1973; Hoffman & Nye, 1974). An additional factor that Muchinsky and Tuttle (1979) suggest is the propensity for women to experience organizational roles differently than men, due to sex-role stereotypes which shape definitions of appropriate female behavior at work (Tipton, 1976; Gordon & Hall, 1974).

Himle, Jayarante, and Chess (1987) consider gender difference in work stress and burnout among clinical social workers. Many of the studies of burnout by gender have utilized the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach and Jackson, 1986), that comprises a portion of the research instrument that was used in this research. The Maslach Burnout Inventory consists of three subscales. Several studies have reported that females have scored significantly higher than males on the emotional exhaustion subscale (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; 1985; Jayaratne, Tripoli & Chess, 1983). On the other hand, a number of studies have reported no significant gender differences on various MBI subscales or on the Burnout Alienation Scale developed by Berkeley Planning Associates (Maslach & Jackson, 1985; Tripoli & Chess, 1983; Berkeley Planning Associates, 1977; Shinn et al., 1981; Justice, Gold, & Klein, 1987). Based
on the lack of a consistent pattern of gender differences in this measurement of burnout, Himle et al. (1987) examined the effect of selected job-related stress variables as predictors of burnout and selected psychosocial strains. They found that decreased emotional support from supervisors and co-workers are predictive of irritation, emotional exhaustion, and depersonalization for females, but not for males.

Hiscott and Connop (1989) examined gender differences in job stress and burnout among mental health professionals. They found that males were more likely to feel that they could create a relaxed atmosphere with patients, while females were more likely to believe that they were positively influencing other lives through their work. With regard to the emotional exhaustion component of burnout, males were much more likely to feel frustrated by their job, as compared to the females in the sample.

Other researchers who have considered the relationship between gender and burnout suggest that males are more prone to burnout than females because they are not as fully socialized to the helping role required by service providers (Burke & Greenglass, 1989; Daley, 1979; Thompson, 1980).

Another group of researchers have either found conflicting evidence or have found no significant relationship between gender and burnout. Gillespie and Numerof (1991), in their investigation of gender and burnout among health service providers, failed to find a significant relationship between the two. Maslach and Jackson (1985)
also found that gender was not a major factor in burnout. In contrast, Etzion and Pines (1986) found a greater incidence of burnout among women.

Other researchers have examined the relationship between gender and job satisfaction. Burke and Greenglass (1989) found that male teachers reported less job satisfaction than did female teachers. Weaver (1977), in his examination between job satisfaction and a number of variables in a national sample of persons employed full-time in a variety of occupations, failed to find support for a relationship between gender and job satisfaction.

Therefore, despite the many studies that examine the relationship between gender and variables in the work environment, the findings are inconclusive.

Age

Another important worker characteristic is age. A number of researchers have found a negative correlation between age and burnout (Epstein, 1990a; Numerof & Gillespie, 1991). It has been suggested that age is negatively associated with burnout because as service providers get older they bring into balance their expectations for helping others with what they have learned that they are able to accomplish (Daley, 1979; Gillespie, 1981; Numerof & Abrams, 1984).

Tenure

A third important worker characteristic is tenure. Tenure may refer to how long a worker has worked in his or her present position, how long a worker has worked at his or her present place of employment, and/or how long he or she has
worked in a particular field of employment. All three conceptualizations of tenure are relevant to a consideration of turnover intentions. Turnover has been found especially severe among new employees. (There is, as might be expected, a correlation between age and tenure.) Several studies have found that half of all turnover occurred during the first year of service in the organization (Price, 1977; Wanous, 1980). Tenure is negatively associated with turnover because, as with age, it is thought that one’s expectations align themselves more realistically as a function of experience, and it is also likely that with experience comes a greater tolerance for ambiguity (Numerof & Abrams, 1984). Gillespie and Numerof (1991), in their investigation which included of all three types of tenure, found experience in the field to be significantly negatively correlated with burnout. The type of tenure that seems to be more commonly investigated relates to the time that an employee has spent in his or her present position. Utilizing this conceptualization of tenure, Ferris and Rowland (1987) found that tenure interacted with absence to influence intent to leave. There are several reasons why distinguishing between the different conceptualizations of turnover may be of importance. In considering the construct of organizational commitment, tenure with the organization may be more relevant than tenure in one’s present position. Gaertner and Nollen (1989) found a strong positive relationship between length of tenure with an organization and what they term psychological commitment. Tenure in the field, especially in the human services field, may relate to the experience of burnout and the intent to leave one’s job, greater than tenure in one’s present position.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Question

The research tested a causal model of turnover intentions among case managers who work in community mental health (see Figure A). The primary research question was "What variables help to explain case managers’ turnover intentions?" It was hypothesized that role strain, felt stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and burnout contribute significantly to turnover intentions. These are the endogenous variables that are part of the causal model. In addition, a number of case manager characteristics were considered to be exogenous variables, outside of the model to be tested. These are the case manager characteristics that have been previously considered: gender, age, length of time as a case manager, length of time at an agency, and length of time in the human services field.

There are a number of causal relationships in this model of turnover intentions among case managers, which suggest that there are both direct as well as indirect effects of variables on other variables in the model. Role strain, as a particular stressor, was proposed to directly affect felt stress. Felt stress was proposed to directly affect both organizational commitment and job satisfaction negatively, and to affect burnout in a positive direction. In addition, according to the model, felt stress
affects burnout indirectly through both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Finally, the model suggests that both job satisfaction and organizational commitment have a direct effect on turnover intentions, as well as an indirect effect on turnover intentions through burnout.

**Research Hypotheses**

This model of turnover intentions among case managers tested the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis #1. The greater the role strain, the greater the felt stress.

Hypothesis #2. The greater the felt stress, the lower the job satisfaction.

Hypothesis #3. The greater the felt stress, the lower the organizational commitment.

Hypothesis #4. The greater the felt stress, the greater the level of burnout.

Hypothesis #5. The greater the job satisfaction, the lower the level of burnout.

Hypothesis #6. The greater the organizational commitment, the lower the level of burnout.

Hypothesis #7. The greater the job satisfaction, the lower the turnover intentions.

Hypothesis #8. The greater the organizational commitment, the lower the turnover intentions.
Hypothesis #9. The greater the level of burnout, the greater the turnover intentions.

Conceptual and Operational Definitions

Organizational commitment -- is conceptualized as a strong belief in and acceptance of an organization's goals and values, and a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization. This variable was measured by the short form of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Mowday et al. (1979). The original entire scale contains 15 items that measure three factors: (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values, (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and (3) a definite desire to maintain membership in the organization. In order to avoid concept redundancy, as proposed by Morrow & Goertz (1988), and as suggested specifically by Parasuraman (1989) as it relates to the concept of organizational commitment, the short form of the OCQ was utilized. This form consists of the first two factors of the original scale and is utilized when such a measure is more appropriate, as in instances such as this research, since the third factor of the original scale, desire to maintain membership in the organization, is part of the dependent variable, intent to quit. This nine-item form of the scale has also been used when a measure of shorter length is desired (Mowday et al., 1982). The short form of the OCQ is derived by eliminating the six items from the original, larger version of the scale that are negatively worded (Price & Mueller, 1986).
The Organization Commitment Questionnaire is the most widely used measure of affective commitment (Meyer et al., 1989). The entire 15-item Organizational Commitment Questionnaire has been used in a great many studies (Michaels & Spector, 1982; Morris & Steers, 1980; Mowday et al., 1984; Pierce & Dunham, 1987) and has demonstrated reliability as well as predictive, convergent, and discriminant validity (Mowday et al., 1979).

The nine-item OCQ has been utilized by a number of researchers in recent years (Blau, 1988; Blau & Boal, 1989; Curry et al., 1985; Gaertner & Nollen, 1989; Landau & Hammer, 1986; Lee & Mowday, 1987; Morris & Snyder, 1979; Parasuraman & Alluto, 1984). Blau and Boal (1989) found a Cronbach's alpha of .84 for the short form of the OCQ, while Gaertner and Nollen (1989) calculated an alpha of .896 for the nine-item measure in their research. Mowday et al. (1982) found the internal consistency for the short form of the OCQ "generally equal" to that of the full measure.

Responses to the scale items are linearly summed to create a scale score. Responses to the OCQ range on a seven point scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." A higher score on this scale indicates a higher degree of organizational commitment. The word "organization," that was originally used in the scale, was changed to "agency" in this research, as this terminology is more commonly used in the not-for-profit sector. Part A of the questionnaire is made up of the nine item organizational commitment scale.
Role strain -- is the extent to which an employee experiences role conflict and role ambiguity in one's job. Role conflict is the extent to which the various roles that comprise one's job are congruent with one another. Role ambiguity is the extent to which the expectations of one's job are clear and unambiguous. Role strain was measured by Rizzo et al.’s (1970) role conflict and role ambiguity scales, which consist of six and eight items, respectively. These two scales are very frequently used together to measure these two role constructs, and are usually considered as one scale. This scale has been used in hundreds of studies, both in the private and the not-for-profit sector (Bartol, 1979; Bedeian & Armenakis, 1981; Drolen & Harrison, 1990; Harrison, 1980; Parker & DeCotiis, 1983). According to Jackson and Schuler (1985), who conducted a meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings, approximately 85% of the research on role conflict and role ambiguity to that time had used these scales. Rizzo et al. (1970) provide evidence of their scale’s construct validity, as it relates to measures of organizational and managerial practices and leader behavior, as well as to member satisfaction and anxiety.

Schuler, Aldag, and Brief (1977) conducted an extensive analysis across six samples of the psychometric properties of the Rizzo scales. The results of their factor analysis and coefficient of congruency indicate support for the two-factor solution. Construct validity for the two scales was found based on the relationships between the two variables and both task characteristics and expectancy measures. Consistent
support was found for each scale across the six samples. Based upon their findings, Schuler and his colleagues suggest that further use of the scales is warranted.

Other investigators have also found evidence of the soundness of these two role scales. Szilagyi, Sims, and Keller (1976) reported congruency coefficients of .99 and .96 for role conflict and role ambiguity across a hospital and manufacturing sample. Bedeian and Armenakis (1981) conducted a factor analysis of the scales which confirmed the unidimensional structure of each of the scales.

Each portion of the scale is scored using a seven-point response mode ranging from "very false" to "very true." Both role conflict and role ambiguity (reversed) are scored so that the greater the score, the greater the perceived role strain. Part B of the questionnaire consists of this 14 item scale.

Felt stress -- is defined as feelings of disturbed affect, such as frustration, tension, being upset, and being under pressure and strain. This construct was measured by a nine-item measure developed by Parasuraman, Drake, and Zammuto (1982). In this study, for which the instrument was initially developed, these researchers found a Cronbach's alpha of .93 for the scale. This felt stress scale has also been used in four other studies by Parasuraman (Parasuraman, 1982; Parasuraman, 1989; Parasuraman & Alutto, 1984; Parasuraman & Hanson, 1987). The alpha reliability of this scale was reported by Parasuraman (1982) to be .90.

The measure asks respondents to report how frequently they are "bothered" by being frustrated, upset, nervous, tense, and under pressure and strain in relation to the
job. The felt stress questionnaire was developed from a set of items adapted from the 
Job Related Tension Index (Kahn et al., 1964), which is frequently cited in the 
literature, and Buck's (1972) Frequency of Perceived Job Pressure Index. Part C of 
the questionnaire utilized in this research consists of the felt stress scale.

Job satisfaction -- is conceptualized as both the extent to which an individual 
is satisfied overall with his or her job, and the extent to which the individual is 
satisfied with the pay that he or she receives and with promotional opportunities. 
Overall job satisfaction was measured by the Hoppock (1935) scale. This scale score 
is obtained by summing responses to the four questions (giving each item equal 
weight), yielding a score between four and 28. This scale was used by Parasuraman 
in several studies of nurses (Parasuraman et al., 1982; Parasuraman & Hansen, 1987), 
as well as by Manley and his colleagues (Manley & Karger, 1972; Manley, Gregory 
& McNichols, 1975), and Coverdale and Terborg (1980). In Parasuraman et al.'s 
1982 study a Cronbach's alpha of .79 was found for this four item scale. McNichols, 
Stahl, and Manley (1978) applied the Hoppock job satisfaction measure in a number 
of large-scale survey efforts using different target populations encompassing a variety 
of individual respondents. They found evidence of construct, concurrent, distribution, 
and convergent validity, as well as of reliability. McNichols et al. (1978) reworded 
the questions and responses very slightly in order to meet the requirements of the 
variety of populations that these researchers sampled. The wording that was used in 
this research is that of these authors. McNichols et al. (1978) also employed principal
component analysis to evaluate the correlation structure of the four questions that comprise the Hoppock scale, in order to examine whether they appear to be measures of a single factor, as well as to evaluate the appropriateness of simply summing the four responses to obtain a univariate measure of job satisfaction (Guilford, 1954). Strong support was found for the assumption that all four questions are measures of the same underlying factor. Cronbach's alpha values ranging from .758 to .890 were found for the four samples, thus demonstrating considerable reliability for the measure.

Satisfaction with pay and satisfaction with promotional opportunities were measured by two subscales of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) that was developed by Smith et al. (1969).

The JDI has been used either in its five subscale entirety, or one or more of its various subscales, in hundreds of studies. Most of the studies of job satisfaction in the for-profit sector have employed this scale (Martin & Hunt, 1980; Nicholson, Wall, & Lisheron, 1977; Roach & Waters, 1976). In addition, a number of studies in the not-for-profit sector have also utilized the measure (Harrison, 1980; Kosmoski & Kalkin, 1986; Leiter, 1988; Mobley et al., 1978; Porter et al., 1974). Not only is the JDI the most commonly used measure of job satisfaction (O'Connor, Peters, & Gordon, 1978), but it is also the most commonly used measure of satisfaction in research that compares the relative strength of relationships between turnover and both commitment and job satisfaction (Peters et al., 1981). The JDI has been described by
Robinson, Athanasiou, and Head (1969), Price (1977), and Schreisheim and Kinicki (1981) as the most carefully constructed measure of job satisfaction. Bateman and Strasser (1984) suggest that the reliabilities and validities of the several subscales of the JDI are "extremely well established." Yeager (1981) also suggests that one reason for the JDI's wide use is the care with which it was developed. Another reason for its extensive use is its application across a wide variety of demographic groups (Golembiewski & Yeager, 1978).

Schneider and Dachler (1978) assessed the stability of the JDI over time by administering the JDI twice within a period of 16 months to employees representing a wide range of occupational titles. Data analyzed within a Campbell and Fiske (1959) multitrait (JDI dimensions) - multimethod (Time 1-Time 2 administration) framework revealed good stability coefficients, and indicated that the five JDI subscales retain their relative independence over time. They found a stability coefficient of .66 for the satisfaction with pay subscale, and of .56 for the satisfaction with promotion subscale. Yeager (1981) performed a principal components factor analysis of the JDI to access its dimensionality. Although he found more than five dimensions to the scale, the pay and promotional opportunity dimensions remained relatively intact, just as they did in Smith et al.'s (1969) scale analysis.

Extensive reliability and validity data for the entire JDI and its subscales are provided by Smith et al. (1969), who describe in great detail the steps involved in the construction of the scale, as well as the findings of a number of validity studies. In
particularly, they provide evidence of the scale's discriminant and convergent validity. 

Further evidence of convergent and discriminant validity of the JDI was found by Gillet and Schwab (1975). Parasuraman (1982) found alpha coefficients of reliability for the pay subscale of .80, and for the promotion subscale of .79. Koch and Rhodes (1981) also found Cronbach's alpha of .80 for the satisfaction with pay subscale. Gillet and Schwab (1975) examined the convergent and discriminant validities of corresponding JDI and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) scales. Convergent validity was found to be significant well beyond the p<.01 levels for both the JDI satisfaction with pay and satisfaction with promotion subscales and the corresponding subscales of the MSQ. They also found discriminant validity between the corresponding subscales.

Each of these two subscales of the JDI contains nine items consisting of adjectives or descriptive phrases relating to the dimension of job satisfaction. Respondents are asked to describe their jobs in terms of these phrases by answering "yes," "no," or "uncertain." The instructions for scoring the scale ask respondents to place a "Y," an "N," or a "?" beside each scale item, corresponding to these three possible responses. Items with a "Y" next to them on the scoring key are scored in a positive direction, and those with an "N" on the scoring key are scored in a negative direction. The scoring for the different responses are as follows: "Yes" to a positive item ("3"); "No" to a negative item ("3"); ? to any item ("1"); "Yes" to a negative
item ("0"); and "No" to a positive item ("0"). The scores are then summed to obtain a total score for each dimension.

A number of studies employ more than one job satisfaction scale in order to measure both overall job satisfaction and facet satisfaction (Hom & Hulin, 1981; Miller et al., 1979; Mobley et al., 1978; Moss holder et al., 1988). Koys and DeCotiis (1991) refer to the appropriateness of dimension-saliency that is manifest whenever a researcher chooses to use some subset of a set of measures. As one of their examples of this practice, they use several of the subscales of the JDI. As they assert, choosing a subset of job satisfaction facets does not deny the existence of a larger universe of facets, nor their theoretical relevance to the concept of job satisfaction. Rather, it indicates that in a given context some facets are more salient than are those which the researcher chooses not to use.

Other researchers have utilized one or more subscales of the JDI. Koch and Rhodes (1981) used two of the subscales of the JDI in their investigation of turnover among female factory workers, including the satisfaction with pay subscale. Sherman (1989) utilized the satisfaction with supervision JDI subscale. Holland, Konick, Buffum, Smith, and Petchers (1981) utilized the "satisfaction with work itself" subscale. In this present research, a total job satisfaction score was computed by summing the scores to the Hoppock scale and the two JDI subscales, after each scale was converted to a standardized Z score, as suggested by Guilford & Fruchter (1978).
Part D consists of the Hoppock scale, and Part E consists of the JDI satisfaction with pay and satisfaction with promotion scales.

**Burnout** -- is the emotional exhaustion, depersonalization of clients, and lack of personal accomplishment that a worker experienced. This construct was measured with the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Maslach & Jackson, 1986), which consists of three scales, one for each of these three components of burnout. The Emotional Exhaustion subscale assesses feeling of being emotionally overextended and exhausted by one’s work. The Depersonalization subscale measures an unfeeling and impersonal response toward recipients of one’s service, care, or treatment. The Personal Accomplishment subscale assesses feelings of competence and successful achievement in one’s work with people. The MBI measures the frequency with which people have these feelings. The MBI, which is in its second edition, is the best known and most widely used scale for the assessment of burnout (Offerman, 1983). It has been used in a large number of studies and is considered to be a well-constructed, well-researched instrument (Dowd, 1985). Based on over 1,300 persons not used in item selections for the development of the scale, Maslach and Jackson (1981) report internal consistency reliability estimated by Cronbach’s alpha at .90 for the emotional exhaustion subscale, .79 for the depersonalization subscale, and .71 for the personal accomplishment subscale. Other investigators (e.g., Beck & Gargiulo, 1983; Iwanicki & Schwab, 1981) have found similarly high estimates of internal consistency. Evidence for the convergent validity of the MBI has been
obtained in several ways (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Further evidence of the validity
of the scale has been provided by Meier (1984) using Campbell and Fiske’s (1959)
multitrait-multimethod approach.

Separate scores are often obtained for each of the three subscales. High scores
on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales and low scores on the
Personal Accomplishment subscale are associated with high levels of burnout.
Burnout is considered as a continuous variable, ranging from low to moderate to high
degrees of experienced feeling. It is not viewed as a dichotomous variable, which is
either present or absent (Maslach & Jackson, 1986).

The majority of the hundreds of researchers who have employed the MBI have
considered the scores separately and not summed them up for a composite burnout
score. (The vast majority of these researchers have considered burnout only as a
dependent variable.) The most notable exception to this approach is the work of
Burke (1989a; 1989b; Wolpin, Burke, & Greenglass, 1991) who has added the scores
to obtain a general measure of the extent of burnout experienced. Burke has
conducted considerable research on the phenomenon of burnout (Burke, 1987; 1989a;
1989b; Burke, Shearer, & Deszca, 1984), as well as considering the phase model of
burnout that has been proposed by Golembiewski and his colleagues (Golembiewski,
considering Golembiewski's phase model of burnout, argues that burnout is more
accurately conceived of on a continuum, and that the three subscales are always
significantly correlated and therefore, the total score is not significantly different from the phase model. (Burke suggests that the phase model approach is a useful approach to burnout research.) Burke further asserts that the three subscales are conceptually distinct but not empirically distinct. Wolpin et al. (1991) report an alpha of .88 for the total MBI score.

In their examination of burnout and job satisfaction, these authors found that the largest amount of variance in job satisfaction was explained when the MBI composite measure was employed. Golembiewski and Munzenrider (1988) also compute a total MBI score, although they note that combining subscale scores is performed infrequently. In considering physical symptoms that result from burnout, these authors utilize a total score for all burnout items as well individual subscale scores and assignment to phases of burnout.

A number of other recent researchers have also computed total burnout scores (Fimian, Fastenau, & Tashner 1989; Arches, 1991). When a total burnout score is computed, the responses for the Personal Accomplishment subscale are reversed, and the scores for each of the 22 items are then summed. Part F of the questionnaire consists of the burnout scale.

Turnover intentions -- is conceptualized as the cognitions and behaviors associated with intentions to leave one’s job.

There is no one commonly used intent to leave scale, in spite of the large number of studies that use this construct as either the study’s criterion variable, or as
both an independent and dependent variable. This situation is in contrast to most of the other scales that comprise the questionnaires utilized in this research. As previously noted, the Job Descriptive Index, used either in its entirety or one or more of its subscales, the Rizzo role conflict and role ambiguity scales, the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, and the Maslach Burnout Inventory all have had widespread use. A considerable number of researchers have utilized a single item intent to leave or propensity to leave scale (Ferris & Rowland, 1987; Nicholson et al., 1977; Parasuraman, 1989; Sherman, 1989; Ward, 1989), although the wording that has been used has differed in various studies.

The intent to quit scale consists of a modification of a measure of intention to quit developed by Peters and Jackofsky (1979) and shown by those authors to bear statistically significant relationships to actual employee withdrawal behavior. This scale was also used by Peters et al. (1981) in their examination of the independent and joint contributions of organization commitment and job satisfaction on intentions to quit. Peters et al. (1981) obtained a reliability for this scale of .88. The second item of Peters and Jackofsky's scale was "I am actively looking for another job." This item was modified for the present research in order to include behaviors related to leaving one's present position other than finding another job. That is, some persons might be exploring options involving further education, while others might be taking steps to reduce their expenses or to pay off bills, in order to be able to leave their position. Therefore, although the Peters and Jackofsky scale has only one report of
reliability as well as one report of validity, it was utilized in this research, partly due to the fact that a three item scale is likely to be more reliable (Billings & Wroten, 1978; Carmines & Zeller, 1979) than the one item measures used by a number of researchers.

After the scoring of the third item is reversed, responses to the three items are summed to obtain a total score, with higher scores reflecting a stronger intention to quit. Part G of the questionnaire contains the intent to leave scale.

In addition to these seven scales, there are two additional pages to the questionnaire. The first of these pages (Part H) includes four open-ended questions which are included to obtain additional information from case managers about their perceptions of their job situation. These questions ask case managers what they like most about their jobs, what they like least about their jobs, if they could change one thing about their jobs, what would it be, and what, if anything else, they would like to reveal about their job situation. The addition of a short qualitative component of the research is included to obtain descriptive information that is of a different nature than data that can be obtained by employing closed-ended objective measures. The inclusion of a qualitative dimension to the research can, and, in fact, did, add a richness to the findings, different from that which is revealed by quantitative findings. These four questions do not directly pertain to model or hypothesis testing, but the information obtained about how case managers perceive their work environment might
be used to generate further hypotheses to be tested at a later time, by either this or another researcher.

The last page of the questionnaire asks case managers to reveal certain information about themselves, including their age, gender, and the three ways in which tenure has been considered, in order to examine the relationship between these personal variables and the organizational variables in the study. Therefore, the last page of the questionnaire asks for information that pertains to the exogenous variables that are not part of the causal model. Other information is asked for on the last page as well. Information on licenses is included in order to relate it to satisfaction with promotion and satisfaction with pay, as previously considered. Items on case managers’ levels and types of educational backgrounds are included for similar reasons. That is, these additional items are included to explore the relationship, if any, between particular case manager characteristics and the variables in the causal model.

Research Methodology

This research consists of a sample survey design in which a self-administered questionnaire was given to a sample of case managers in order to test the model of turnover intentions that has been proposed herein.

This researcher met with the case managers as a group at each of 14 sites (some agencies have more than one site), briefly explain the nature of the research, including the fact that their participation was voluntary, and asked them to complete
the questionnaire at that time, while the researcher waited for them to do so. The case managers were informed verbally that their responses to the questionnaire would be kept confidential. (In addition, the confidential nature of the research is described on the first page of the questionnaire.) Since some case managers were not able to remain to complete the questionnaire at the designated time, and others were not present, the instrument was left in self-addressed stamped envelopes for these persons to complete and mail back to the researcher, except for two sites where case managers were instructed to return the completed questionnaires to a designated person. These questionnaires were then either mailed back to this researcher, or were picked up from the agencies by her. Follow-up telephone calls were made to those respondents who did not return the questionnaires, requesting that they do so. In some instances numerous calls were made in an attempt to talk to a particular case manager. Almost all the case managers who did not return the questionnaire were contacted personally by this researcher, or a message was left on that person’s telephone answering machine. This aggressive follow-up strategy was employed in order to obtain as close to an exhaustive sample as possible, thereby minimizing sampling bias. There is no reason to suspect that those case managers who returned the questionnaire at a later time are in any way different from those case managers who completed the questionnaire in this researcher’s presence. Nor is there reason to assume that this researcher’s presence or absence during questionnaire completion influenced the responses given.
Questionnaire Pretest

The scale that has been previously described was pretested on the first twenty case managers that were part of the research sample. Pretesting the proposed research instrument served several purposes. It investigated whether the case managers who would be asked to complete the questionnaire might have any difficulties doing so, it ascertained the approximate time required to complete the questionnaire, and it assessed the reliabilities of the various scales that comprise the questionnaire. These first twenty subjects were treated no differently from the other case managers that comprise this sample, and were not told that they were part of a pretest.

No difficulties were reported by any of the persons that completed the questionnaire. All Cronbach's alphas except one were found to be .70 or higher, and ranged from .72 to .95, with most above .80. The one exception was the Satisfaction with Pay Scale, which was an alpha of .63. An examination of the reliability analysis for this scale revealed that if Item #2, "satisfactory profit sharing," were deleted, the alpha would increase to .70 and then meet this minimum criterion of .70. Since deleting this item from the scale made sense conceptually (as government or nonprofit agencies rarely, if ever, have profit-sharing as a benefit), this item was deleted from the questionnaires that were administered to the remaining case managers, and excluded from further consideration (see Appendix A for the revised Case Manager Questionnaire).
Sampling

The study used a convenience sample of all of the case managers who work with adult severely mentally disabled persons in community mental health centers in Cuyahoga and Summit counties in the state of Ohio. This convenience sample of the case managers from these two counties was selected on the basis of the willingness of the community mental health board and agency administrators from these two areas to cooperate with this researcher’s efforts. Prior to conducting the research, this researcher met with the Associate Director of the Cuyahoga County Community Mental Health Board and spoke over the telephone to the Assistant Director of Community Support Services (Summit County) to explain the nature and purpose of the research, and to solicit their support. This researcher obtained the written consent of each of these administrators to cooperate in the research study (see Appendixes B and C).

The case managers in this sample are somewhat representative of case managers in other large urban counties, and the sample includes both centralized and decentralized case management models. However, because the delivery of case management services is influenced by a number of variables in the work environment including different physical facilities, different supervisors, administrators and coworkers, different client populations, and different communities, it is difficult to ascertain the actual extent to which this sample is representative of case managers elsewhere.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Data Collection

A total of 170 case managers completed the questionnaire, 115 case managers from Cuyahoga County, and 55 case managers from Summit County. This total number represents a completion rate of about 92 percent, as there were approximately 185 case managers who worked at the nine community mental health centers in the two counties during the time period that the questionnaires were administered, excluding several new case managers who had only been employed at their agencies for a few days at the time that they were asked to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaires were completed between September and November, 1991. This researcher met with the case managers as a group at each of 14 sites (some agencies have more than one site), briefly explained the nature of the research, and remained while the case managers completed the questionnaire at that time (see Chapter Three for more information of the methodology employed).

Description of the Sample

Descriptive data on the case managers in the sample was examined (see Table 1). Of the 167 case managers who reported their gender, 67.1 percent were female (N = 114) and 31.2 percent were male (N = 53). The length of time that they worked
at their agencies ranged from less than one month to 25 years, with a mean tenure of 33.5 months (S.D. = 44.8) and a median of 24 months. The length of time that they worked as case managers ranged from less than one month to 12 years, with a mean of 28.6 months (S.D. = 24.8) and a median of 24 months, or two years. The total length of time that the case managers had worked in the human services field ranged from one month to 420 months, with a mean of 86.3 months, or just over seven years (S.D. = .83.92) and a median of 60 months, or five years. The case managers ranged in age from 22 years to 63 years of age. The mean age was 33.9 years (S.D. = 9.5), with the median age being 31 years.

With regard to education, 18 case managers (10.6%) reported that they had less than a bachelor’s degree, 116 held a bachelor’s degree (68.2%) and 28 case managers reported having a master’s degree (16.9%). (Most of the case managers who had less than a bachelor’s degree are from one agency that recently promoted a number of "case aides" to the position of case manager.) In addition, ten case managers were in the process of working on a master’s degree--four in social work, three in counselling, and one in another human service field. Of those case managers who had bachelor’s degrees, 24 are in social work, one is in counselling, 72 are in other human service fields, including psychology and sociology, and five are in other disciplines. Of those persons with a master’s degree, eight are in social work, 13 are in counselling, and two are in another human service field. (The remaining case managers did not indicate their majors.) Of the 94 persons who responded to the item
TABLE 1. CASE MANAGER CHARACTERISTICS  
(N = 170)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LENGTH OF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TIME AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.5 mos.</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>1 month to 25 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LENGTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TIME AS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CASE MANAGER 28.6 mos.</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>1 month to 12 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LENGTH OF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TIME IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HUMAN SERVICES</td>
<td>86.3 mos.</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>33.9 yrs.</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on Master’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (or missing)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSW</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISW</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on licenses possessed, 34 case managers reported that they were licensed social
workers (LSW), six were licensed independent social workers (LISW), and four were
licensed professional counselors (LPC). One case manager reported being both a
licensed social worker and a licensed professional counselor. Three other persons
reported that they had a license pending. Therefore, only half of the case managers
responding to this item reported having either a social work or a counselling license.

**Questionnaire Responses**

The responses to each of the scales that comprised the questionnaire were
examined. On all scales, higher scores indicate a greater amount of the particular
variable that is being measured. That is, for example, the higher the score on the
Organizational Commitment Scale, the greater the level of organizational commitment
(see Table 2).

The possible range on the Organizational Commitment scale (Part A) was from
9 to 63. One case manager had a scale score of 9, and four more respondents had
scale scores of less than 20. On the other end of the scale range, one respondent had
a scale score of 63, and ten more respondents had scores of 60 or greater. The mean
score was 44.14 (S.D = 12.34), the median was 47, and the mode was 54. Therefore,
these data suggest that case managers as a group possess relatively high levels of
organizational commitment. However, there are nine different "organizations" at
which they work, if the community mental health center is the unit of analysis, or 14
"organizations" if one considers the site the most relevant unit of analysis. Therefore,
TABLE 2. MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, RANGES AND CRONBACH’S ALPHAS OF SCALES USED IN THIS STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>44.14</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>9-63</td>
<td>.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Strain</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>18-81</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt Stress</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>9-45</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>9-25</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction With Pay</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>0-21</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction With Promotion</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>0-27</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>42.03</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>3-103</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intentions</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3-15</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it makes sense that organizational commitment varies considerably, as there are many
different organizations involved.

The possible range of responses on the Role Strain questionnaire (Part B) was
14 to 98. The actual responses ranged from 18 to 81, with a mean score of 50.0 (S.D.
= 14.07), a median of 51, and a mode of 52. Therefore, the case managers in this
sample experience relatively high role strain.

The actual responses on the Felt Stress questionnaire (Part C) span the total
possible range of 9 (with one respondent having this score) to 45 (with two
respondents having this scale score). The mean score was 27.50 (S.D. = 7.99), the
median was 27, and the mode was 26. Therefore, these data suggest that the case
managers in this sample experience moderate felt stress.

The possible range on the Overall Job Satisfaction questionnaire (Part D) was
from 4 to 28. The actual scores fell between 9 and 25. The mean score was 18.53
(S.D. = 3.80), the median score was 19, and the mode was also 19. Therefore, these
data suggest that the case managers in this sample have moderately high overall job
satisfaction.

Of particular interest are the scores on the Satisfaction with Pay scale (Part E,
Section I). The possible range of responses to the seven item scale was 0 to 21.
Thirty respondents, or 17.6 percent of the 167 persons responding to this scale, had
a scale score of 0. Another ten case managers had a score of 1, and a total of 77 case
managers had a score of 5 or less, representing 45.3 percent of those case managers
who completed this scale. The mean scale score was 6.443 (S.D. = 5.434), the median was 6.0, and the mode, 0. Satisfaction with pay had been conceptualized as an important component of total job satisfaction, as it had been postulated that the pay received by case managers was problematic. The findings of this research support this position—that a great many case managers experience very low satisfaction with the pay that they receive.

Twenty-seven respondents, 15.9 percent of those who completed the Satisfaction with Promotion scale (Part E, Section II), had a score of 0, and a total of 76 case managers, or 44.7 percent of those responding, had a score of 5 or less out of a possible maximum of 27. The mean score was 7.38 (S.D. = 6.92), the median was 6 and the mode was 0. Thus, as was also suggested to be the situation by this researcher, the case managers in this sample were found to experience low satisfaction with opportunities for promotion.

In order to compute a total job satisfaction score, the three satisfaction scores were converted to z scores, due to the fact that two different types of scales were employed to assess job satisfaction, one for satisfaction with pay and promotion, and another for overall job satisfaction. These z scores were then added to compute a total job satisfaction score. Converting scores to z, or standard, scores and then combining them is commonly employed, and has been suggested by many statisticians (Guilford & Fruchter, 1978; Roscoe, 1975).
The Burnout scale scores (Part F) ranged from 3 to 103, out of a possible range of 0 to 132, with a mean of 42.03 (S.D. = 18.36), a median of 42, and a mode of 29. Thus, the case managers in this sample appear to experience moderate burnout. Missing data on the Burnout scale was treated differently from missing data on all the other scales that comprise the questionnaire. With regard to other scales, in two instances, case managers omitted completely one or more entire scales, probably inadvertently, through skipping one or more pages. However, on the Burnout scale, which consists of 22 items, several respondents omitted only a few items, and several commented to this researcher about their inability to respond appropriately to one or more items, or made written remarks on that page of the questionnaire about their difficulty in responding appropriately. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1986) which comprises this scale is in its second edition. The first edition consisted of the same list of 22 items to which the person completing the scale was to respond twice—once on a frequency dimension and once on an intensity dimension. Because these responses were found to be highly correlated, the second edition of the scale was shortened to include only the frequency dimension. However, several comments by case managers in this research to particular scale items indicated that a response based on the frequency of one’s experience was inappropriate. Therefore, it did not seem appropriate to exclude an entire scale score because of several missing items, as the missing items were not random. Instead, as suggested by Cohen and Cohen (1983), the scale mean was substituted for the missing items, and a total scale
score computed on this basis. There were seven questionnaires with missing items on the burnout scale, for which this substitution was made.

The possible range of scores for the Turnover Intentions scale (Part G) was 3 to 15. Twenty-six persons, or 15.3 percent of those responding, reported the lowest intent to leave, with a scale score of 3, and 59 case managers had a score of 5 or less. Therefore, just over one-third of the 169 case managers who completed this scale, reported very low intentions to leave their jobs. Ten case managers, or 5.9 percent of respondents, persons had a score of 15, and therefore the highest intention to leave their jobs. A total of 25 case managers, or 14.8 percent, had very high intentions to leave, with scores between 13 and 15. For the Turnover Intentions scale, the mean scale score was 7.615 (S.D. = 3.710), the median was 7.0, and the mode was 3. This mean score is similar to the mean turnover intentions score of 7.71 (S.D., 3.20) reported by Peters et al. (1981) who utilized the same basic scale in their investigation of turnover intentions of subjects covering a broad range of jobs and organizational levels in a variety of organizations (N = 175). Therefore, contrary to what had been suggested by this researcher, and contrary to the high turnover rate that has existed in the past, the case managers in this sample were found to possess only moderate intentions to leave their jobs. Perhaps this is due to the poor economic conditions that existed at the time that this research was conducted. That is, as suggested by Drehery and Dougherty (1980), as well as by March and Simon’s (1958) early model of organizational withdrawal, that were considered earlier, the perceived alternatives to
the present situation are a factor in a consideration of both turnover intentions and turnover.

**Scale Reliabilities**

Cronbach’s alphas were computed for each of the scales in order to ascertain their reliabilities. With one exception, these reliabilities were found to be between .829 and .935.

A standardized alpha of .9345 was found for the Organizational Commitment scale. A standardized alpha of .8544 was computed for the Role Strain questionnaire. For the Felt Stress scale, a standardized alpha of .9371 was found. The four-item Overall Job Satisfaction scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of .8287. The lowest of all the alphas was found for the Satisfaction with Pay scale---.7081, which is above the .70 level usually considered acceptable. Promotion with pay had an alpha of .8613. When the Satisfaction with Pay and the Satisfaction with Promotion scales were considered together as one scale, a standardized alpha of .883 was found. For the Burnout scale, the standardized alpha was found to be .8757. A standardized alpha of .8981 was found for the three-item turnover intentions scale.

Therefore, acceptable to quite high reliabilities were found for all the scales utilized in this research (see Table 2 for scale reliabilities).

**Factor Analysis**

Confirmatory factor analyses were performed for all of the scales utilized in the research. An examination of the factor structure for each of the scales revealed
no great discrepancies in the factor structure for any of the scales. Therefore, the
factor structure of all the scales was confirmed by the analyses.

Hypothesis Testing

An examination of the correlation matrix of the endogenous variables in the
model revealed that for all nine of the hypotheses proposed by the research, the null
hypotheses of no difference could be rejected (see Table 3):

Hypothesis #1. The greater the role strain, the greater the felt stress.

A significant correlation of .4923 (p<.001) was found between these variables.
Therefore, a highly significant, positive moderate correlation was found between role
strain and felt stress.

Hypothesis #2. The greater the felt stress, the less the job satisfaction.

A significant correlation of -.5400 (p<.001) was found between felt stress and
job satisfaction. Hence, a positive, moderate correlation was also found between felt
stress and job satisfaction.

Hypothesis #3. The greater the felt stress, the less the organizational
commitment.

A significant correlation of -.2723 (p<.001) was found between felt stress and
organizational commitment. Therefore, a relatively weak, but highly significant
negative correlation was found between felt stress and organizational commitment.

Hypothesis #4. The greater the felt stress, the greater the burnout.
TABLE 3. CORRELATION MATRIX OF ENDOGENOUS VARIABLES IN ORIGINAL MODEL*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Felt Stress</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Strain</td>
<td>.4923</td>
<td>-.4545</td>
<td>-.4623</td>
<td>.4460</td>
<td>.4185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.5400</td>
<td>-.2723</td>
<td>.6344</td>
<td>.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.5587</td>
<td>-.6125</td>
<td>-.6595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.4280</td>
<td>-.4888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All correlations are significant at $p < .001$
A significant correlation of .6344 (p<.001) was found between felt stress and burnout. Thus, a moderately high, significant positive correlation was found between felt stress and burnout.

**Hypothesis #5. The greater the job satisfaction, the lower the level of burnout.**

A significant and moderately high correlation of -.6125 (p<.001) was found between these two variables. Thus, job satisfaction and burnout were found to have a highly significant and negative correlation with one another.

**Hypothesis #6. The greater the organizational commitment, the lower the level of burnout.**

A significant correlation of -.4280 (p<.001) was found between organizational commitment and burnout. Therefore, a moderate, highly significant, negative correlation between organizational commitment and burnout was found.

**Hypothesis #7. The greater the job satisfaction, the lower the turnover intentions.**

A significant and moderately high correlation of -.6595 (p<.001) was found between job satisfaction and intent to leave one’s job. This correlation was the highest among those correlations that relate to all nine hypotheses, as well as the highest correlation among all the correlations between any of the variables in the model.

**Hypothesis #8. The greater the organizational commitment, the lower the turnover intentions.**
A significant correlation of -.4888 (p<.001) was found between organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Therefore, a highly significant, moderate, negative correlation was found between case managers' commitment to their agencies, and their intentions to their jobs.

**Hypothesis #9. The greater the burnout, the greater the turnover intentions.**

A significant correlation of .4907 (p<.001) was found between these two variables. Therefore, a highly significant, moderate positive correlation was found between the burnout experienced by case managers and their intentions to leave their jobs.

Therefore, all nine of the hypotheses can be accepted and were found to be highly significant with a p<.001 in all instances.

**Path Analysis**

Path analysis was utilized to examine the relationship between the variables in the causal model. Path analysis is a data analytic technique using standardized multiple regression equations in examining theoretical models (Miller, 1983). In all instances, listwise deletion of missing data was employed. This method was utilized based on Cohen and Cohen's (1983) assertion that pairwise deletion often gives nonrepresentative results. A number of ordinary least square regression equations were computed to obtain path estimates, which are standardized partial regression coefficients, or betas, after it was determined that the necessary assumptions had been met. These assumptions, necessary to utilize path analysis, are that the model is
linear, additive, and nonrecursive, that measurement is conducted at the interval level, and that the residuals are uncorrelated. The first three of these assumptions are stipulated by the proposed model. With regard to measurement, all the instruments used in the research were interval level measures. In order to test the uncorrelated residual assumption, considered to be an important one not to violate, several computations were made. A number of regression equations were computed in which the endogenous variables were regressed on the dependent variables, according to the proposed causal model. Residuals were computed for each of the endogenous variables and a correlation matrix of all these variables and their residuals was computed. An examination of this correlation matrix revealed that the residuals were all uncorrelated and normally distributed. That is, as required, a given residual was found to be correlated neither with other variables that precede it in the model, nor with other residuals.

The residuals were also examined to ascertain whether there was heteroscedasticity—the situation in which the error term in a regression model does not have constant variance (Berry & Feldman, 1985). Heteroscedasticity is an important consideration in assessing the adequacy of a regression model (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). This examination was performed by plotting the residuals for each variable. An examination of each of these plots revealed that the residuals were fairly normally distributed. Histograms of the distribution of residuals were also examined to ascertain their distribution, and a fairly close to normal distribution was also found.
by this examination. Therefore, heteroscedacity was not determined to be an inhibiting factor.

A further important consideration in path analysis is that of measurement error. Billings and Wroten (1978) propose that errors should be minimized by careful construction of items, the use of multiple items or indicators, adequate pretesting of measures, and the assessment of reliability of measures. This research has included all of these methods. For the most part, as previously described, well-established research instruments have been employed. All scales have multiple measures. Of particular importance, turnover intentions has been measured by a three-item scale, rather than by a single-item measure, as has very often been employed to measure this variable. The pretesting of the measures for this sample has been previously reported, as have the scale reliabilities.

A correlation matrix of the exogenous and endogenous variables was computed and examined. Contrary to what had been expected, gender did not correlate significantly with any of the endogenous variables. Age was found to have a negative correlation with three of the endogenous variables. An r of -.201 was found between age and job satisfaction (p<.01), an r of -.294 between age and burnout (p<.001), and an r of -.263 between age and turnover intentions (p = .001). Two weak correlations were found between length of time as a case manager and the endogenous variables. A correlation of -.134 was found with job satisfaction, and of -.136 with organizational commitment. Both of these correlations were significant at p<.05.
Only one weak correlation was found between length of time at the agency and the endogenous variables—that of .134 with role strain (p<.05). Two weak correlations were also found between length of time in the human services field and burnout (r = -.1618), and length of time in the human services field and turnover intentions (r = -.1817). Both of these correlations were significant at the .05 probability level. Therefore, the highest correlations between the exogenous and endogenous variables occurred between age and three endogenous variables. These three negative correlations ranged between -.2014 and -.2939. While significant correlations were found between all three of the tenure variables and the endogenous variables, the highest correlation was -.1817.

The first regression analysis that was performed included both the five exogenous variables as well as the model's six endogenous variables. The five exogenous variables—gender, age, length of time at the agency, length of time as a case manager, and length of time in the human services field, were entered into the equation in Block One, in order to ascertain their total effect on turnover intentions. An adjusted R\(^2\) of .095 was found (p<.01). Therefore, these five variables account for less than ten percent of the variance in turnover intentions. An examination of the betas for these variables revealed that only two were significant. Age had a beta of -.275, and length of time as a case manager had a beta of .191. Both betas were significant at p<.05. Because age, gender, and the three variables relating to tenure are considered exogenous, they will be excluded from further consideration, as they
are considered to be outside of the model under consideration, and all the analyses that follow pertain only to the six endogenous variables in the causal model that was proposed.

A regression analysis incorporating all six of these endogenous variables revealed an $R^2$ of .458 for the entire model ($N = 163$). Thus, the amount of variance explained by the five independent variables on turnover intentions is almost 46 percent (see Table 4). This compares favorably with other research on turnover intentions. For example, Parasuraman (1989), in her model on turnover among nurses, found that 38 percent of the variance in turnover intentions was explained by the variables that preceded it in the model. And Peters et al. (1981), utilizing a similar measure of turnover intentions, found that their model explained 44 percent of the variance in turnover intentions, the dependent variable in their research. As previously considered with regard to the residual analysis, other regression analyses were performed on the other dependent variables in the causal model. A significant path of .4923 was found between role strain and felt stress ($p < .001$), when role strain is the only variable regressed on felt stress. A significant path of .4784 was found between felt stress and burnout. Other significant paths were found between felt stress and job satisfaction (-.3983), and between job satisfaction and burnout (-.2624). All of these other path coefficients were also found significant at $p < .001$. However, the path coefficients for the four other paths proposed by the model were not found to be significant at $p < .05$, including all three of the paths involving organizational
### Table 4. Regression of Variables on Turnover Intentions in Original Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-1.15187</td>
<td>.18757</td>
<td>-.51335</td>
<td>-6.141</td>
<td>.0000 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Strain</td>
<td>.02839</td>
<td>.01934</td>
<td>.10576</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>.1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>-.03445</td>
<td>.02225</td>
<td>-.11445</td>
<td>-1.549</td>
<td>.1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt Stress</td>
<td>-.04959</td>
<td>.03767</td>
<td>-.10648</td>
<td>-1.316</td>
<td>.1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>.66493</td>
<td>.36672</td>
<td>.15099</td>
<td>1.813</td>
<td>.0717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>7.80844</td>
<td>1.60779</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.857</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001
commitment. These are the paths between felt stress and organizational commitment, organizational commitment and burnout, and organizational commitment and turnover intentions. In addition, the path between burnout and turnover intentions was not significant. Therefore, of the nine paths proposed by the model, only five were found to be significant at \( p < .05 \), when regressed on the variables as proposed by the model. Additional paths among the endogenous variables that were not hypothesized by the model were also considered. An examination found two additional paths to be significant. A path of \(-.2481\) was found between role strain and job satisfaction \((p = .001)\), and a path of \(-.4319\) was found between role strain and organizational commitment \((p < .001)\). Thus, it appears that role strain is more important than initially considered, by impacting indirectly on turnover intentions through two additional variables in the model, as well as significantly affecting felt stress, which has an indirect effect on turnover intentions. In addition, the only path found to be significant as it relates to organizational commitment is that from role strain.

The effects of the variables in the model were decomposed into their direct and indirect effects (see Table 5). Indirect effects are those parts of a variable’s total effect which are transmitted or mediated by variables specified as intervening between the cause and effect. That is, they indicate how much of a given effect occurs because changes in an antecedent variable lead to changes in other variables, which in turn change the consequent variable. The direct effect of one variable on another is simply that part of its total effect which is not transmitted via intervening variables,
TABLE 5. TOTAL EFFECTS OF VARIABLES ON OTHER VARIABLES IN THE ORIGINAL MODEL OF TURNOVER INTENTIONS
(N = 170)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Felt Stress</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Strain</td>
<td>.4784 D</td>
<td>-.2481 D</td>
<td>-.4319 D</td>
<td>.3505 I*</td>
<td>.2327 I**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt Stress</td>
<td>-.3983 D</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5829***</td>
<td>.2048****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I&amp;D</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.2624 D</td>
<td>-.5143 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = Direct effects only
I = Indirect effects only
D&I = Both direct and indirect effects
NS = Paths hypothesized by the models not found significant at p < .05

* Role Strain-->Job Satisfaction-->Burnout = .0635
Role Strain-->Felt Stress-->Burnout = .2355
Role Strain-->Felt Stress-->Job Satisfaction-->Burnout = .0515

** Role Strain-->Job Satisfaction-->Turnover Intentions = .1130
Role Strain-->Felt Stress-->Turnover Intentions = .0974

*** Felt Stress-->Job Satisfaction-->Burnout = .1048
Felt Stress-->Burnout = .4784

**** Felt Stress-->Job Satisfaction-->Turnover Intentions = .2048
i.e., it is the effect which remains when intervening variables are held constant (Alwin & Hauser, 1975). The total effect of role strain on turnover intentions was found to be .2327, with an indirect effect through job satisfaction of .1130, and through felt stress and job satisfaction of .0974. Felt stress had an indirect effect of .2048 on turnover intentions of .2048 through job satisfaction. Job satisfaction had only a direct effect on turnover intentions of -.5143, as previously considered, since although job satisfaction had a significant path coefficient on burnout of -.2624, the path of burnout on turnover intentions was not significant. Since both role strain and felt stress have significant negative effects on job satisfaction, they therefore have an indirect effect on turnover intentions.

Therefore, when job satisfaction is included in the model on turnover intentions, the effects of burnout and organizational commitment are not significant, although the correlations between both of these variables and turnover intentions are moderate and significant, with a correlation of .4907 between burnout and turnover intentions, and a correlation of -.488 between organizational commitment and turnover intentions. The correlation between role strain and turnover intentions ($r = .4185$), and the correlation between felt stress and turnover intentions ($r = .3500$) are significant at $p<.001$, as are the correlations between turnover intentions and the other variables.

Possible explanations for the finding of insignificant paths were considered. One reason that variables are sometimes not significant in a regression equation is due
to high multicollinearity among variables. Although the correlations among these variables are moderately high, they are not extreme, utilizing the criterion of above .80, that is usually employed (Billings and Wroten, 1978).

Another method for detecting high multicollinearity was conducted, as Berry and Feldman (1985) postulate that a severe multicollinearity problem may not be detected in bivariate correlations; one independent variable may be approximately a linear combination of several other independent variables in the model, yet that variable may not be highly correlated with any other single independent variable. They further suggest that it is very difficult to define a cutoff value that will always be appropriate. Therefore, Berry and Feldman (1985) offer what they consider to be a preferable test for multicollinearity, that of regressing each independent variable in the equation on all the other independent variables, in order to examine the $R^2$ for these regressions; if any are close to 1.00, there is a high degree of multicollinearity present. This procedure was performed, and the $R^2$ of these regression equations ranged from .207 to .505; none were close to 1.00. Therefore, high multicollinearity was not found between any of the variables, utilizing either of these methods of detection, and thus does not appear to account for the paths that were not found to be significant.

The next consideration involved whether organizational commitment and burnout should, in fact, be included in the causal model of turnover intentions, or whether the model should be "trimmed" by deleting one or both of these variables.
From a statistical perspective, one could justify deleting both these variables because of the paths that were not found to be significant, and thereby trimming the model. This would be consistent with one of the two common methods of deleting nonmeaningful paths from a causal model (Heise, 1969): deleting those variables with coefficients that are not statistically significant, and deleting those paths whose coefficients are "small," usually less than .10 or .05.

Two additional regression analyses were performed, each one excluding from the model under consideration one of the two variables that had been hypothesized to directly explain turnover intentions, but not found to significantly do so. That is, one regression analysis excluded organizational commitment but included burnout, and one excluded burnout but included organizational commitment. These analyses were conducted in order to determine whether the paths of each of these variables would be found significant if the effects of the other were absent.

With burnout excluded from the model, an adjusted $R^2$ of .450 was found for the model, which is very close to the $R^2$ of .458, that is explained by the full model (see Table 6). However, only the path to turnover intentions found to be significant at $p<.05$ was still job satisfaction, which was significant at $p<.001$. Therefore, excluding burnout from the model did not result in a significant path between organizational commitment and turnover intentions. An examination of the residuals in this model revealed that they were significantly and highly correlated, an indication that an important variable was missing from this model.
### TABLE 6. REGRESSION OF VARIABLES ON TURNOVER INTENTIONS IN MODEL WITH BURNOUT EXCLUDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-1.252184</td>
<td>0.180515</td>
<td>-0.558060</td>
<td>-6.937</td>
<td>.0000 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Strain</td>
<td>0.030381</td>
<td>0.019443</td>
<td>0.113184</td>
<td>1.563</td>
<td>.1202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>-0.040285</td>
<td>0.022174</td>
<td>-0.133823</td>
<td>-1.817</td>
<td>.0711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt Stress</td>
<td>-0.020658</td>
<td>0.034375</td>
<td>-0.044359</td>
<td>-.601</td>
<td>.5487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.421452</td>
<td>1.583179</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.319</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001
When organizational commitment was excluded from the model, an adjusted $R^2$ of .451 was found, very close to the .458 variance explained by the full model (see Table 7). This model yielded a relatively weak but significant path of .1675 between burnout and turnover intentions ($p<.05$). A significant path of .5678 was found between job satisfaction and turnover intentions in this model ($p<.001$). Thus, when organizational commitment is excluded from the model and the other four variables are regressed on turnover intentions, burnout is found to have a significant direct effect on turnover intentions (see Table 7).

Other regression analyses were conducted on the dependent variables in this model that excluded organizational commitment. When role strain was regressed on felt stress, a significant beta of .4923 was found ($p<.001$) and the $R^2$ was .2378. Role strain was also found to have a significant path of -.2482 ($p = .001$) when regressed on job satisfaction, as was felt stress which had a path of -.4166 ($p<.001$). When both role strain and felt stress were regressed on job satisfaction, an adjusted $R^2$ of .3294 was found. When role strain, felt stress and job satisfaction, were regressed on burnout, 50.19 percent of the variance was explained, and two additional significant paths were found. A path of -.3571 was found between job satisfaction and burnout, and a path of .3976 between felt stress and burnout. Both of these paths are significant at $p<.001$. An examination of the residuals in the model with turnover intentions as the dependent variable, that excludes organizational commitment, found
### TABLE 7. REGRESSION OF VARIABLES ON TURNOVER INTENTIONS IN REVISED MODEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>0.734865</td>
<td>0.363931</td>
<td>0.167634</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>0.0451*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Strain</td>
<td>0.035846</td>
<td>0.018543</td>
<td>0.134389</td>
<td>1.933</td>
<td>0.0550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-1.273249</td>
<td>0.173197</td>
<td>-0.567837</td>
<td>-7.351</td>
<td>0.0000 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt Stress</td>
<td>-0.062048</td>
<td>0.037121</td>
<td>-0.134101</td>
<td>-1.671</td>
<td>0.0966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>6.117436</td>
<td>1.102030</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.551</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01 
*** p<.001
the residuals to be not correlated, an indication that an important variable is not missing.

Based on these findings, a revised causal model is proposed (see Figure B). This model contains five of the six variables found in the original proposed model, deletes three paths from the original model, and adds one new path for a total of seven significant paths. This revised model is the model that was just previously described, with organizational commitment excluded. As previously indicated, the $R^2$ for this model is .451. The new path is between role strain and job satisfaction, which was found significant in the regression analysis. The magnitude and level of significance of the paths in the new causal model are included, along with the zero order correlations between the variables (which are indicated in parentheses). Therefore, organizational commitment has been excluded from the model, not because it does not significantly correlate with turnover intentions, but because it does not significantly directly explain turnover intentions above that which is explained by the other four independent variables in the model.

The paths just described indicate the direct effects of the variables on other variables in the model. In addition, the indirect paths were calculated. Role strain affects job satisfaction indirectly through felt stress, as well as directly. Its indirect effect through felt stress is .2051. Therefore, its total effect on job satisfaction is .4533. Role strain affects burnout indirectly in three ways. It has an indirect effect of .1957 through felt stress, an even more indirect effect through both felt stress and
FIGURE B. REVISED PATH MODEL OF TURNOVER INTENTIONS

*Numbers in parentheses indicate zero-order correlations. Other numbers are path coefficients.

- *p < .05
- **p < .01
- ***p < .001
job satisfaction of .0794, and an indirect effect of .0961 through job satisfaction. Therefore, the total indirect effect of role strain on burnout is .3712. Role strain also affects turnover intentions indirectly through five different paths. Role strain has an indirect effect on turnover intentions through job satisfaction of .1410. It also affects turnover intentions through felt stress and burnout with an effect of .0328 as well, and through job satisfaction and burnout with an effect of .0149. Two additional ways in which role strain affect turnover intentions are through both felt stress and job satisfaction, with an effect of .1165, and through felt stress, job satisfaction, and burnout for an effect of .0123. Therefore, although these individual indirect effects of role strain on turnover intentions are small, they add up to a total indirect effect of .3175.

Additional indirect and total effects were calculated. Felt stress affects burnout indirectly through job satisfaction as well as directly. Its indirect effect on burnout is .1477, for a total effect of .5453 on burnout. Felt stress also affects turnover intentions through burnout with an effect of .0666, through job satisfaction with an effect of .2365, and through job satisfaction and burnout for an effect of .0249. Thus, the total indirect effect of felt stress on turnover intentions is .3280. Besides the direct effect of job satisfaction on turnover intentions of .5678, it has an indirect effect of .0598 through burnout for a total effect on .6276 (see Tables 8 and 9).

Thus, utilizing path analysis to determine both the direct and indirect effects of variables on other variables in the models reveal the greater total effects than are
TABLE 8. TOTAL EFFECTS OF VARIABLES ON OTHER VARIABLES IN THE REVISED MODEL OF TURNOVER INTENTIONS (N = 170)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Felt Stress</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Turnover Intentions***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Strain</td>
<td>.4923 D</td>
<td>.4533 D<em>I</em></td>
<td>.3712 I**</td>
<td>.3175 I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td>.4166 D</td>
<td>.5453 D<em>I</em>**</td>
<td>.3280 I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3571 D</td>
<td>.6276 D*I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1676 D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D = Direct effects only
I = Indirect effects only
D&I = Both direct and indirect effects

* Role Strain-->Felt Stress-->Job Satisfaction = .2051

** Role Strain-->Felt Stress-->Burnout = .1957
Role Strain-->Felt Stress-->Job Satisfaction-->Burnout = .0794
Role Strain-->Job Satisfaction-->Burnout = .0961

*** Felt Stress-->Job Satisfaction-->Burnout = .1477

**** See Table 9. for indirect, direct, and total effects on turnover intentions.
# Table 9. Direct, Indirect and Total Effects on Turnover Intentions in the Revised Model

**Indirect Effect Via**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Felt Stress</th>
<th>Felt Stress and Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction and Burnout</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Felt Stress and Burnout</th>
<th>Total Effect on Turnover Intentions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Strain</td>
<td>.0133</td>
<td>.1165</td>
<td>-.1409</td>
<td>.0161</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0328</td>
<td>.3195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2365</td>
<td>.0249</td>
<td>.0166</td>
<td>.3280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.5678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0598</td>
<td>.6276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>.1676</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
initially apparent. These analyses show that role strain, felt stress, and job satisfaction all have at least moderate total effects on turnover intentions.

**Additional Analyses**

A number of additional analyses were performed. Some of these relate to whether case managers differ in any of the endogenous variables by any of the case manager characteristics asked for on the last page of the questionnaire.

Additional considerations were whether the case managers in this sample differ significantly in their turnover intentions according to whether or not they possess a professional license, and according to the particular license that they possess. A t test revealed no significant difference in turnover intentions on the basis of whether or not case managers possessed a professional license (p<.05). An analysis of variance was computed utilizing the criterion of whether a case manager had a social work license (LSW or LISW), a counselling license (LPC), or no license at all. This analysis also found no significant difference in turnover intentions (p<.05).

A further consideration was whether the case managers in this sample differ in their turnover intentions by their level of education. Those case managers with less than a college degree had a mean turnover intentions score of 5.61 (N = 18), while those with a college degree had a mean turnover intentions score of 7.5 (N = 116), and those with a master's degree had a mean score on this variable of 8.59 (N = 27). An analysis of variance revealed these differences to be significant at p<.05. A Tukey test was then performed to ascertain which of these differences between groups were
significant. It was found that those case managers with master’s degrees had significantly greater intentions to quit their jobs than those case managers with less than a college degree (p<.05). No significant differences were found between those with less than a bachelor’s degree and those with a bachelor’s degree, or between those with a bachelor’s degree and those case managers with a master’s degree.

Since the case managers from two different counties participated in this research study, a number of analyses were performed to ascertain whether significant differences exist on variables between the two counties, one of which has eight community mental health centers located throughout the county, and the other which practices centralized case management with just one case management agency. The mean turnover intentions score for case managers in Cuyahoga County was 7.809, while this mean score for case managers in Summit County was 7.130. A t test revealed no significant difference by county at p<.05.

Other t tests were performed to ascertain whether case managers differed in any of the other variables by county. No differences were found in role strain, felt stress, organizational commitment or burnout by the county in which a case manager worked. The only significant difference was found in total job satisfaction. The mean total job satisfaction score for the case managers in Cuyahoga County of -.1910 was significantly lower than the mean total job satisfaction score obtained for the case managers in Summit County of .4231 (p<.05).
Open-Ended Questions

The responses to each of the four open-ended questions were examined and categorized on the basis of this examination. It was not very difficult to categorize most of the responses, as many of the responses given by the case managers in the sample were similar.

The first question asked case managers what they liked best about their jobs. One hundred and sixty case managers responded to this question, many of whom gave more than one response. By far, the largest category of responses related to working with and/or helping their clients to improve their lives. A total of 124 responses pertained to this category, and 96 persons, or 60% of those answering this first question, indicated this as their first response. The second most frequent category of response to this question related to case managers liking the flexibility and/or autonomy that they have with regard to both scheduling and decision-making. There were a total of 52 responses that pertained to this, and 31 case managers gave responses in this category as their first answer to this question. Another response pertained to positive aspects of the agency at which case managers worked, including the support that they received from their supervisor (N = 30). Case managers also made positive comments about their co-workers, including that they were competent, caring, and/or supportive (N = 29). Case managers also reported that they liked working out in the field and not being "stuck" in an office all day (N = 19). Five
case managers indicated, in response to this question, that there was nothing at all that they liked about their jobs (see Table 10).

The second question asked case managers what they liked least about their jobs. One hundred and fifty-eight case managers responded to this question. Of the wide range of responses given to this question, the most frequent response related to too much paperwork. Fifty case managers, or 31.6% of those responding to this question, gave responses relating to too much and/or unnecessary paperwork. The second most frequent category of responses, given 37 times, related to agency complaints, including dissatisfaction with one's supervisor and/or with administration. There were thirty responses that related to role demands, including that case managers feel that they were overworked, that expectations were unrealistic, and/or that there was role conflict. An equal number of case managers' responses relate to what has been categorized as "system" complaints, including the bureaucracy with which they have to deal in securing resources for their clients. Twenty-nine persons indicated that what they liked least about their job was the low pay that they received. Lack of adequate resources, especially housing, was noted by 25 respondents. An issue identified 14 times by case managers related to the lack of recognition, respect, and concern they perceived from either their agency and/or their community mental health board. Another ten responses pertained to the clients themselves, including their unwillingness to cooperate and/or to follow through on plans. One case manager summed up the separate responses of others with this answer: "Unreasonable
TABLE 10. NUMBER OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION #1 "WHAT DO YOU LIKE THE MOST ABOUT YOUR JOB?" BY CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Times Response is Given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping clients to improve their lives</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility/Autonomy</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comments about Agency (including supervisor/agency is supportive, helpful)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not being &quot;stuck&quot; in an office all day</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comments about co-workers (including that they are caring, competent, helpful, friendly)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing at all</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
paperwork demands, hopeless clients, low pay, no raises of any significance, agency cares more about paperwork and productivity than actual client needs. Low prestige in the field" (see Table 11).

The third question pertained to what one thing case managers would do, if they could, to change their jobs. Although the question asked for one thing, many case managers indicated a number of changes that they would make. The most frequent response, given by 40 case managers, or 25.3 percent of those responding to this question, was to increase case managers’ pay. The next most frequent response, identified by 30 case managers, or 19 percent of those responding, was to reduce paperwork. Twenty-seven suggestions related to making improvements with case managers’ agency or supervisor. Eighteen respondents, or 11.4 percent of those giving an answer to this question, indicated that caseload size should be reduced. Another fifteen responses related to providing more community resources, especially housing (see Table 12).

A final question asked case managers what else, if anything, that they would like to reveal about their job situation. Seventy-five case managers responded to this item. Twenty-one responses related to negative comments about case management as a system or philosophy, including that it encouraged clients to be dependent on case managers and/or the system. These negative remarks about case management were given as a first response by twenty respondents, or 26.7 percent of those who answered this question. There were 12 negative remarks about one’s agency,
TABLE 11. NUMBER OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION #2 "WHAT DO YOU LIKE THE LEAST ABOUT YOUR JOB?" BY CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Times Response is Given</th>
<th>% of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much/unnecessary paperwork</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency complaints (including supervisor, administration)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role demands (not enough time, unrealistic demands, role conflict/ambiguity)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System complaints (including bureaucracy)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low pay</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition, respect, support for, too little input from case managers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress/pressure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients themselves (including they are demanding, uncooperative)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large caseload size</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little chance for promotion, lack of benefits, few raises</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses Given</strong></td>
<td><strong>278</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 12-NUMBER OF RESPONSES TO QUESTION #3 "IF YOU COULD CHANGE ONE THING ABOUT YOUR JOB, WHAT WOULD IT BE?" BY CATEGORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Times Response is Given</th>
<th>% of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase pay</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce paperwork</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve things about my agency</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce caseload size</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more resources</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicit more input from case managers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better physical working conditions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Number of Responses** 193
supervisor, administrator, and/or community mental health board. However not all responses to this question were negative. Eleven responses related to enjoying one’s job and/or finding it rewarding or satisfying. Another eleven responses were positive comments about the case manager’s agency, supervisor, or co-workers (see Table 13).

An examination of the responses to these open-ended questions was made on the basis of themes that emerged. With regard to the categories of responses just described, only those responses given to a particular answer in relatively large number were given their own category, with the remaining responses to each question categorized under "Other." A difficulty with this approach is that some case managers identified an issue in response to one question, and others identified a concern of a similar nature, but in response to another of the questions. Therefore, the responses to all the questions were considered in order to ascertain what particular issues seemed to be identified in response to the several questions. In addition, the responses were examined to determine whether they were especially given by case managers at one particular agency. Responses of this nature, particularly responses that related to complaints specific to one agency, such as complaints about a particular employee, are not reported. Although these particular agency issues can be of considerable importance, they are not pertinent to this examination.

Case managers raised the issue of salary quite often. Several case managers compared their pay to workers with less education or training. One case manager stated, "Could be a rewarding job if the pay were a lot more adequate. Especially
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Times Response is Given</th>
<th>% of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative comments about case management as a system/philosophy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comments about agency, supervisor, administrator, community mental health board, co-workers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I like my job, my job is rewarding/satisfying&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I like my agency, supervisor, co-workers&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case managers are not recognized, valued, their input/discretion is not respected</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Raise case managers' pay&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve physical working conditions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
when you start comparing our pay scales to that of unskilled laborers." Another case manager, in response to Question #2 noted:

I hate my pay scale. I'm tired of being broke. Did you know an executive secretary with a GED makes more money starting than a case manager with experience and a college degree—with far less experience and responsibility on the job: Check the want ads if you don't believe me.

In response to what they like least about their job, another case manager noted:

Pay. As case managers and considering our broad responsibilities and the problems that affront (sic) us every day, we are without doubt grossly underpaid. This, I believe, the system must address if it is to retain quality people. [The respondent underlined the word "grossly" twice.]

Another case manager responded to Question #3 with: "The pay, increase it. That sounds selfish, true. But though it wouldn't make the headaches go away, or the frustrations stop, it would make them more bearable."

Another issue that was addressed a number of times in response to different questions is the lack of respect, regard, and concern for case managers that they perceive, as well as the lack of input solicited from them by the agency and/or the community mental health board. As noted by one case manager in response to the last question was: "Too much frustration—never any recognition or reward from CCMHB. No incentive to stay at this." Another case manager indicated in response to the last question that "the system needs to show more respect for case managers and clients. Bureaucratic ideas do not apply in the real world. Clients suffer as a result and good workers get frustrated and leave the system." Another response to
Question #4 was: "Working with our client population is difficult enough; we get very little support or encouragement or pats on the back for what we do."

Still another important issue that was often identified by the case managers in this sample relates to role demands. One respondent, who gave many answers to the question pertaining to what one likes least about one's job, put an asterisk next to "impossible demands". This same respondent gave the following answer to Question #4:

It is absolutely impossible to achieve 4.5 direct contact time and keep up with paperwork and required meetings, etc. What happen [sic] is that case managers end up either behind with paperwork or they do work at home without getting credit for that time. This is very draining and unfair!

Many case managers commented on the unrealistic demands placed upon them. One respondent stated that case managers were expected to be "miracle workers." Other case managers also addressed job expectations in relation to the pay that they received. As one case manager put it: "I would feel better about case management if pay was more appropriate." Some case managers mentioned role expectations in relation to paperwork requirements. That is, it was unrealistic for case managers to maintain the high direct service time requirement, do all the things that they are expected to do for each client, and keep up with all the paperwork.

Another issue of considerable importance that was mentioned a number of times in response to different questions relates to case managers who took issue with case management as a system and/or philosophy. One case manager noted in
Question #4 that "I believe a client driven system should encourage responsibility as well as choice and this one does not." A similar response to this question by another case manager was: "Clients have rights but generally without much personal responsibilities. This makes it difficult to make serious progress." This issue of case management fostering clients dependence was mentioned by a number of case managers, as well as the related issue of case managers having "the responsibility of client's lives that should not be theirs," as one case manager expressed it. Another case manager noted that "the current system as it is now structured fosters too much client dependency on the case manager. Fewer systems are in place to actually teach clients independent living skills or provide a network support system."

Several case managers questioned the future of case management. One response to Question #4 was: "I question whether case management is going to be the place to be in the future."

Another case manager's criticism of case management, in response to the last question, was:

Its my opinion that when case management was put into play they (county? state?) put the cart before the hoarse [sic]. Now we have burnt out case managers working with next to no resources. When are they going to think of developing resources? Probably after I leave case management.

Still another case manager, whose response to Question #3 was, "Stop case management," indicated in response to the last question that: "Case management has
some good foundations but it is being carried out with the intent to save money, not
for the best interest of the clients. *It's inhumane* (underlining is this writer's).

Several case managers addressed the issue of why many case managers do not
remain at their jobs for very long. One case manager noted:

I think, in its current form, case management limits the duration anyone can
work at it. Due to the resistance from the mental health board and society to
help. The frustration will eventually drive us all away from it. *It's not the
clients, its the system we must work with.*

There is still another important issue addressed by case managers, in response
to the last three questions—that of case managers not "supposed" to do counselling.
That is, counselling is not among the categories of service to clients for which case
management agencies are reimbursed through Medicaid payments by the State of Ohio
(the means by which case management services are reimbursed to community mental
health centers). This situation exists because counselling is not deemed to be an
appropriate case management activity. One case manager addressed this issue in the
following manner

I would like to have the CMHB change their policy of not having case
managers do any counselling. I have a master's degree in Counselling and as
a case manager I am limited in using these skills. I'm sure I speak for others
in my situation who opt to move on in order to use their skills—could be why
Master's level people are leaving case management.

Not all the case managers who addressed the issue of counselling possessed
master's degrees. There seems to be two separate issues regarding counselling. One,
as this respondent addresses, is master's prepared counselors and social workers not
remaining as case managers for very long. The other issue is severely mentally disabled clients not receiving the counselling that they might need. Or, as stated by one case manager, "Clients need and deserve counselling and aren't getting it." The issue of counselling was addressed by case managers in response to Questions #2, #3, and #4. For example, in response to Question #3, what they would like to change about their jobs, one response was "that counselling would be better recognized as an integral part of case management." Another case manager noted that: "Case management focuses too much on concrete ways of helping people such as plugging them into housing. I think a more important role is to help people to adapt in their thinking and feeling."

Many case managers indicated that they did not think that what was best for the client was the agency's and/or system's primary concern. This is reflected by one case manager whose response to Question #3 was, "I would put the clients' needs first," as well as by the response by another case manager to Question #4 of: "People before deadlines, paperwork, because people are the bottom line." (The word "are" was underlined twice.)

Still another response worth noting pertained to the job of case manager as a stepping stone or learning experience. That is, the job as case manager was viewed by these respondents as a means toward an end. In response to Question #4 one respondent noted: "It is a great learning opportunity and stepping stone while I get my master's degree." Several other case managers indicated in response to what they
liked most about their job, that they liked the experience they were getting working with severely mentally disabled clients.

In addition to a consideration of the themes present in the responses to these open-ended questions, responses were also examined on the basis of extreme scores on the Turnover Intentions scale. That is, the responses of case managers who had very high turnover intentions, as well as those with very low turnover intentions, were examined to ascertain what they might reveal.

One case manager with a turnover intentions score of 15, the highest possible, remarked that "Case management is nothing more than rescuing, the whole system needs to be revamped. . . . The mental health system is oppressive to clients and staff." Another case manager, who also had a turnover intentions score of 15, and who had been a case manager for five years, indicated that what she liked least about her job was the "poor management, lack of exact job description, poor support, low pay." In response to Question #3, "If you could change one thing about your job, what would it be?" this case manager answered, "Everything." And, in response to Question #4, this same respondent indicated, "Unmanageable." Another case manager, with a turnover intentions score of 14, responded that what she liked least about her job was, "All pressures placed upon case managers, uncertainty of job security, pay!! and unclear duties." Still another case manager, who also had a score of 15 for turnover intentions, indicated that what she liked least about her job was "poor communication, inconsistent policies, and lack of individualism." She answered
Question #3, what one thing she would like to change about her job, with "increase agency and coworkers' concern for clients." Another case manager who had a turnover intentions score of 15, was in fact leaving her job soon. This case manager indicated that "more money" would be the one thing that she would change about her job, and she noted in Question #4, "The term case management should be changed to 'case juggling.'"

At the other extreme on the Turnover Intentions scale is a case manager who had worked ten years in the human services field, and two years both at the agency and as a case manager, had the lowest possible turnover intentions score, a very low role strain score, and a high organizational commitment score. In response to Question #1, what she liked most about her job, this respondent answered, "The feeling that I'm doing something worthwhile—that I'm helping people have a better life. The support and encouragement I receive from my boss and fellow workers on my team." And in response to Question #4 this same case manager wrote:

Although my agency isn't one of the highest paid, I rarely think of leaving because of the positive and supportive atmosphere I work in. My boss treats me like a professional and values my judgement and insight. I think that it would be hard to find that elsewhere and for me that is more important than my pay.

(This person had indicated that if she could change one thing about her job, it would be "The amount I get paid.") Another case manager with a score of 4 on the Turnover Intentions scale remarked for Question 4 that "I think that case management has definitely had an impact on our clientele's lives. While the job can be difficult
at times, it challenges me to be sensitive to others, needs." A case manager with a turnover intentions score of 3, the lowest possible, answered the first question with, "I like being in the position to be able to help someone less fortunate than myself"; and responded to the last question with, "The job is stressful but satisfying." Another case manager, with a turnover intentions score of 5, responded to Question #4 with, "Good team, good supervisor."

Therefore, a number of the case managers in this sample expressed considerable dissatisfaction with their jobs, and identified a number of major issues that they found problematic. There are a number of case managers in this sample who feel unsupported by their agencies and/or community mental health boards. They believe that counselling should be recognized as an integral and legitimate case management function. A number of case managers in this sample also take issue with the basic tenets of case management, and believe that it fosters dependence by clients on their case managers. These case managers believe that they are given too much responsibility for clients' behavior, and for finding resources that sometimes do not exist for their clients. And many of the case managers in this sample expressed that, in spite of the many pressures and responsibilities demanded by their positions, they are poorly compensated, and have little opportunity for advancement.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of Findings

This research tested a number of hypotheses relating to variables in case managers' work environment. All nine of these hypotheses were found to be supported at the significance level of p<.001. The study also tested a model of turnover intentions that included the variables of role strain, felt stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, burnout, and turnover intentions. As a result of the findings of path analysis, the model was revised and one of the variables, organizational commitment, was excluded because of the fact that it was found to not explain a significant amount of variance in turnover intentions, the dependent variable, over that which is explained by the other independent variables in the model.

Role strain was found to significantly affect a number of variables in the model, above that which was initially hypothesized, as it had an indirect effect, as well as a direct effect on several of the variables. In the original model, a path was proposed between role strain and felt stress. The results of the path analysis on this model revealed significant paths between role strain and job satisfaction, and between role strain and organizational commitment, as well as finding the proposed path between role strain and felt stress to be significant. Therefore, the revised model includes a path between role strain and job satisfaction, as the path analysis performed
on this revised model also found this path to be significant. Role strain was found to have a number of indirect effects on the other variables in the revised model. It was found to affect job satisfaction indirectly through felt stress. The findings of this research also revealed that role strain affected burnout indirectly through three different paths. Role strain was found to have a total of five indirect paths to turnover intentions. Thus, role strain was found to be an important variable in this model of turnover intentions.

This research also found job satisfaction to be of considerable importance. It had the largest direct path to turnover intentions. Job satisfaction was also found to be affected both directly and indirectly by other variables in the model. Job satisfaction is an old construct that has long been recognized as important to any consideration of turnover behavior, and, more recently, to an understanding of turnover intentions as well. Both burnout and organizational commitment are more recent conceptualizations that have been recognized to contribute to both turnover intentions and actual turnover behavior. This research confirmed the importance of job satisfaction, even when one or both of these two newer constructs are included in a model of turnover intentions.

This research did not support the claims of this investigator that case managers have high turnover intentions. Despite the high turnover behavior among case managers in the past, only moderate turnover intentions were found among the case managers in this sample.
The five exogenous variables--age, gender, length of time at the agency, length of time as a case manager, and length of time in the human services field--were found to explain less than 10 percent of the variance in turnover intentions. A somewhat surprising finding was that gender was not found to correlate significantly with any of the variables in the model at p<.05.

The case managers in this sample expressed a number of common dissatisfactions and concerns. Among these were low pay, excessive paperwork, lack of resources in the community, especially housing, with which to link up their clients, large caseload size, and unrealistic role demands. In spite of these, case managers reported that they like working with their clients and helping them to improve their lives. They also reported that they like the autonomy and freedom that is part of their job.

Many of the case managers in this sample took issue with case management as a system and philosophy. They thought that the way in which case management is practiced tends to foster clients' dependence upon them. In addition, many case managers in the sample believe that they are undervalued by their agencies and the community mental health system, and that they should be given more respect and consideration.

A number of the case managers in this sample also believe that counselling should be a recognized case management function. The reasons given for this
position include that clients need and deserve counselling, and that some case managers have counselling skills that they are not supposed to use.

An additional finding of this research pertains to the dissatisfaction with their pay that case managers expressed. This dissatisfaction is evidenced both by the very low scores on the satisfaction with pay scale, as well as by case managers' many responses to the open-ended questions regarding this issue.

A further important finding concerns case managers' dissatisfaction with their opportunities for promotion, which they expressed both on the satisfaction with promotion scale, and in the answers they gave to the various open-ended questions.

**A Consideration of the Findings**

One possible explanation for the finding that organizational commitment did not significantly directly explain turnover intentions, either in the full model or in the model that excluded burnout, relates to the nature of the job as case manager. The construct of organizational commitment is most widely used in the for-profit setting, and it is in this setting that most of the research has been conducted that has investigated the antecedents and consequences of this construct, as well as the specific relationship between organizational commitment and both turnover intentions, and between organizational commitment and actual turnover behavior. Perhaps organizational commitment is not as relevant a construct within the social service setting, and particularly for case managers. That is, case managers are primarily concerned with helping their clients, and therefore, perhaps, their attitudes toward the
agency at which they are employed is of secondary importance, as compared with the role strain, felt stress, job satisfaction, and burnout that they experience.

In addition, in contrast to many occupations within the human services where employees work primarily in one location, case managers work throughout the community to secure services and resources for their clients. Therefore, the particular organization, or agency, at which case managers work may be of limited importance.

In contrast, accountants, for example, might regard the organization for which they work as more important in deciding if they wish to remain in or leave their present position. And even nurses, who work within the human services and whose main concern is helping their patients (similar, in some regards, to case managers’ focus on helping their clients), are, perhaps, more influenced by the particular organizational context, than case managers, as a particular nurse usually works almost exclusively in one setting. Perhaps this reasoning accounts for why Parasuraman (1989) found organizational commitment to significantly affect turnover intentions, as well as actual turnover behavior among nurses, while this present research did not find organizational commitment to significantly explain case managers’ turnover intentions over that which is explained by the other variables in the model.

Another unexpected finding pertains to the moderate level of turnover intentions found for the case managers in this sample. As previously considered, the perceived alternatives to one’s current job situation is an important variable, beyond the scope of the organizational factors that have been considered, that influences
turnover intentions. It is likely that the poor economic climate and the high jobless rate that existed at the time that this research was conducted helps to explain the moderate level of turnover intentions found in the case managers in this sample, contrary to what had been the actual previous turnover behavior of case managers (Champney, 1989) and what had been suggested by this researcher.

This research provides further evidence for several issues that have been previously considered. One of these issues is case manager role ambiguity. The role ambiguity reported by other researchers that was earlier considered, was also found in this research. This research also corroborated the findings of others concerning the lack of agreement on the training and education needed for the job of case manager, as evidenced by the wide level of case managers’ education, as well as the wide range of areas in which case managers have their formal training.

**Limitations of the Study**

There are a number of limitations of this research. Since this study made use of a convenience sample, the case managers in this sample are not necessarily representative of all case managers, either in the state of Ohio, or nationally. Case management is practiced somewhat differently in direct community mental health centers, counties, and states. In addition to the various ways in which case management is practiced, the environment in which case managers work varies. These differences in the case manager’s environment include different physical facilities, different supervisors, administrators, and co-workers, different client
populations, and different communities. This research, therefore, has somewhat limited external validity.

In addition, since this sample survey was conducted at only one point in time, it only reflects case manager’s perceptions at the particular time at which it was completed. In particular, this study was conducted at a time when the economic climate was poor and a high unemployment rate existed. These economic conditions are likely to influence the perceived alternatives to one’s current job situation that, in turn, affect turnover intentions.

Other limitations concern the measures utilized and the possibility of measurement error. There are no well-established scales to measure turnover intentions, despite the numerous studies that include this variable. Many of these, in recent years, consider turnover intentions as the study’s dependent variable (Fimian et al., 1988; Walsh et al., 1985). Therefore, in spite of the relatively high reliability found both in this study as well as the other research for which the scale’s reliability has been reported, the scale has had limited use. In addition, there is only one reported instance of the scale’s validity (Peters & Jackofsky, 1979).

This writer pointed out earlier a possible shortcoming of the Maslach Burnout Inventory, which was used in this research to measure burnout. Although the MBI has been used in many hundreds of studies, several case managers in this study noted that several of the items are not applicable to the frequency dimension upon which respondents are to indicate their responses to each item. Perhaps some of these items
are better suited for the intensity dimension, that was also utilized in addition to the frequency dimension, in the scale's original edition.

Another measurement limitation concerns the Job Descriptive Inventory (JDI), whose satisfaction with pay and satisfaction with promotion scales, were utilized to measure these two components of job satisfaction in this study. These scales, as well, have been used in hundreds of studies, and there have been numerous reports of their reliability and validity. However, because the respondents are asked merely to describe the applicability of each item to their job situation, the scale does not, in fact, access the respondent's actual extent of satisfaction with each item, only whether the respondent believes that each particular item pertains to his or her job situation.

**Implications of the Study**

In spite of these limitations, this research raises a number of important issues. As such, the study has a number of important implications for practice, policy, service delivery, and future research.

**Practice Implications**

These findings have important implications for practice. Because role strain was found to have a relatively large total effect on turnover intentions, these findings would seem to suggest that reducing role strain might result in reduced turnover intentions. Therefore, community mental health boards and/or community mental health centers might consider taking steps to identify and reduce both role ambiguity and role conflict. This might be accomplished by clarifying case manager role
expectations, and by lessening the conflicting roles that currently comprise the job of case managers.

A number of case managers addressed the issue that they did not believe that they were recognized, appreciated, and valued. This is an important issue that relates to the future of case management, since a considerable number of persons addressed this concern. While case management has emerged as an important and widespread service delivery model, case managers themselves have not been similarly accorded a very high status. In addition, the resources, particularly housing, necessary to perform their jobs effectively are seriously lacking. In dealing with other systems in their efforts to secure services for their clients, they are often also not highly regarded. Perhaps more importantly, as several case managers reported, they are not highly regarded by other professionals within the community mental health system.

Another issue raised by case managers concerned the support that they perceive that they receive from their supervisors. While several case managers made positive comments about their supervisors, and the support that they receive from them, a larger number indicated a lack of perceived support. Perhaps case management supervisors might consider how they might be more supportive to case managers, in helping them to perform their difficult and potentially stressful job.

Implications for Policy

The findings of this research also have important implications for policy. One implication pertains to the present policy of not allowing case managers' work
experience to count toward becoming licensed, even though one of several licenses is required for the position of case management supervisor. This study lends support to the position that such a policy is unwise and should be reconsidered.

Another policy implication concerns the issue of case managers providing counselling to severely mentally disabled clients, when this is indicated and/or when the client requests these services. These two issues are not unrelated. Because case management is not highly valued, as was noted by a number of case managers, the experience of performing case management does not "count" toward the more "important" activities of counselling and supervision, both of which require licenses. If case managers were also skilled counselors, then their work experience would count toward licensing, and their position would more likely be more highly valued.

It seems that only by recognizing the importance of case management as a legitimate form of social work practice will it be possible to effectively resolve this issue. If case managers can legitimately provide counseling to their clients, then this activity would probably count toward licensure as an independent social worker. By recognizing case management as a skilled profession, and, of course, compensating these professionals accordingly, case managers would more likely feel more recognized and more highly regarded. This, in turn, would make their job of advocating for their clients in the community easier, because of the greater status that they would be afforded.
Related to the issue of status for case manager is the educational background needed for the position of case manager. It seems that there needs to be some consensus on the level of education and training necessary for the job. This issue appears to be an important policy concern.

Implications for Service Delivery

The findings of this research have severe implications for service delivery. The scope of this service delivery extends beyond the field of community mental health, as case management is being more widely practiced with other at-risk populations, including the developmentally disabled and the elderly. As Rose (1992) asserts, case management will be an expanding form of practice over the next decade and more. Mandated by federal legislation, case management has become inseparable from the funding and delivery of public services. And case managers are the most critical components of the case management system (Intaglia, 1992).

This findings of this research would seem to suggest that both clients and case managers need to become empowered. Clients need to learn how to exercise more control over their illnesses and their lives, rather than being so dependent upon their case manager. Case managers need, in some instances, to develop skills, and to have their skills recognized.

If there were some consensus that case management is an important and highly skilled form of social work practice, and if case managers’ opinions were more highly valued, they would be more likely to be able to do their jobs more effectively,
especially as they seek resources for and advocate on behalf of their clients. And, ultimately, it would be severely mentally disabled clients in the community mental health delivery system who would be better served, as fewer case managers leave their jobs, not because the poor economic conditions offer few other job opportunities, but because case managers feel a sense of accomplishment from being highly regarded and being able to help their clients to live more satisfying lives. Then clients would not be frustrated by having to adjust to a new case manager all the time, but would, instead, be able to develop a mutually satisfying relationship with one case manager for a longer period of time. And, if that case manager were to leave his or her job, it would more likely be to become a case management supervisor, where he or she would be able to use many of the skills and knowledge developed as a case manager in his or her new job of supervising other case managers.

As Intaglia (1992) maintains, case managers’ actual activities are shaped ultimately by the constraints of the environment within which they work, not by their formal job descriptions. This position is congruent with the ecological framework which has guided this research. One important component of this environment is the resources that are available for severely mentally disabled clients. Until these resources are made available in adequate supply, both case managers and clients will continue to be frustrated. The greatest resource needed, as identified by many of the case managers in this sample, is a range of housing options. Providing these facilities is crucial to effect service delivery.
Suggestions for Future Research

This research supported many of the ideas that had been put forth by this researcher. One area for further research would be to investigate how agencies can do more to support case managers. As several of the case managers in this sample mentioned that they were supported and respected by their agencies, while other case managers noted the lack of this perceived support, future research might explore what specifically contributes to this perception of support. Further investigation of the relationship between perceptions of support and a number of the variables in this study might also be warranted. That is, do case managers differ in their turnover intentions by various perceptions of support received? Perhaps agencies at which turnover intentions are relatively low can be examined to ascertain whether there are specific things these agencies do that result in low turnover intentions and turnover behavior. In addition to support from their agencies, a further question might relate to what community mental health boards can do to support case managers.

Another area for further research concerns how role strain can be reduced. This issue was referred to as it relates to implications for practice. Such research could investigate the specific ways in which case managers find their roles to be ambiguous and conflicting, as well as which of these ways they perceive as most problematic.

The case managers in this sample often referred to the unrealistic demands placed on them. There is need to investigate what is realistic for a case manager, as
it relates both to caseload size and to role expectations. Then realistic job descriptions can be developed, and caseload size standards can be established.

As this research found that the level of case managers’ education significantly affected turnover intentions, further research might examine whether the variables associated with case managers’ turnover intentions differ by educational level.

Another concern for future research pertains to the issue that was previously related regarding policy implications—the level of education and training necessary to effectively perform case management. For the reasons that have previously been considered, this is an area that is certainly in need of future research. This issue should be investigated from the perspectives of case managers, case management supervisors, agency administrators, clients, community mental health board personnel, state department of mental health personnel, and family members of clients. In this researcher’s opinion, this is an area of research that should receive high priority.

Conclusion

As previously considered, reducing turnover intentions and actual turnover behavior among case managers can have important implications for the community mental health system, other case managers and mental health professionals, and ultimately, severely mentally disabled clients themselves—those persons whom, hopefully, are served by the community mental health system. It is hoped that this research can make a contribution toward achieving this goal.
LITERATURE CITED


Champney, T.F. (1989). Case management and related research as viewed from Ohio: Critical findings and issues. Office of Program Evaluation and Research, Ohio Department of Mental Health, Columbus, Ohio.


Epstein, B. (1990b). Findings from the first case manager’s questionnaire. Cuyahoga County Community Mental Health Board. Cleveland, Ohio.


APPENDIX A

CASE MANAGER'S QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to better understand how case managers view their jobs and various factors in their work environment. This questionnaire is being given for research for a doctoral dissertation in social welfare. It is possible that the information obtained will be shared in a general way with your agency and/or your community mental health board, as the information obtained will also be useful to them. However, your particular response to the questionnaire will be kept confidential. Over two hundred case managers from two different counties are being asked to complete this questionnaire. No one at your agency will see the actual completed questionnaires nor will any individual information be shared with anyone that might reveal your identity.

On the pages that follow will be a number of items relating to various aspects of your work situation. Please indicate the letter of each item that best completes each statement, per the specific instructions for each section.
PLEASE NOTE

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

176-184, Appendix A
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APPENDIX B

Cuyahoga County
Community Mental Health Board
1400 West 15th Street • Cleveland, Ohio • 44113-7132
Tel (216) 241-3400 • Fax (216) 865-5087 or (216) 865-4243

July 9, 1991

Ms. Barbara Epstein
2724 Rocklyn Road
Shaker Heights, Ohio 44122

Dear Barb,

Thanks for sending me your questionnaire and other materials related to your study of attrition and burn-out with Case Managers in the mental health setting. I have reviewed the questionnaire and believe it to be quite compatible with our interests in better understanding the pressures perceived by Case Managers and the varieties of ways in which they seek to reduce them. I certainly will be supportive of your efforts to administer this questionnaire to agencies within our system.

As you know, the Board’s role is limited vis-à-vis individual, autonomous private, non-profit agencies that we contract with, particularly for things that fall outside the realm of contracted services. Compliance by Case Management agencies with requests like yours are strictly voluntary. I certainly will be supportive of your request and assist you as much as I can to access our 150 Adult Case Managers.

CCHHB’s role and function in this type of situation is strictly advisory and recommendatory. I will encourage the major Adult Case Management agencies in Cuyahoga County to cooperate and participate. However, I know this request will be seen as another time drain placed on people who are very busy and already have multiple demands placed on them. I do believe, if you approach the task as we’ve discussed, (that is to schedule time when the Case Managers are all at the agency for staff meeting, at the convenience of the agency,) you will have good success. I will be happy to work with you and the Case Management agency personnel to help you maximize your case manager’s response.

Your topic is important and timely and of considerable interest to me and to the Board. We wish you well with it and look forward to reviewing your findings.

Sincerely,

Gary Long
Associate Director for Adult Services

Copy to: B. Karbler
         T. Lester
         V. Bledsoe

Dedicated to innovation, participation and self-determination
APPENDIX C

June 13, 1991

Ms. Barbara K. Epstein
2724 Rocklyn Road
Shaker Heights, Ohio 44122

Dear Ms. Epstein,

Please be advised that Community Support Services is very willing to have our case managers participate in your research project. Community Support Services would be able to have 50 to 55 case managers available to participate in the project.

Community Support Services is supportive of your project since this issue is of equal importance to us. We would request that a copy of your results be given to us upon completion of your research.

Please contact me at your convenience to make arrangements for a mutually agreeable time for our case managers to complete the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Terrence B. Dalton
Program Director

TSD/rs

cc: Delores Drone
Case Management Unit Managers