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The purpose of this study was to analyze, describe and explain the relationship between role ambiguity and burnout of social workers. Also, the study was designed to determine the best predictor of role ambiguity and burnout of social workers.

Survey research was employed in a metropolitan area involving randomly selected samples of 158 social worker respondents compiled from a list of National Association of Social workers (NASW), National Association of Black Social Worker (NABSW) and Clark Atlanta University School of Social Work.

The questionnaire employed one section from two instruments. The emotional exhaustion section of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) and the role ambiguity section of the Rizzo’s Role Perception Questionnaire. The findings of
the study indicated a statistically significant relationship between burnout and role ambiguity among social workers. The majority of the social workers agreed that they experienced burnout and a majority disagreed that they experienced role ambiguity in the workplace. The study indicated that the best predictor of role ambiguity and burnout for social workers was the independent variable current job satisfaction.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Social work as a caring profession has not given much care and attention to the problems of professional social workers in the workplace. Although the core work in a human service organization occurs through client-worker relations in which social workers are expected to promote the well-being of the client, the well-being of the social worker is mostly ignored (Hasenfield, 1992).

Many practitioners experience role ambiguity and burnout from overworking themselves in an attempt to make their practice successful. Social workers are devoting tremendous amounts of time to their jobs because they are often burdened with responsibilities that exceed their job descriptions. It is believed that social work practitioners experience burnout because their roles are not clearly defined and that little or no support is provided for those in leadership positions (Baker, 1995).

Social work has a rich heritage and has achieved distinction as the profession that advocates for the poor, the disadvantaged, the disenfranchised, and the oppressed (Specht, 1994). Social work can take pride in being recognized as the profession that serves as the nation's
conscience. Although historically the profession of social work has served the poor and the disadvantaged, today social workers serve in such diverse settings as governmental agencies, schools, health care centers, family and child welfare agencies, mental health centers, business and industry, correctional settings, and private practice (Specht, 1994).

Given the diversity and complexity of social work activities, it has been a difficult and elusive task to define social work (National Association of Social Workers, 1981). Numerous definitions of social work have been developed, but according to the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), social work is the professional activity of helping individuals, groups, or communities to enhance or restore their capacity for social functioning and to create societal conditions favorable to their goals (National Association of Social Workers, 1981).

Members of the social work profession are beginning to engage in discussions regarding the professional authenticity of the field of social work. This raises the question: 1) Does social work meet the criteria for a profession, and 2) do the functions that social workers perform characterize a professional activity? It also has been questioned whether social workers have their own theoretical framework or whether they borrow too heavily from other professions such as psychology, sociology,
anthropology, business, and economics. Because social workers are trained to utilize theoretical frameworks of numerous other professions, it also raises the question: Do social workers experience role ambiguity in performing their role as a social worker (Goldstein, 1992)?

Statement of the Problem

Role ambiguity and burnout may affect the physical health, mental health and social functioning of employees in the workplace. The importance of role ambiguity and burnout to social workers in the workplace stems from the fact that social workers provide services through the medium of human interaction. Consequently, well trained and prepared social workers who have an understanding of these workplace problems are assets to any human service organization. It is very clear that role ambiguity and burnout are serious workplace problems which may impact the degree to which social workers are effective in providing services (McNeeley, 1992).

Of the two variables of this study role ambiguity and burnout, role ambiguity has attracted the least attention from researchers concerning social workers. In the past, the study of role ambiguity has not been considered important. Little is known about the specifics of role ambiguity of general employees within organizations, however burnout is more important and more prominent in the literature (Kleelman, 1991).
Role ambiguity is defined as the lack of clarity regarding what is expected, appropriate or effective job behavior. According to McNeely, it is believed that workers in various work settings are unsure about what their direct roles and responsibilities are, therefore it may contribute to job-related stress. It would seem reasonable that workers need to know what is required of them in order for them to perform their job functions. If expectations of the job are not clear, then workers may not be able to adequately perform their jobs (McNeely, 1992).

It is important that social workers understand their task in order to carry out their day-to-day responsibilities. In the limited literature regarding role ambiguity and social workers, researchers have reported that unclarity of job responsibilities in their organizations is linked to role ambiguity (Meyerson, 1994).

The type of organization in which the social worker is employed may determine the intensity and degree of role ambiguity experienced by the social worker. For example, social workers in a hospital setting are believed to be more reluctant to talk about ambiguity than social workers in other organizations. However, it is believed by Meyerson (1994) that social workers may experience role ambiguity and may be reluctant to discuss it; however there is no evidence that role ambiguity exists among social workers which may lead to burnout if not addressed (Meyerson, 1994).
The term burnout has not been clearly defined in the social sciences' research. It has been used by social scientists to refer to such concepts as anxiety, depression and difficulty, as well as others. Due to the different uses of the term, the scope and applicability of burnout has remained elusive. However in spite of this elusiveness, universally everyone experiences burnout. Whether we want to admit it or not, burnout is an intrinsic part of being human. For example, a person may experience such events as death, loss of job, or change in marital status, often referred to as life events that ultimately may lead to burnout in all individuals (Barley, 1991).

Barley (1991) stated that burnout is nothing new to humanity. It was first identified as a result of any life changes that disturb the homeostasis of the body. Burnout can be identified with all major and minor life events. Two examples are major changes on a job and downsizing. Burnout has been generally accepted as a part of growing up and preparing for life. Today, burnout is surfacing in more recognizable ways and is compounded by the unique problems of the 1980’s (Barley, 1991).

Due to the growing concerns of burnout, the question is asked, does burnout on the job contribute to role ambiguity? Would it be correct to say that it is almost impossible for workers to perform their jobs accurately if they are experiencing some burnout? Barley indicated that workers
experience burnout when multiple tasks are placed upon them and short deadlines are given (Barley, 1991).

Due to the limited amount of literature on role ambiguity as it relates to burnout, there is a need for further investigation on how social workers respond to burnout, and if role ambiguity contributes to that burnout. Therefore, more research which includes this important aspect must be generated to lesson this deficit in the literature.

According to Ewalt (1991), burnout is defined as a state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion marked by physical depletion and chronic fatigue, a feeling of hopelessness and the development of negative attitudes about work, life, and other people. When a worker becomes burned out, there is no interest or motivation to perform one's job or responsibilities. People sometime experience temporary burnout during busy periods in their lives. It is believed that if a person has reached the level of burnout, then reduced job satisfaction, reduced productivity, increased absenteeism, or increased job turn-overs becomes probable (Ewalt, 1991).

In the social work profession there is a high degree of personal investment in work, high performance expectations, and emotionally demanding situations. Literature states that burnout is increasing among the helping profession because of issues such as low pay, long hours, excessive paperwork,
little opportunity for advancement, and employer unresponsiveness (Cordes & Daughty, 1993).

In a variety of settings, many people are in need of services precisely because they are lacking personal and social skills. At least part of the time, it is believed that human service workers must deal directly with uncooperative, hostile, generally obnoxious and disturbed clients. In dealing with these clients it is necessary that the role of the worker is clear (Cordes & Daughty, 1993).

In summary, there is a need to determine if there is a relationship between role ambiguity and burnout. Research has addressed burnout in organizations, but the literature has not addressed burnout as it relates to role ambiguity. This research therefore seeks to broaden this body of knowledge among social workers in the metropolitan Atlanta area and will examine how burnout and role ambiguity are associated with each other in the workplace among social workers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to ascertain data in order to analyze and explain selected demographic factors and their relationship between the workplace problems of role ambiguity and burnout among social workers in the metropolitan Atlanta area. Also, the study will analyze role ambiguity and burnout in order to identify predictors of these workplace problems among social workers.
Research Questions

The research questions of this study are as follows:

1. Is there a relationship between role ambiguity and burnout among social workers in the metropolitan Atlanta area?

2. Is there a relationship between gender, age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, type of work setting, on the job and role ambiguity among social workers in the metropolitan Atlanta area?

3. Is there a relationship between gender, age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, type of work setting, on the job and burnout among social workers in the metropolitan Atlanta area?

Hypotheses

The null hypotheses for this study are as follows:

1. There is no statistically significant relationship between role ambiguity and burnout among social workers in the metropolitan Atlanta area?

2. There is no statistically significant relationship between gender, age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, type of work setting, on the job and role ambiguity among social workers in the metropolitan Atlanta area?
3. There is no statistically significant relationship between gender, age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, type of work setting, on the job and burnout among social workers in the metropolitan Atlanta area?

The following independent and dependent variables will facilitate the measurement for the preceding hypotheses. The dependent variables are burnout and role ambiguity. The independent variables are gender, age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, type of work setting and satisfied with job.

Significance of the Study

A review of the literature revealed that social workers experience a variety of workplace problems. Mentioned prominently among these workplace problems were role ambiguity and burnout. The literature review indicated that these problems seemed in some ways related to each other, however there was little to no evidence from research that indicated a statistical relationship between these workplace problems among social workers. Because this study will focus on social workers, it is anticipated that the study will add to what is known about social workers in the workplace. The research data developed as a result of this study will add to the existing literature on role ambiguity and burnout in a unique way. This research will analyze and explain whether
there is a statistical relationship between role ambiguity and burnout among social workers in the workplace.

In summary this dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter I consists of the introduction of the research. Chapter II consists of the review of literature related to role ambiguity and burnout among social workers. Also in chapter II, there is a discussion of applicable theoretical frameworks, which highlights theories used in the study. Chapter III presents the methodology of the study. Chapter IV is the presentation of the findings. Lastly, chapter V presents the conclusion and implications of the study.

List Of Terms

Burnout - A nontechnical term to describe workers who feel apathy or anger as a result of on-the-job stress and frustration. Burnout is found in social work and other fields where workers have more responsibility than control. Role ambiguity also can be defined as the situation in which there is uncertainty about job duties and responsibilities.

Role Ambiguity - A situation in which the expectations of a role are unclear or diffuse either to the person enacting it or to the relevant other.

Social Worker - A person that has graduated from a school of social work (either bachelor’s or master’s degrees), who use their knowledge and skills to provide social services for clients.
Work Setting - describes the place in which a person works. For example, hospital, social agency, schools, etc.

Type of Work Setting - Indicates the area of work, such as a public agency, private agency, federal government, state & local, etc.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the current literature for role ambiguity and burnout among social workers. The intent is to develop a better understanding of how role ambiguity and burnout relate to professional social workers and what perceptions social workers have of role ambiguity and burnout in the workplace.

The field of social work has experienced numerous changes over the past four decades. Among these changes are the inclusion of advanced practice and refinement of theory, knowledge and research, including more recently energies towards academics and doctoral candidates. These advancements, however, still have not diminished the question "does social work meet the criteria for a profession and do the functions that social workers perform characterize professional activity?" Although there has been progress with the technologies and theories of the arts and humanities, such advancement improves techniques but does not necessarily result in progress towards defining a profession (Goldstein, 1992).
This is not to say that the social work profession should not advance theory, development, research, and other scholarly pursuits of social work. Just as the aspiring musician ought to be knowledgeable about musicology or the writer about literacy criticism, so should professional social workers be well-grounded in the human sciences. Schon (1983), Greene (1996), are among the few theorists who define social work as an art form and who recommend that the art of humanities are foundations for practice.

In this study, role ambiguity and burnout are considered principle concepts that are the concerns of social workers on their jobs. In order to gain a better understanding of the relationship between role ambiguity and burnout, the literature review is organized into five sections: (1) role ambiguity within organization; (2) role ambiguity and social workers; (3) burnout within organizations; (4) burnout and social workers; and (5) theoretical framework.

Role Ambiguity Within Organizations

Role ambiguity describes the situation in which there is uncertainty about job duties and responsibilities. Also, role ambiguity is a particular important source of much job related stress (Leigh & Lucas, 1998). While many employees might suffer from ambiguity or conflicting expectations and uncertainty are particularly common in the managerial role. Having responsibility for the behavior of others and a lack
of opportunity to participate in important decisions affecting the job are other aspects of employees' roles that may be stressful (Leigh & Lucas, 1998).

It is better if individuals have a good working relationship with peers, subordinates, and superiors. Within an organization, relationships and interactions with others are a crucial part of organizational life and may be a potential source of burnout. For example, a study of employees indicated that intrusions by others—interruptions from noisy co-workers, ringing telephones, and people walking into and around their work station were important sources of burnout (Sutton, 1997).

As a reaction to the above mentioned workplace intrusions there is a possibility that certain types of intrusions may cause burnout. According to Jackson (1995), severe role ambiguity often may cause burnout in organizations and subsequently coping behaviors. These behaviors may include (1) aggressive action and hostile communication; (2) withdrawal; and (3) approaching the managers regarding joint problem solving. Research findings are not clear on the relationship between role ambiguity and organizational development. However, burnout is a common reaction to severe role ambiguity (Jackson, 1995).

Organizational development is used to manage and change the organization's culture and climate. Organization
development focuses on the systems effect to implement change (Lahiry, 1994).

Communication is the foundation of human relations. If managers desire subordinates to meet expectations and objectives, they must effectively communicate these objectives. According to one study, worker loyalty is being challenged by a failure to convey goals. Personal communication helps job satisfaction and commitment. If managers want to help employees meet their needs, they will have to communicate effectively with employees to find out what their needs are. Otherwise, motivation cannot take place. Creating a winning situation also requires effective two-way communication. (Wallstreet, 1990).

Although the intensity, duration, frequency, and consequences may vary, burnout has three basic components: physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion. Physical exhaustion is characterized by low energy, chronic fatigue, weakness, and weariness. Emotional exhaustion involves feelings of depression helplessness, and entrapment leading to extreme cases of mental illness or thoughts about suicide. Mental exhaustion is characterized by the development of negative attitudes toward one's self, toward work, and toward life. Also, included are three common antecedents of burnout in human services. They include: work that is emotionally stressful, certain personality characteristics that made people choose human service as a

There has been extensive research conducted on the constructs of role ambiguity and strain at the individual level of analysis (Jackson & Schuler, 1985). Although theoretical justification exists for considering these constructs as the group level of analysis, the literature has not adequately addressed role ambiguity and strain as group level phenomena. This study attempted to increase the understanding of role ambiguity as group level phenomena. The results provided a support for the notion that the revised model of the consequences of role ambiguity may be moderated by task interdependence (Jackson & Schuler, 1985).

In a study conducted by Frost (1996), the literature findings indicated that the relationship between job security and each of the job behaviors and attitudes may be mediated by two workplace stressors: role ambiguity and role overload. Mediating relationships are important because they statistically define the psychological factors of job insecurity and the expected outcome. Consequently, it was pointed out how or why two variables are related to one another, which in turn, suggest specific intervention strategies to lessen the impact of job insecurity (Frost, 1996).
Role Ambiguity and Social Workers

Generally role ambiguity is referred to as a perceived lack of job-related information. Ilgen and Hollenbeck (1991) defined role ambiguity as the level of uncertainty or lack of clarity surrounding expectations about a single role.

Although much of the early research on role ambiguity began with the assumption that ambiguity frustrates the human need for clarity or structure in the environment (Ilgen and Hollenbeck, 1991), more recent explanations have been offered for the negative effects of role ambiguity. King and King (1990) suggested that the negative consequences of role ambiguity results from the fact that role ambiguity interferes with goal accomplishments. If, according to Sawyer (1992), employees lack information concerning their supervisor's expectations or feel unsure about how to do their jobs, this uncertainty can hinder job performance and can lead to job dissatisfaction. Sawyer's (1992) explanation for the effects of role ambiguity as an inherently stressful state, assumes that role ambiguity has negative effects because it interferes with the ability of employees to effectively do their jobs. These explanations by both King and King (1990) and by Sawyer (1992) offer partial explanations for the outcome associated with role ambiguity.
Role ambiguity also can be defined as the situation in which there is uncertainty about job duties and responsibilities. Leigh and Lucas (1998) believe that role ambiguity is a particular source of job-related stress, and they defined it as a person's perception or a lack of clear, consistent information about a particular job (Leigh & Lucas, 1998).

Role ambiguity has attracted little attention from researchers as a major concern of social workers. According to Kleman (1991), the study of role ambiguity is not considered important because researchers have identified the term ambiguity as a lack of clarity as to what is expected, appropriate, or effective job behavior of employees.

Forman and Sauer (1990) identified four major kinds of opaqueness in social work organizations that are related to ambiguity. First is the ambiguity of intention which states that many social work organizations are characterized by inconsistent and ill-defined objectives. It often is impossible to specify a meaningful preference function for an organization that satisfies both the consistency requirements for theories of choice and the empirical requirements of describing organizational motive. Second is that lack of clarity is the ambiguity of understanding. For example, the causal world in which social workers live is obscure; technologies are unclear; environments are difficult to interpret, and it is hard to see the
connections between organizational actions and their consequences. Thirdly, the lack of clarity is the ambiguity of history, and without history, it would be difficult to interpret the future. For example, understanding what happened, why it is happening, and whether it had to happen would be problematic. Fourth, the lack of clarity is the ambiguity of organization. Individuals vary in the attention they provide to different decisions and they may vary from one situation to another. Consequently, the pattern of participation is uncertain and changing (Marsh & Ilsen, 1987).

In general, there is not much literature about social workers as it relates to role ambiguity. Also, little is known about the specifics of role ambiguity related to social workers although there is considerable information about ambiguity in organizations. Literature on role ambiguity as it affects social workers, has been an under-explored concept. According to the literature, social workers are viewed as having a clear understanding of their role as it relates to role ambiguity in the workforce, however the literature also indicated that some social workers are untruthful during their interviews about role ambiguity and that away from the interview, they more openly discuss role ambiguity and this lack of a clear organizational role (Marsh & Ilsen, 1987).
Lester (1984) conducted a study on counselors in the Clark County School District. The study was designed to study the relationship of job satisfaction, role ambiguity and role conflict of those counselors in an attempt to assess the effect of the variables in six selected areas of job satisfaction, work itself, working condition, recognition, responsibility, supervision and colleagues. The results indicated that as the job satisfaction of the counselors increased, the amount of role ambiguity and role conflict decreased (Lester, 1984).

In another study by Duffus (1996), he explored the relationship of school counselors role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. Also, the study was designed to determine if there were statistically significant differences among the control variables, role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. The sample included 221 counselors, and 166 responded to the survey. The results of the study indicated that the relationship between role conflict and job satisfaction was significant. Overall, role conflict was significantly related to job satisfaction. There was no significant differences among job satisfaction, role conflict, role ambiguity, and the control variables for the counselors (Duffus, 1996).

According to a study by Dannemiller (1992), a high role ambiguity was associated with high burnout levels. The study was designed to examine the extent to which burnout,
with its characteristics of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment, existed among special education service leadership personnel in public schools (Dannemiller, 1992).

A cross-sectional survey was conducted of 183 protective service workers which examined the impact of burnout, sense of competence, level of experience, role ambiguity, and social support of helpers perceptions of clients. The study built upon previous research showing that some professional helpers develop negative perceptions of clients personality traits. Ten hypothesis were tested and among those ten role ambiguity was positively associated with burnout (Barnes, 1985).

The workers were found to perceive clients as average people, who were not overly negative in their personality traits. Burnout was not related to workers perception of clients. But experience level and sense of competence were positively correlated with burnout and negatively correlated with sense of competence. Social support was positively correlated with sense of competence and negatively correlated with role ambiguity (Barnes, 1985).

Burnout Within Organizations

According to Pines and Kafry (1998), burnout is a state of physical and emotional exhaustion. It is characterized by physical depletion, by feelings of negative self-concept and negative attitudes toward work, life and other people.
Burnout is the result of constant or repeated emotional pressure associated with intense involvement with people over a long period of time. Such involvement is particularly prevalent in all human-service professions (Pines & Kafry, 1998).

Organizations in general share three antecedents of burnout: overload, lack of autonomy, and lack of rewards. Overload implies more work that can be completed in a given period of time. It also implies that the job requires skill and knowledge exceeding those of the workers. Lack of control over one’s environment is a highly stressful experience which may result in learned helplessness and depression. A perceived lack of autonomy appears to be a powerful antecedent of burnout in organizations.

Organizations are inefficient distributors of rewards, appreciation, and recognition. Burnout comes in part from the feeling that one is working hard, beyond requirements of the job, and yet one’s efforts are not appreciated. From an extreme form, burnout may reach a breaking point beyond which the individual loses the ability to cope with and enjoy the environment (Billingsley, 1994).

According to Chance (1981), burnout is a very costly phenomena. It appears to be costly for those who quit their jobs in terms of their wasted training, and it is costly for those who stay in terms of the psychological price they pay. It is costly for the organization in terms of lost talents,
and poor performance. It is also costly for the clients and patients. As a result of burnout, a client waits longer to receive attention and concern. The quality of the care that the clients receive is poor and the experience of obtaining this care is very humiliating (Chance, 1981).

According to Clark (1980), the immediate cause of burnout is a mismatch between effort and results. A large percentage of the time, good intentions are met with low pay, impossible workloads, miles of red tape, inadequate training, low prestige and ungrateful clients. The ideal of helping people becomes very difficult. Too little stress and we rush out. Too much stress and we burnout (Clark, 1980).

In addition to changes in the organization, some employees may experience physical and behavioral signs. These signs may include chronic fatigue, frequent colds, the flu, headaches, and gastrointestinal disturbances. Other symptoms of burnout include sleeplessness and, excessive use of drugs, or decline in self-esteem (Coburn, 1995).

The working definition of burnout is viewed as the process of wearing out and wearing down of a person’s energy, or the combination of physical fatigue, emotional exhaustion, and cognitive wear out that develops gradually over time (Freudenberger and North, 1985).

Burnout research publish about 60 to 80 articles per year (Roberts, 1986). Moreover, the field first appeared in 1974, when a clinical psychologist, Freudenberger used it to
represent a syndrome he observed in his practice. This syndrome consisted of a certain combination of long-lasting emotional exhaustion, physical fatigue, absence of job involvement, dehumanization of the recipients of one's services, and lowered job accomplishments of the recipients of one's services, and lowered job accomplishments (Freudenberger, 1980).

As noted earlier, burnout is present in social work organizations. The adverse consequences of it, in term of employee morale and satisfaction, employee health, and organization-level outcomes such as absenteeism and productivity, are well documented. These consequences are known to be very significant to the well-being of individual employees and to the viability of organizations (Vingerhoets & Marcelissen, 1988).

There are threads of evidence connecting burnout to various disease states. The literature on burnout has dealt almost exclusively with individual employee burnout. Researchers have overlooked the potentialities of defining and investigating group or organizational burnout. It is believed that there is a parallelism between individual employee and organizational burnout (Staw, Sandelands, & Dutton, 1981).

According to Kramer (1990), organizational burnout may be self-imposed, such as when unrealistic production targets for employees create overload that eventually impacts
on the members’ motivation, attitudes, and behavior. It may be externally imposed by stockholders’ excessive demands that continuously deplete the organization’s energetic resources. The study of the impact of organizational resources on the birth, growth, and mortality or organizations has been a recurring theme in the organizational ecology literature (Singh & Lumsden, 1991).

Literature has not indicated a comprehensive relationship between measures of burnout and the work settings in organizations. Ackerley (1988) found that human service workers who work in public settings experience higher levels of burnout than those in private practice. Boice and Myers (1987) found that psychologists in private practice were happier than those in academic positions. Dupree and Day (1995) likewise found therapists in private practice reported higher levels of satisfaction and lower levels of burnout than public sector therapists. Conversely, Hellman and Morrison (1987) reported that psychologists in private practice experienced more burnout than those who work in institutional settings.

Given the research on burnout in psychologists, and the contradictory finding in the literature, continued research on burnout is needed. In an investigation to study burnout in a national sample of counseling psychologists, the primary goal was to examine the relationship between burnout and type of primary practice setting, type of secondary
practice setting, hours of client contact, years in present position, and years employed with current organization. It was hypothesized that some practice settings, hours of client contact, years employed in present position, and years employed with current organization combined could predict emotional exhaustion, depersonalization of clients, and a sense of personal accomplishment, when demographic variables of age, gender, and marital status were controlled. These variables were included to control for their potential effects on relationships between burnout and type of practice setting, hours of client contact, and years on the job, the principal variables under investigation. A second goal of this investigation was to compare levels of burnout in counseling psychologists with those used in the morning of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach, et al., 1996).

Participants in this study were 1,000 members of the American Psychological Association (APA) who had received a doctoral-level degree from counseling psychological programs in the United States. Of the 1,000 members selected to receive the mailed instruments, a total of 521 were returned and usable. This represents a usable return rate of 52.1 percent of the survey population. The mean age of the sample participants was 47.5 years and ranged from 30 to 79. Sixty-four percent of the respondents were female, and 36 percent were male. Approximately 43% of the respondents
indicated that their primary practice setting was in private practice, 29% were employed in a university setting, 10.9% were employed in inpatient hospital settings, 7.3% of the participants were employed at community mental health centers, and 9.8% were employed in other settings (Maslach, 1996).

It has been consistently demonstrated that burnout is an identifiable and important phenomenon in the human service profession, it is by no means clearly understood. Continued research on the experience and correlates of burnout is critical to developing better understanding and improved strategies for preventing and reducing its incidence among psychologists and other human service providers. Such research on burnout among counseling psychologists and other mental health professionals is directly relevant to their health and well being, and indirectly relevant to the quality of care they provide to their clients (McGee, 1989).

Burnout and Social Workers

Although burnout is not limited to human service workers, job characteristics common in human services jobs, such as low pay, long hours, excessive paperwork, little opportunity for advancement, powerlessness, and unresponsive and unappreciative bureaucratic environments have been found to be related to burnout. Also, the social service profession is client-centered and often requires emotional
involvement which may put stress on employees and personnel (Beemsterboer & Baum, 1994).

Hospital social workers are particularly vulnerable to burnout for several reasons. First, like all human services workers, hospital social workers work with people in emotionally demanding situations and in less-than-ideal working conditions. Second, they work in hospitals, which are known to be stressful working environments. Finally, hospital social workers deal with the rapid expansion of for-profit health care; they need to develop income-producing services; heavier caseloads; more complex and demanding cases; the pressure to surcharge patients and increased competition among the health profession, particularly between social workers and physicians (Himle, Jayaratne & Thyness, 1999).

Burnout is viewed differently by many people. Some individuals view burnout as a state of process and outcome, but more appropriately burnout may be understood in both an individual context and an organizational context (Clark, 1992).

Clark (1992) stated that in order to address the root causes of burnout, researchers need to examine the philosophy of the organization and the individual workers within the organization, taking into consideration the values, ethics, and morality of society. The Maslach Burnout Inventory is one method of measuring burnout.
According to Edelwich (1990), burnout among professionals and paraprofessionals in the human services is much easier to observe and to describe than it is to define. He states that burnout is an overworked, underpaid counselor or a recovering addict, or a person that drinks on the job until he or she is forced to resign because of an alcohol problem. Burnout is a high school teacher that constantly talks about the students' behaviors in the teacher lounge. Burnout is a nurse feeling as if her arms are being pulled out of the sockets by all the patients who call for help as she walks past their rooms (Edelwich, 1990).

Andreas Gehmeyer (1993) described burnout as a "problem born of good intention." The author goes on to say that people set unrealistic goals for themselves, and although filled with enthusiasm in the beginning of the project, they often feel overwhelmed. These people are normally very dedicated to a project in the beginning.

Gehmeyer identified three things associated with burnout: role ambiguity (the person is not sure what is expected of him/her); role conflict (conflicting responsibilities pull a person in different directions); and role overload (the person cannot say no and keeps taking on more responsibilities) (Gehmeyer, 1993).

These descriptions suggest a working definition. Andreas Gehmeyer used the term "burnout" to refer to progressive loss of idealism, energy, and purpose.
experienced by people in the helping profession as a result of the conditions of their work. These conditions range from insufficient training to client overload, from too many hours to too little pay, from inadequate funding to ungrateful clients, from bureaucratic or political constraints to the inherent gap between aspiration and accomplishment (Gehmeyr, 1993).

Burnout most frequently is found among members of the helping professions which include doctors, nurses, police officers, teachers and social workers (Burke & Richardson, 1996). Burnout is increasing among the helping professions because of low pay, long hours, excessive paperwork, little opportunity for advancement, powerlessness, and an unresponsive and unappreciative work environment (Gibson, 1993).

Many social work practitioners experience burnout from overload. They must devote a tremendous amount of time to activities, paperwork, assessments, and weekly reports. Furthermore, the practitioner often facilitates burnout because there are inadequate social and professional support services (Baker, 1995).

Although burnout can occur in any job situation, social workers in the helping profession are most likely to experience burnout for the following reasons:
Ambiguity in organizations contributes to ambiguity in organizational roles, which ultimately leads to increased stress, tension, and burnout (Cherniss, 1998).

An individual personality characteristic (e.g., overly anxious individuals who are self-punitive when they fail to achieve their unrealistic high goals (Cherniss, 1998).

Alienation, a condition in which individuals experience themselves and significant spaces of the physical and social environment as estranged and out of their control (Powell, 1994).

Overinvolvement or excessive commitment to clients, which may be detrimental to client and social worker, or both system factors (Koeske & Kelley, 1995).

The initial literature on burnout conceptualized it as an individual's inability to cope with stress. Thus, subsequent remedies focused on the individual (Powell, 1994). Later authors shifted this focus to the relationship between the worker and the work environment (Arches, 1991).

Some levels of burnout may be inevitable for all human service workers. However, social workers and their supervisors need to be aware of the symptoms of burnout and employ early measures of prevention (Leitner, 1991).
Burnout is a "vicious cycle," especially among people working in the helping professions, and has detrimental effects on those individuals' productivity and job satisfaction (Leitner, 1991). A study on job burnout was conducted on 275 randomly selected social workers practicing in Massachusetts. The study revealed that social workers were most satisfied with their jobs when they felt they had control over their work setting and were not stifled by multiple roles. The results of this study add to the importance of social workers having control over their freedom to decide how and what methods they use in performing their work activities. The study further indicated that as long as social workers lacked clarity of job responsibility, they are likely to be dissatisfied and experience some degree of on-the-job stress or burnout (Arches, 1991).

Verstraete (1994) reports that "in order to meet organizational goals and mandates in a professional manner, an agency must have a seasoned, well-balanced staff." A sound work atmosphere provides an active support system for all of its staff members. Jayaratne and Chess (1984) reported that if an agency is demanding "high quality work" they should lessen the caseload of the social workers, which in turn enables the social workers to provide the quality of work demanded by the agency. Verstraete (1994) explains that social workers cannot bear the cost of burnout. These costs
infringe upon the agency's ethical obligation to their employees to protect their physical and mental health.

Kari Killen (1996) examined the cost of burnout to individuals and families and noted that the worker that feels totally responsible for the people they serve will be unable to serve the client properly, and that this will interfere with the worker's delivery of care to clients. Research literature contributes to the knowledge of burnout by addressing where the responsibility for burnout lies. Soderfedlt (1995) reported that some of the responsibility to reduce burnout lies with agencies and social workers. This may be attributed to workers' exposure to direct service work early, and their ability to recognize the signs of burnout and to develop coping techniques.

The intense involvement with clients required of professional staff in various human-service institutions includes a great deal of emotional stress. Failure to cope successfully with such stress can result in the emotional exhaustion syndrome of burnout. The burnout syndrome seems to manifest in stages. First, emotional exhaustion is seen specifically as a loss of positive feelings, sympathy, and respect for clients. Secondly, a cynical and dehumanizing perception of clients occurs. As the condition advances, the emotional stress of burnout are dealt with less and less effectively. Finally, the burnout victim may resign from his or her position, possibly the profession (Maslach, 1998).
Johnson and Stone (1997) suggested that mental exhaustion be characterized by the development of negative attitudes toward one's self, toward work and toward life. Workers who become burned out often report dissatisfaction with their work and the way of life and a lowered self-concept; they feel inadequate, inferior, and incompetent. In addition to developing negative self concepts and pessimistic views of their own work, people that burnout also develop negative attitudes toward others. They often discover in themselves coldness and nastiness they never knew existed. Burnout professionals in the human services often come to see their clients as aggregates of problems rather than as individuals (Johnson & Stone, 1997).

Based on the literature review from Johnson and Stone (1997) some of the changes that have occurred in health care over the past decade have significant impact on social workers who practice in health care settings. The literature underscores the importance of understanding the structural aspects as they relate to role ambiguity and burnout of social workers. As long as social workers are stressed with their work in organizations, they are likely to be dissatisfied and experience some degree of burnout.
Theoretical Framework

A theoretical foundation for examining the premise that professional burnout and role ambiguity may be found in various leadership and organizational theories were examined to construct this chapter. To formulate the conceptual framework for this study, the succeeding section focuses on the relationships between the independent and dependent variables which emanated from the literature review. The study endeavored to investigate the relationship among role ambiguity and burnout in the workplace of social workers. It is believed that a great number of people may not relax at the workplace, which is important in our lives. Some of us may see the workplace as a source of fulfillment and satisfaction or a source of dissatisfaction and unfulfillment. Some may view it as being enjoyable or only as a means of making money, work is defined as a primary part of our lives. In the United States our social status is determined primarily from the work and income it produces. Our role in society is defined by work, because it is an important factor in our lives (Reisman, 1986).

The theoretical framework used for this research is Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of Job Satisfaction and Reisman's Management Theory. Both theories provided a context for developing hypotheses to test in this investigation and served as the theoretical basis for interpreting this study's findings.
The first theory that will be used is Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction. In 1959, Herzberg and two colleagues conducted a study on job attitudes and motivation in order to determine characteristics of job satisfaction. This study suggests that two distinctly different dimensions existing as separate and independent continuums could be identified by individuals with regard to their work. The dimensions identified were job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. The first dimension, job satisfaction, exists on a continuum that ranges from no satisfaction to satisfaction. This dimension relates to the nature of the work and the psychological rewards that stems from it. The intrinsic characteristics derived from this dimension are known as motivators. Motivators act as reinforcers. Factors that influence motivators are achievement, recognition, advancement, growth, and responsibility. The second dimension, known as job dissatisfaction, exists on a continuum ranging from dissatisfaction to no dissatisfaction. This dimension incorporates environmental indices exemplified from the job; hence the factors related to this dimension are extrinsic in nature and are known as hygiene factors. Characteristics affiliated with hygiene factors are supervision, interpersonal relations, physical working conditions, salary, company policies, administrative practices, benefits, and job security. According to Herzberg, when hygiene factors decrease below the employees'
expectations, then job dissatisfaction increases. Herzberg’s theory is based upon psychological phenomena and environmental issues that determine whether or not individuals are satisfied or dissatisfied with their work situations (Herzberg, 1968).

The second theory used for this study was Reisman’s Management Theory. The conceptual framework that undergirds this theory is considered consistent within the perspective of occupational achievement (Reisman, 1986).

Reisman (1986) wrote that major changes in industrial management theories had significant implications for the field of social work. He reported that the essence of these changes was a shift of emphasis from formal hierarchical structure toward the needs of the people in the organization. Reisman stated that traditionally, social workers did not favor management as a source of theory for managing their social agencies. The assumption was that an incompatibility exists between the profit-making motives of business managers and the altruistic and human service objectives of social work professionals. Reisman pointed out that the changes taking place in many leading businesses warrant reassessment, and that their interrelationships suggest a growing compatibility between business values and those of social work (Reisman, 1986).

According to Reisman (1986), social workers appear to have an aversion to professional management concepts, and
that two conclusions can be drawn about the pattern of de-emphasizing professional management techniques in social work agencies. The first conclusion is based on a perception of control in management functions and the second conclusion is based on a pattern of denial by social agencies of the advantages of good management in handling financial and human resources.

If, as Reisman suggested, there is an aversion among social workers to utilize management theories, this aversion is not realized in the scholarly review of literature. Researchers have developed very useful theories that have proven to be useful in understanding and managing people in human service organizations (Reisman, 1986).

In summary, professional social work administrators in their efforts to effectively manage human service organizations often relied upon and were impacted by management theories that made circumstances of complex organizations comprehensible. The inclusion of social workers in research related to role ambiguity and burnout is limited. However, the identification of one study conducted at a large southern university yielded a sample population of 1,456 employees. This study included 306 minority men matched with 606 white men and 422 minority women matched with 422 minority women. Minority employees included African American, Hispanics, Asian, and Native American (Reisman, 1986).
The sample population was matched according to gender, stress, job titles, burnout and salary. However, the limited number of social workers identified in this study was too small for analysis therefore social workers were not represented adequately in this study. Hispanics were considered the minority because they scored 2.26 for experiencing stress and burnout, and Whites ranked second reporting 2.23 in experiencing stress and burnout (Beehr, et al., 1990).

The percentage of minority group members in the total workforce of the United States is increasing significantly. While current studies may not reflect this growth, it is nevertheless important for human service organizations to benefit from current literature on role ambiguity and burnout and to create prevention programs for all social workers, especially social workers who most often are prone to stress in the work force (James & Khoi, 1991). Shumaker and Hill (1991) also found whatever unevenness in research related to gender, role ambiguity, and burnout. The researchers also found that there was virtually no studies on social worker referencing to these variables (Shumaker & Hill, 1991). Sufficient data does not exist on role ambiguity and burnout experienced by social workers - a population that is becoming highly visible in the work force.
In sum, this chapter was a review of the literature on role ambiguity and burnout of social workers who were employed. The literature review was presented in order to lay a scholarly foundation for this study. Understanding role ambiguity and burnout is very important to social work practice because some of the clients referred to social workers are seen by other workers in the social work field and because their intervention practices can have a ripple affect. Often when social workers are burned out they make bad or wrong decisions which have an adverse affect on clients, agencies and workers.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents a design for explaining and describing the scope of the relationship between the two dependent variables, role ambiguity and burnout, and the selected ten independent variables which are gender, age, marital status, job function, race, income, ethnicity, work setting, type of work setting and current job satisfaction. More specifically, this chapter describes the research design, description of the site, population and sample, instrumentation, treatment of data, and limitations of this study.

Research Design

The study uses a quantitative research design to examine the relationship between role ambiguity and burnout among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area. This research design was chosen because the quantitative research design allows the researcher to investigate relatively large amounts of data and subjects using descriptive and inferential statistics, survey techniques and statistical tests.
A descriptive research design gives indication of the type of study proposed and how it will be conducted. The design selected for a study is determined by the researcher's intent (Kerlinger, 1992). The current research is designed to examine whether a relationship exists between role ambiguity and burnout among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area.

Description of the Site

The site for this study is Atlanta, Georgia, an urban area that includes ten counties. Five of these ten counties were chosen for the current study. They were Fulton, Dekalb, Gwinnett, Clayton and Cobb.

These counties were chosen because of their size and high number of social workers. This type of distribution is advantageous in that these counties have a wide geographic contact and have accessibility to numerous social workers in the metropolitan Atlanta area.

Population and Sample

The sample population consisted of 300 social workers employed in organizations in the Metropolitan Atlanta area. The term social workers, as used here, refer to persons with a bachelor, masters or doctorate degree in social work and who are currently employed in the Metropolitan Atlanta area.

The current study's population consisted of social workers selected from three sources. These sources are the
membership list of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Georgia chapter; the membership list of the National Association of Black Social Workers (NABSW) Atlanta Chapter; and non-member social workers employed in private agencies, public agencies, K-12 schools, and hospitals located in the Metropolitan Atlanta area.

The sample population for the current study was randomly selected from the various human service organizations listed above. The sample population includes women and men who have a degree in social work. Random sampling is used because it allows the researcher to collect data on some small portion of a population in order to draw conclusions about the entire population.

Instrumentation

The instruments used in this study were developed from Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (1996) and Rizzo's Role Perception Questionnaire (1970). The Maslach Burnout Inventory and the Role Perception instruments were chosen because of their relevancy to securing appropriate data, and because of their high degree of face validity. These instruments have standard, accepted measures and are not complicated to administer.

The emphasis for this study is on social work planning, administration, and policy. The Exhaustion-Energy portion of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) was utilized as the instrument of choice for the current study. This section of
the Maslach Burnout Inventory was chosen because of its applicability for measuring burnout. A brief description of each instrument follows:

**Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI)**

Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) was developed by Maslach and Jackson (1994). It is a definitive measure of burnout, used by organizations and by researchers to assess how employees experience their work. It is a reliable inventory that provides a concise perspective on the energy, involvement, and effectiveness of staff members on the job.

The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) measures the three core dimensions of a person's experience with work: exhaustion-energy; depersonalization-involvement; and inefficacy-accomplishment. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) focuses on the workers' personal experience of their work (Maslach & Leiter, 1997).

After reviewing the instrument it was concluded that the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) tends to be the most popular measurement of burnout among organizational researchers. It may also have been the most carefully developed, for many researchers have studied its reliability and validity. Since the validity and reliability of the MBI instrument has been well established, the accuracy of measurement and the consistency of measurement for the current study are considered valid.
Role Perception Questionnaire

The Role Perception Questionnaire was developed by Rizzo (1970). It was designed to measure role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. This instrument accesses various attitudes an individual may have towards specific responsibilities that are associated with their work (Rizzo, 1970).

The Role Perception Questionnaire also has tended to be one of the most popular measurements of role ambiguity among researchers. It also may have been the most carefully developed, and like the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), the Role Perception Questionnaire's reliability and validity already have been established in several previous research studies (Spector, 1988).

Because the validity and reliability of the Role Perception Questionnaire have been well documented, this index is being used for the current study. The questions are placed on a four-point Likert scale. The scale equals: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, and 4=strongly agree.

In sum, there are several advantages to using a portion of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) and the Role Perception Questionnaire. First, they were specifically designed to address certain areas of burnout and role ambiguity. The questions allow for several different areas of burnout and role ambiguity to be measured separately.
This makes it possible for the researcher to establish a clear understanding of the sample population's perception of burnout and role ambiguity in several different areas. Second, the questions are clear and concise. Finally, both questionnaires directly ask the respondent to describe their work by telling how satisfied they are with their work. The questionnaires are very direct and require the respondents to provide information that allows a researcher to determine the respondents level of burnout.

The Study Questionnaire

The questionnaire for this study has two sections. Section I provides demographic information on the survey participants. In section I, ten questions will include gender, age group, marital status, job position, race, education, income, work setting, type of work setting, and current job satisfaction. The purpose of this section is to develop a demographic profile in order to describe the respondents of the study and to gain insight into the independent variables for this study. The ten items selected as independent variables are gender, age group, marital status, job function, race, education, income, work setting, type of work setting, and current job satisfaction.

Section II of the questionnaire is designed to measure the two dependent variables (burnout and role ambiguity) of the study. The questionnaire has eleven (11) questions related to role ambiguity based on the Role Perception
Questionnaire by Rizzo (1990) and ten (10) questions related to burnout based on the Maslach Burnout Inventory, (1996). Maslach and Rizzo have used all questions in other studies. The questions were measured on a four-point continuum Likert scale; 1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=agree and 4=strongly agree in the burnout and role ambiguity instruments.

**Independent Variables**

Ten independent variables were selected for the study. The independent variables are gender, age group, marital status, job position, race, education, income, work setting, type of work setting, current job satisfaction. The structural variables represented three specific categories: 1) Social characteristics (gender and race); 2) Economic characteristics (education, income, work setting, job function, current job satisfaction and type of work setting); and 3) Demographic characteristics (age and marital status).

**Dependent Variables**

Burnout and role ambiguity are the dependent variables of the study. Burnout is defined as a state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion, marked by physical depletion and chronic fatigue, a feeling of hopelessness and the development of negative attitudes about work, life, and other people. When a worker becomes burned out, there is no
interest or motivation to perform during busy periods in their lives. It is believed that when a person has reached the level of burnout, then reduced job satisfaction, reduced productivity, increased absenteeism, or increased job turnover become probable.

Burnout has been addressed in the literature as it relates to other variables, however the literature has not addressed burnout as it relates to role ambiguity. This research therefore seeks to broaden this body of knowledge among social workers. Also, the study examines how burnout and role ambiguity are associated with each other in the workplace among social workers.

Role ambiguity is the second dependent variable of this study. Role ambiguity describes the situation in which there is uncertainty about job duties and responsibilities. Role ambiguity is a particularly important source of much job-related stress.

Role ambiguity has not been addressed very much in the literature as it relates to social workers. This study will attempt to examine role ambiguity as it relates to burnout. This research therefore seeks to broaden this body of knowledge among social workers. Also, the study will examine how role ambiguity and burnout are associated with each other in the workplace among social workers.

Role ambiguity and burnout consist of one broad category: performance related measures. Performance related
measures have three dimensions: 1) variables related to work; 2) variables related to coworkers; and 3) variables related to everyone.

All responses to these variables have four categorical options which are coded for measurement purposes in the following manner: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = strongly agree.

Treatment of Data

Statistical treatment of the data employed descriptive statistics, which included measures of central tendency, frequency distribution, crosstabulations, chi-square, regression and correlation analysis. Data were analyzed utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics were used to organize and analyze the data collected from the survey questionnaire.

Frequency distribution is used on each of the variables of the study in order to summarize the basic measurements of the study. A demographic profile was developed on the study's participants using items from the questionnaire. A frequency distribution also was used to generate demographic information, and the information is presented on tables.

Crosstabulations were done on the ten independent variables (gender, age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, and type of work setting and current job satisfaction) with the dependent variables (role ambiguity and burnout). This
measurement is used in order to show the strength of the relationship between the two variables. The test statistics is the Pearson’s R significance at the .05 level of probability.

Stepwise multiple regression was used to explain the variation between the variables of the study. The test statistics was F-ratio. The hypothesis of the study was tested for statistical significance at .05 level of probability.

Limitations of the Study

Inherent in this study are the following limitations. The study sample was selected from social workers that are working in the metropolitan Atlanta area. Therefore this study’s findings can only be generalized to social workers outside this population area to a limited degree. The validity and reliability of the information contained in this study is restricted to respondents’ ability to accurately and honestly recall and self report events and perceptions that dealt with role ambiguity and burnout. Because perceptions change over time, these findings may be contaminated by change in participant’s attitude and or growth.

In sum, this chapter presents a design for examining and explaining the nature and scope of the relationship between the two dependent variables used in this study. Specifically, it described the research design, description
of the site, population and sample, instrumentation, treatment of data, and the limitation of the study that were used in this study.

The study examined the possible relationship between role ambiguity and burnout of social workers in the metropolitan Atlanta area. Also, the study examined the relationship between the two variables, role ambiguity and burnout, indicating the presence and perception of each variable.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

The major purpose of this study was to determine if there was a statistical relationship between role ambiguity and burnout of social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area. This chapter describes the statistical analysis utilized to test the hypotheses which were formulated from the research questions in Chapter I, and it is divided into two sections. Section one briefly describes the demographic data, and research questions and hypotheses.

A total of 300 social workers who were employed in social service organizations in the Metropolitan Atlanta area were surveyed. Of the 300 social workers surveyed, 158 or 52.2 percent were respondents in the study. The sample was drawn from a pool of 550 potential respondents obtained from two different mailing lists of social workers as well as several social work agencies, hospitals and K-12 schools that had a large number of social workers.

Demographic Data

This section provides a profile of the study respondents. Descriptive statistics were employed to analyze the variables of this study. Table 1 is a demographic
profile of the independent variables. It shows the association between the independent variables of the social workers in the metropolitan Atlanta area.

**Demographic Data**

Table 1. Demographic Profile Of Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cum %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Function</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cum %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSW</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW-PHD</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $30,000</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$39,999</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$49,999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 &amp; Up</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work setting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital &amp; Health</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Agency</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School K-12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court/Justice Sys.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Practice</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The typical social worker respondent of the study was married, African American, and between 40-50 years of age with a master of social work (MSW) degree. The typical social worker was employed in a social agency with the major job function of direct service in a private non-profit type of work setting with an annual income from $30,000-$40,000. Social workers in general indicated that they were satisfied with their job. The percentages revealed that 15.8 percent were dissatisfied with their jobs and 84.2 percent were satisfied with their jobs.

As shown in Table 1, 120 or 75.9 percent of the social work respondents were females and 38 or 24.1 percent were males. These percentages indicated that more females responded to the questionnaire.

The majority of the respondents were married as indicated in Table 1, of the 158 social workers, 71 or 44.9
percent of the social workers indicated that they were married, 53 or 33.5 percent were never married, 29 or 18.4 percent were divorced and 5 or 3.2 percent indicated that they were widowed. The study indicated that most social work respondents worked in direct service. Also, of the 158 respondents in Table 1, 66 or 41.8 percent worked in the administrative work setting and 92 or 58.2 percent of the social workers were working in direct service.

African American social workers represented the majority of the sample. Table 1 indicated that of the 158 respondents, 105 or 66.5 percent were African American, 45 or 28.5 percent were White and 8 or 5.1 percent of the sample represented other ethnic groups.

The majority of the respondents held a master of social work (MSW) degree. Table 1 indicated that of the 158 respondents, 25 or 15.8 percent held a bachelor degree (BSW), 103 or 65.2 percent held a masters of social work degree (MSW), 24 or 15.2 percent held a doctoral degree and 8 or 3.8 percent indicated they held other social work degrees.

The annual income of the social workers ranged from under $30,000 to over $50,000. As shown in table 1, of the 158 respondents, 47 or 29.7 percent indicated that they earned under $30,000 annually, 73 or 46.2 percent earned between $30,000-$39,999 annually, 21 or 13.3 percent earned
between $40,000—$49,999 and 17 or 10.8 percent earned between $50,000 & up annually.

The majority of the social workers worked in social agencies. As shown in Table 1, of the 158 respondents, 43 or 27.2 percent indicated their work setting as hospital & health, 49 or 31.0 percent worked in social agencies, 18 or 11.4 percent worked in K-12 schools, 9 or 5.7 percent worked in courts or justice systems, 33 or 20.9 percent worked in private practice and 6 or 3.8 percent worked in other work settings.

The major employer of social workers, according to type of work setting was private human service organizations. As shown in Table 1, of the 158 respondents, 78 or 49.4 percent worked in public agencies and 80 or 50.6 percent worked in private agencies.

Table 1 indicated that the majority of the social workers were satisfied with their jobs. Of the respondents, 25 or 15.8 percent were dissatisfied with their jobs and 133 or 84.2 percent of the social workers were satisfied with their jobs.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

In this study there were three research questions and three null hypotheses. This section is an analysis of these questions and the testing of the hypotheses. Each hypothesis was restated and evidence presented to determine whether or not each hypothesis was rejected or accepted. The three
research questions were restated and data presented so as to facilitate analysis of each question.

This section is an analysis of the first research question of the study. Data were presented in order to analyze the relationship between role ambiguity and burnout of social workers.

**Relationship between Role Ambiguity and Burnout**

Research Question 1: Is there a relationship between role ambiguity and burnout among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area?

Null Hypotheses 1: There is no statistical relationship between role ambiguity and burnout among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area.

Table 2 is a crosstabulation of burnout and role ambiguity of the respondents. It shows the association between burnout and role ambiguity of social workers.
Table 2. Burnout by Role Ambiguity Among Social Workers  
(N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .37160, df = 1, P< .00000

The majority of the social workers disagreed that they experienced role ambiguity on the job. Table 2 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 34 or 21.5 percent of the social work respondents disagreed that they experienced burnout as a result of role ambiguity and 19 respondents or 12.0 percent agreed that role ambiguity was a result of their burnout. Also, 98 or 62.0 percent of the respondents disagreed that burnout was a result of role ambiguity and 7 or 4.4 percent agreed that burnout was a result of role ambiguity. It was determined that more respondents agreed that their on the job burnout was not related to role ambiguity.

The null hypothesis was rejected. The Phi test indicated that there was a statistically significant
relationship ($P <= .00000$) between role ambiguity and social workers at the .05 level of probability.

**Role Ambiguity Among Social Workers**

**Research Question 2:** Is there a relationship between gender, age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, and type of work setting, current job satisfaction and role ambiguity among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area?

**Null Hypotheses 2:** There is no statistical relationship between gender, age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, and type of work setting, current job satisfaction and role ambiguity among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area.

Table 3 is a frequency distribution of role ambiguity among social workers. It is an indication of the number of social workers who disagree and/or agree that they experience role ambiguity in the workplace.
Table 3. Role Ambiguity Among Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.677   Std dev. 792

The majority of the social workers agreed that they experienced some role ambiguity in the workplace. Table 3 indicates that of the 158 social workers 88 or 55.7 percent of the social workers agreed that they experienced some role ambiguity. Also, 17 or 10.8 percent strongly agreed that they experienced role ambiguity. On the other hand 15 or 9.5 percent of the social workers strongly disagreed that they experienced role ambiguity while 38 or 24.1 percent disagreed that they experienced role ambiguity.

Table 4 is a crosstabulation of gender and role ambiguity of social workers. It shows the association between gender and role ambiguity of social workers.
Table 4. Gender by Role Ambiguity Among Social Workers
(N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .05479, df = 1, P< .49102

Table 4 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 78 or 49.4 percent of the females agreed that they experienced some role ambiguity on their jobs, and 27 or 17.1 percent of the males agreed that they experience role ambiguity. Of the males, 11 or 7.0 percent did not experience role ambiguity and 42 or 26.6 percent of the females disagreed that they experienced role ambiguity on their jobs. It was determined that females experienced more role ambiguity than males on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. The Phi test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (P< .49102) between gender and role ambiguity of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 5 is a crosstabulation between age and role ambiguity of the respondents. It shows the association between age and role ambiguity of social workers.
Table 5. Age by Role Ambiguity Among Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = .80502, df = 3, P< .764963

Table 5 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 36 or 22.8 percent of the respondents between the age of 40-49 agreed that they experienced some role ambiguity on the job, and 19 or 12.0 percent between 40-49 disagreed that they experienced some role ambiguity on the job. It was determined that respondents between the age of 40-49 experienced more role ambiguity than any other age group.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 5, the Contingency Coefficient test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (P<.76493) between age and role ambiguity of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 6 is a crosstabulation of marital status and role ambiguity of the respondents. It shows the association between marital status and role ambiguity of social workers.
Table 6. Marital Status by Role Ambiguity Among Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = .05268, df = 3, P< = .93193

Table 6 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 49 or 31.0 percents of the respondents were married and agreed that they experienced some role ambiguity on the job, and 22 or 13.9 percents married respondents disagree that they experienced role ambiguity on the job. It was determined that the married respondents experienced more role ambiguity than others as it related to marital status on the job. Of the marital status table 6 indicated that the majority of the social workers agreed that they experienced role ambiguity on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 6, the Contingency Coefficient test indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship (P<=.93193)
between marital status and role ambiguity of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 7 is a crosstabulation of job function and role ambiguity of the respondents. It shows the association between job function and role ambiguity of social workers.

Table 7. Job Function by Role Ambiguity Among Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .00378, df = 2, P = .96206

Table 7 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 61 or 38.6 percent of the respondents that worked in direct service agreed that they experienced some role ambiguity on their jobs, and 31 or 19.6 percents disagreed that experienced some role ambiguity on the job. It was determined that direct service workers experienced more role ambiguity than those working in administrative jobs, 22 or 13.9 percent worked in the administrative areas and 31 or 19.6 percent of the respondents worked in direct service.
The study indicated that a total of 41.8 percent of the respondents worked in administrative work and 58.2 percent worked in direct service. The results of this analysis indicated that the majority of the respondents to the questionnaire worked in direct service. It shows the association of job function with role ambiguity of social workers and indicates whether the respondent worked in administrative or direct service. Table 7 indicates that the majority of the direct service social workers agreed that they experienced role ambiguity on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 7, the Phi test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($P<=.96206$) between job function and role ambiguity of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 8 is a crosstabulation of race and role ambiguity of the respondents. It shows the association between race and role ambiguity of social workers.
Table 8. Race by Role Ambiguity Among Social Workers
(N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .12565, df = 2, P< = .28732

Table 8 indicated that the majority of the African American respondents agreed that they experienced role ambiguity on the job. Of the 158 social workers, 71 or 44.9 percent of the African Americans agreed that they experienced some role ambiguity on the job, and 34 or 21.5 percent of the African Americans disagreed that they experienced role ambiguity on the job. It was determined that the African American experienced more role ambiguity as it relates to any other race on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 8, the Phi test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (P< = .28732) between race and role ambiguity of social workers at the .05 level of probability.
Table 9 is a crosstabulation of education and role ambiguity of the respondents. It shows the association of education with role ambiguity of social workers and indicated if the respondent has a bachelor, masters, or a doctoral degree in social work.

Table 9. Education by Role Ambiguity Among Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW-PHD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ C = .14659, \quad df = 3, \quad P < .33462 \]

Table 9 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 64 or 40.5 percent of the (MSW's) agreed that they experienced some role ambiguity on their jobs, and 39 or 24.7 percent of the (MSW's) disagreed that they experienced some role ambiguity on the job.

It was determined that the respondents that held a master's degree in social work experienced more role ambiguity than any other educational group as it relates to
role ambiguity on the job. Table 9 indicates that the majority of the master's level social workers agreed that they experienced role ambiguity on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 9, the Contingency Coefficient test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (P<=.33462) between the educational status by role ambiguity of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 10 is a crosstabulation of income and role ambiguity of the respondent. It shows the association of income with role ambiguity of social workers.

Table 10. Income by Role Ambiguity Among Social Workers
(N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under - $30,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$39,999</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$49,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 &amp; up</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = .08419, df = 3, P< = .77226

Table 10 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 49 or 31.0 percent that earned between $30,000-$39,999 agreed
that they experienced some role ambiguity on their jobs, and 24 or 15.2 percent disagreed that they experienced role ambiguity on the job. It was determined that the respondents that earned between $30,000-$39,999 experienced more role ambiguity than any other income bracket as it relates to role ambiguity on the job. Table 10 indicated that the majority of the social workers that earned $30,000-$39,999 experienced more role ambiguity on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 10, the Contingency Coefficient test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (P<=.77226) between the earned income by role ambiguity of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 11 is a crosstabulation of the work setting and role ambiguity of the respondents. It shows the association of the work setting with role ambiguity of social workers and indicated if the social worker were currently working in a hospital and health setting, social agency, school (K-12), court/justice system or private practice.
Table 11. Work Setting by Role Ambiguity Among Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital &amp; Health</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Agency</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School K-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court/Justice System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Practice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = .20777, df = 5, P< = .21126

Table 11 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 30 or 19.0 percent of the hospital and health workers agreed that they experienced some role ambiguity on the job, and 23 or 14.6 percent of the respondents that worked in social agencies disagreed that they experienced role ambiguity on the job. It was determined that the respondents that worked in the hospital or health settings experienced more role ambiguity than any other work setting as it relates to role ambiguity. Table 11 indicates that the majority of the social workers that worked in hospitals and health work settings agreed that they experienced role ambiguity on the job.
The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 11, the Contingency Coefficient test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship \((P<=.21126)\) between the work setting by role ambiguity of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 12 is a crosstabulation of the type of work setting and role ambiguity of the respondents. It shows the association of the type work setting with role ambiguity of social workers and indicated if the social worker were currently working in private or public agencies.

Table 12. Type of Work Setting by Role Ambiguity Among Social Workers \((N=158)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Agency</td>
<td>22 13.9</td>
<td>56 35.4</td>
<td>78 49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Agency</td>
<td>31 19.6</td>
<td>49 31.0</td>
<td>80 50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 33.5</td>
<td>105 66.5</td>
<td>158 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\Phi = .11166, \ df = 1, \ P< .16045\)

Table 12 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 49 or 31.0 percent of the private agency respondents agreed that they experienced some role ambiguity on their jobs, and 31 or 19.6 percent of the private agency respondents disagreed that they experienced role ambiguity on the job.
It was determined that public agency social workers experienced more role ambiguity than public agency social workers as it relates to type of work setting on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 12, the Phi test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (P<=.16045) between the type of work setting and role ambiguity of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 13 is a crosstabulation of the current job satisfaction and role ambiguity of the respondent. It shows the association of the current job satisfaction with role ambiguity of social workers and indicated if the social worker currently very satisfied, dissatisfied, satisfied and or very satisfied on the job.

Table 13. Current Job Satisfaction by Role Ambiguity Among Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>20 12.7</td>
<td>5 3.2</td>
<td>25 15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>33 20.9</td>
<td>100 63.3</td>
<td>133 84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 33.5</td>
<td>105 66.5</td>
<td>158 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .42659, df = 1, P< = .00000
Table 13 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 100 or 63.3 percent of the social workers agreed that they were satisfied with their jobs as it relates to role ambiguity, and 33 or 20.9 percent disagreed that role ambiguity influenced their satisfaction with their jobs. It was determined that social workers were satisfied with their jobs as it relates to role ambiguity.

The null hypothesis was rejected. As shown in Table 13 the Pearson R test indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship (P<=.00000) between current job satisfaction and role ambiguity of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 14 is a compilation of the relationship between role ambiguity and the selected variables. It is a summary of the data on gender, age group, marital status, job function, race, education and income. Table 14 indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship between gender, age group, education, marital status, job function and income.
Table 14. Role Ambiguity and Selected Variables of Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW-PHD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $30,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-39,999</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-49,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 &amp; Up</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 is a compilation of the relationship between role ambiguity and the selected variables. It is a summary of the data on work setting, type of work setting and current job satisfaction. As shown in table 14, there was no statistically significant relationship between work setting, type of work setting. However, table 14 indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship (P<.00000) between role ambiguity and current job satisfaction.
In sum, the majority of the social workers agreed that they experienced some role ambiguity in the workplace (see Table 13). Of the ten selected independent variables of the study it was concluded that there was statistically significant relationship between role ambiguity and current job satisfaction. Also, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant relationship between gender, age group, education, marital status, job function, income, work
setting, type of work setting and role ambiguity in the workplace (see Tables 14 & 15).

**Burnout Among Social Workers**

Research Question 3: Is there a relationship between gender, age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, and type of work setting, current job satisfaction and burnout among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area?

Null Hypotheses 3: There is no statistical relationship between gender, age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, and type of work setting, current job satisfaction and burnout among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area.

Table 16 is a frequency distribution of burnout among social workers. It is an indication of the number of social workers who disagree and/or agree that they experience burnout in the workplace.
Table 16. Burnout Among Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 1.614  Std dev. 788

The majority of the social workers disagreed that they experienced some burnout in the workplace. Table 16 indicates that of the 158 social workers 89 or 56.3 percent of the social workers strongly disagreed that they experienced some burnout. Also, 43 or 27.2 percent disagreed that they experienced burnout. On the other hand 24 or 15.2 percent of the social workers agreed that they experienced burnout while 2 or 1.3 percent strongly agreed that they experienced burnout.

Table 17 is a crosstabulation of gender and burnout of the respondents. It shows the association of gender with burnout of social workers.
Table 17. Gender by Burnout Among Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Phi} = 0.12293, \quad \text{df} = 1, \quad P < 0.10243 \]

Table 17 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 23 or 14.6 percent of the females agreed that they experienced some burnout on their jobs, and 3 or 1.9 percent of the males agreed that they experience burnout. Of the males, 35 or 22.2 percent did not experience burnout and 97 or 61.4 percent of the females disagreed that they experienced burnout on their jobs. It was determined that females experienced more burnout than males as it relates to gender on the job. and indicates that the majority of the female respondents agreed that they experienced burnout on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 17, the Phi test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship \((P <= 0.10243)\) between gender and burnout of social workers at the .05 level of probability.
Table 18 is a crosstabulation between age and burnout of the respondents. It shows the association of gender with burnout of social workers.

Table 18. Age Group by Burnout Among Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = .10578, df = 3, P< = .61757

Table 18 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 8 or 5.1 percent of the respondents between the age of 40-49 agreed that they experienced some burnout on the job, and 47 or 29.7 between 40-49 disagreed that they experienced some burnout on the job. It was determined that respondents between the age of 40-49 experienced more burnout than any other age group. It indicated that the majority of the respondents was between the age of 40-49. The respondents indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship between age of the respondents and burnout.
The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 18, the Contingency Coefficient test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship \( (P<=.61757) \) between age and burnout of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 19 is a crosstabulation of marital status and burnout of the respondents. It shows the association of marital status with burnout of social workers.

Table 19. Marital Status by Burnout Among Social Workers
\( (N=158) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( C = .06758, \ df = 3, \ P< = .86734 \)

Table 19 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 10 or 6.3 percent of the respondents were married and agreed that they experienced some burnout on the job, and 61 or 38.6 percent of married respondents disagree that they
experienced burnout on the job. It was determined that the married respondents experienced more burnout than other as it related to marital status on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 19, the Contingency Coefficient test indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship \((P<=.86734)\) between marital status and burnout of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 20 is a crosstabulation of job function and burnout of the respondents. It shows the association of job function with burnout of social workers.

Table 20. Job Function by Burnout Among Social Workers
\((N=158)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{Phi } = .02979, \text{ df } = 1, \text{ P } = .70805\)

Table 20 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 16 or 10.1 percent of the respondents that worked in direct service agreed that they experienced some burnout on their
jobs, and 76 or 48.1 percents disagreed that they experienced some burnout on the job. It was determined that direct service workers experienced more burnout than those working in administrative jobs. The table indicated whether the respondent worked in administrative or direct service on their jobs. Table 20 indicates that the majority of the direct service social workers agreed that they experienced burnout on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 20, the Phi test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (P<=.70805) between job function and burnout of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 21 is a crosstabulation of race and burnout of the respondents. It shows the association of race with burnout of social workers.

Table 21. Race by Burnout Among Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .09953, df = 2, P< = .45723
Table 21 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 19 or 12.0 percent of the African Americans agreed that they experienced some burnout on the job, and 86 or 54.4 percent of the African Americans disagreed that they experienced burnout on the job. It was determined that the African American experienced more burnout as it relates to any other race on the job. Table 21 indicated that the majority of the African American respondents agreed that they experienced burnout on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 21, the Phi test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (P<=.45723) between race and burnout of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 22 is a crosstabulation of education and burnout of the respondents. It shows the association of education with burnout of social workers.
Table 22. Educational Status by Burnout Among Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSW</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW-PHD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$C = .11930, \ df = 3, \ P< = .51612$

Table 22 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 16 or 10.1 percent of the Master level social workers (MSW) agreed that they experienced some burnout on their jobs, and 87 or 55.1 percent of the Masters level social workers (MSW) disagreed that they experienced some burnout on the job. It was determined that the respondents that held a master's degree in social work experienced more burnout than any other educational group as it relates to burnout on the job. Table 22 indicates that the majority of the master's level social workers agreed that they experienced burnout on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 22, the Contingency Coefficient test indicated that
there was not a statistically significant relationship
\((P<=.51612)\) between the educational status by burnout of
social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 23 is a crosstabulation of income and burnout of
the respondent. It shows the association of income with
burnout of social workers.

Table 23. Income by Burnout Among Social Workers \((N=158)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under - $30,000</td>
<td>36  22.2</td>
<td>11    7.0</td>
<td>47    29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$39,999</td>
<td>61  38.6</td>
<td>12    7.6</td>
<td>73    46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$49,999</td>
<td>19  12.0</td>
<td>2     1.3</td>
<td>21    13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 &amp; Up</td>
<td>16  10.1</td>
<td>1     .6</td>
<td>17    10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132 83.5</td>
<td>26    16.5</td>
<td>158   100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(C = .15260, \ df = 3, \ P< .28774\)

Table 23 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 12
or 7.6 percent that earned between $30,000-$39,999 agreed
that they experienced some burnout on their jobs, and 61 or
38.6 percent disagreed that they experienced burnout on the
job. It was determined that the respondents that earned
between $30,000-$39,999 experienced more burnout than any
other income bracket as it relates to burnout on the job.
Table 23 indicated that the majority of the social workers that earned $30,000-$39,999 experienced more burnout on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 23, the Contingency Coefficient test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (P<=.28774) between the earned income by burnout of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 24 is a crosstabulation of the work setting and burnout of the respondents. It shows the association of the works setting with burnout of social workers.

Table 24. Work Setting By Burnout Among Social Workers
(N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Health</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Agency</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School K-12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court/Justice System</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Practice</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = .13698,  df = 5,  P< = .69671
Table 24 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 8 or 5.1 percent of the social agencies and private practice workers agreed that they experienced some burnout on the job, and 41 or 25.9 percent of social agency social workers and 25 or 15.8 private practice social work respondents disagreed that they experienced burnout on the job. It was determined that the respondents that worked in the social agencies and private practice settings experienced more burnout than any other work setting as it relates to burnout. The table indicated if the social worker were currently working in a hospital/health setting, social agency, school (K-12), court/justice system or private practice. Table 24 indicates that the majority of the social workers that worked in social agencies and private practice agreed that they experienced role ambiguity on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 24, the Contingency Coefficient test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship ($P\leq .69671$) between the work setting by burnout of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 25 is a crosstabulation of the type of work setting and burnout of the respondents. It shows the association of the type work setting with burnout of social workers.
Table 25. Type of Work Setting by Burnout Among Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree n</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Agree n</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Agency</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Agency</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .06267, df = 1, P< = .43087

Table 25 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 15 or 9.5 percent of the private agency respondents agreed that they experienced some burnout on their jobs, and 67 or 42.4 percent of the public agency respondents disagreed that they experienced burnout on the job. It was determined that public agency social workers experienced more burnout than public agency social workers as it relates to type of work setting on the job.

The table indicated if the social worker were currently working in private or public agencies. Table 25 indicates that the majority of the social workers that worked in private agencies agreed that they experienced burnout on the job.

The null hypothesis was not rejected. As shown in Table 25, the Phi test indicated that there was not a
statistically significant relationship \((P<.05)\) between the type of work setting and burnout of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 26 is a crosstabulation of the current job satisfaction and burnout of the respondent. It shows the association of the social workers current job satisfaction and burnout.

Table 26. Current Job Satisfaction by Role Ambiguity Among Social Workers \((N=158)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\Phi = .74303, \quad df = 1, \quad P = .00000\)

Table 26 indicates that of the 158 social workers, 20 or 12.7 percent of the social workers agreed that they were satisfied with their jobs as it relates to burnout, and 127 or 80.4 percent disagreed that burnout influenced their satisfaction with their jobs. It was determined that social workers were satisfied with their jobs as it relates to burnout.
The table indicated if the social worker currently very satisfied, dissatisfied, satisfied and or very satisfied on their job. It was determined that the majority of the social work respondents agreed that they were satisfied with their jobs as it relates to burnout.

The null hypothesis was rejected. As shown in Table 26, the Phi test indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship (P<=.00000) between current job satisfaction and burnout of social workers at the .05 level of probability.

Table 27 is a compilation of the relationship between burnout and the selected variables. It is a summary of the data on gender, age group, marital status, job function, race, education and income. As shown in Table 27, there was no statistically relationship between gender, age group, education, marital status, job function and income.
Table 27. Burnout and Selected Variables of Social Workers
(N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>.10243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Service</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSW</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW-PHD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $30,000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - 39,999</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 &amp; Up</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28 is a compilation of the relationship between burnout and the selected variables. It is a summary of the data on work setting, type of work setting and current job satisfaction. As shown in Table 28, there was no statistically significant relationship between work setting, type of work setting. However, Table 27 indicated that there was a statistically relationship (P<=.00000) between burnout and current job satisfaction.
Table 28. Burnout and Other Selected Variables of Social Workers (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Setting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital &amp; Health</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Agency</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School K - 12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court/Justice System</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Practice</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Work Setting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Agency</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Agency</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, the majority of the social workers agreed that they experienced some role burnout in the workplace (See Table 27). Of the ten selected independent variables of the study it was concluded that there was statistically significant relationship between burnout and current job satisfaction. Also, it was concluded that there was no statistically significant relationship between gender, age group, education, marital status, job function, income,
ethnicity, work setting, type of work setting and burnout in the workplace (See Tables 27 & 28).

**Predictors of Role Ambiguity and Burnout**

This section will analyze role ambiguity and burnout in order to identify predictors of these workplace problems. Table 29 is a stepwise multiple regression analysis of 158 social workers respondents.

Table 29. Stepwise Multiple Regression of Role Ambiguity
(N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Current Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.622872</td>
<td>.073083</td>
<td>.563646</td>
<td>72.638</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.781002</td>
<td>.228536</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.679</td>
<td>.0008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Square = .317, Sign F = .00000

As shown in Table 29, stepwise multiple regression was performed. The variable Current Job Satisfaction emerged as the best predictor of role ambiguity (R square = .317, F < .00000). Table 29 indicated that 31 percent of the variation in role ambiguity could be explained by current job satisfaction.
Table 30. Stepwise Multiple Regression of Burnout (N=158)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Current Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.672916</td>
<td>.069563</td>
<td>-.612323</td>
<td>93.576</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.662483</td>
<td>.217528</td>
<td>283.480</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Square = .374          Sign F = .00000

As shown in Table 30 stepwise multiple regression was performed, current job satisfaction emerged as the best predictor of burnout (R square = .374, F < .00000). Table 30 indicated that 37 percent of the variation in burnout could be explained by current job satisfaction.

In sum, as shown in Tables 29 and 30 the variable current job satisfaction emerged as the best predictor of role ambiguity and burnout of social workers in the workplace. Thirty-one percent of the variation of role ambiguity could be explained by current job satisfaction and thirty-seven percent of the variation of burnout could be explained by current job satisfaction among social workers.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

The research study was designed to answer three questions related to role ambiguity and burnout of social workers in the metropolitan Atlanta. The conclusions, which were based on the research findings of the study, are presented in this chapter.

A brief discussion of each question was presented in order to summarize the significant finding of interest. Also recommendations were presented to encourage research relating to role ambiguity and burnout of social workers.

Research Question 1: Is there a relationship between role ambiguity and burnout among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area?

To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between role ambiguity and burnout of social workers, the Pearson R test was employed. The Pearson R test indicated that there was a statistical significance (P<=.00000) at the .05 level of probability between role ambiguity and burnout of social workers (see
Table 2). The null hypothesis was rejected. It was concluded that there was a statistically significant relationship between role ambiguity and burnout.

Overall, the data indicated a majority of the 158 social workers 34 or (21.5) percent disagreed that they experienced burnout and role ambiguity. While 7 or 4.4 percent agreed that experienced burnout and role ambiguity. Also, 98 or 62.0 percent indicated that they disagreed that they experienced burnout but agreed they experienced role ambiguity.

The Pearson R test indicated a significance of (P<=.00000) at the .05 level of probability between role ambiguity and burnout of social workers. It was concluded that there was a statistically significant relationship between role ambiguity and burnout of social workers.

Research Question 2: Is there a relationship between gender, age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, and type of work setting, current job satisfaction and role ambiguity among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area?

To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between gender, age group, marital
status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, and type of work setting, current job satisfaction and role ambiguity among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area. After the Pearson R test was employed, of the ten independent variables, only the variable current job satisfaction rejected the null hypothesis at the .05 level of probability.

In sum, the majority of the social workers agreed that they experienced some role ambiguity in the workplace (see Table 13). Of the ten selected independent variables of the study it was concluded that there was a statistically significant relationship between role ambiguity and current job satisfaction. Also, it was concluded that there was no statistical relationship between gender, age group, education, ethnicity, marital status, job function, income, work setting, type of work setting and role ambiguity in the workplace (See Tables 14 & 15).

Research Question 3: Is there a relationship between gender, age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, and type of work setting, current job satisfaction and burnout among social workers in the Metropolitan area?
To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between gender, age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, and type of work setting, current job satisfaction and burnout among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area the Pearson R test was employed. Of the ten independent variables only gender was not rejected by the null hypothesis at the .05 probability. It was concluded that there was a statistically significant relationship between gender and burnout, however there was no statistically significant relationship between age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, and type of work setting, current job satisfaction and burnout among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area.

In sum, of the 158 social workers, 23 or 14.6 percent of the females agreed that they experienced some burnout on their jobs, and 3 or 1.9 percent of the males agreed that they experience burnout. Of the males, 35 or 22.2 percent did not experience burnout and 97 or 61.4 percent of the females disagreed that they experienced burnout on their jobs. It was determined that females experienced more burnout than males as it relates to gender on the job.

Although these data indicated that a majority of the social work respondents experienced some burnout on their jobs, it was concluded based on the Pearson R test that
there was a statistically significant relationship between gender and burnout of social workers, while there was no statistically significant relationship between age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, and type of work setting, current job satisfaction and burnout among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area.

Overall, the findings of the study indicated that:
(1) It was concluded that there was a statistically significant relationship between role ambiguity and burnout of social workers; and that (2) There was a statistically significant relationship between current job satisfaction and role ambiguity and social workers, while there was no statistically significant relationship between age group, gender, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, and type of work setting, and role ambiguity among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area; also (3) There was a statistically significant relationship between gender and burnout, while there was no statistical significant relationship between age group, marital status, education, ethnicity, income, job function, work setting, and type of work setting, current job satisfaction and burnout among social workers in the Metropolitan Atlanta area; and finally (4) It was determined that the best predictor burnout and role ambiguity based on stepwise multiple regression analysis was the variable
current job satisfaction. For burnout, the coefficient of determination (R square = .374) indicated that 37 percent of the variation in the variable could be explained or predicated. For role ambiguity, the coefficient of determination (R square = .317) indicated 31 percent of the variation in the variable could be explained or predicted.

Recommendations

The scholarly examination of aspects of the workplace that impact upon social workers is necessary knowledge for social workers and the social work profession. It is therefore imperative that social workers engage in research that will not only add to the knowledge about issues in the workplace, but will also contribute to the knowledge about themselves and the profession of social work. Thus, it is important to understand how social workers are affected by role ambiguity and burnout.

Consequently, it is thereby recommended that social workers engage in research to gain a better understanding of social workers in the workplace. Specifically, it is hereby recommended that:

1. Further study be done to identify specific task items that directly cause burnout and the nature of roles of social workers as they interact within the organizational structure.
2. Social workers become aware of the effects of role ambiguity and burnout within social organization in order to be effective in organizational development and policy formulation in the workplace.

3. Social workers develop organizational strategies and workplace activities that will tend to eliminate role ambiguity and burnout in the workplace.
APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER TO SOCIAL WORKERS

Janon Wilson
Clark Atlanta University  P0 Box 754  J. P. Brawley Dr. & Fair St SW  Atlanta, GA 30314

February 14, 2000

Dear «Title» «Last_Name»:

I am a student in the Ph.D Program in Social Work at Clark Atlanta University. I invite you to participate in a study of social workers. The questionnaire will take less than ten minutes to complete.

A review of the literature indicates that role ambiguity and burnout are problems in the workplace for social workers. The purpose of this study is to learn more about the nature of these two concepts in order to develop a better understanding of how they are related to social workers in their workplace in the Atlanta area.

«Title» «Last_Name» two questionnaires are provided. Please record your answers on the white questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope. You may keep the other questionnaire for your records.

Because we want to keep all responses confidential please do not put your name on the questionnaire answer sheet. Choose only one answer for each question. Please respond to all questions. The questionnaire will take less than ten minutes to complete.

Please mail your questionnaire answer sheet today. Feel free to contact me at the above address for additional information. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Janon Wilson

cc: Dean D. Bowles
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Survey Questionnaire

Role Ambiguity and Burnout among Social Workers

Keep this questionnaire for your records

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am a student in a doctoral program in social work at Clark Atlanta University. I invite you to participate in a study of factors affecting social workers in the workplace. The purpose of the study is to learn more about the nature of role ambiguity and burnout among social workers. The findings will be used in an analysis for my dissertation. I would appreciate your cooperation. The questionnaire will only take about five minutes to complete.

Because we want all responses to remain confidential, please do not put your name on the questionnaire answer sheet. Choose only one answer for each question. Please respond to all questions. Record your answers on the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope. Again, thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Jamon Wilson

Section I  Background Information

Place a mark ( x ) next to the appropriate item. Choose only one answer for each question.

1. My gender is: 1) ____ Male 2) ____ Female
2. My age group is: 1) ____ Under 30 2) ____ 30 – 39 3) ____ 40 – 49 4) ____ Over 50
3. My marital status: 1) ____ Married 2) ____ Never married 3) ____ Divorced 4) ____ Widowed
4. My main job function is: 1) ____ Administrative 2) ____ Direct Service
5. The one racial category that best describes me: 1) ____ African American 2) ____ White
3) ____ Hispanic 4) ____ Asian 5) ____ Other
6. My highest degree is: 1) ____ BSW 2) ____ MSW 3) ____ DSW/PHD 4) ____ Other
7. My annual income is: 1) ____ Under $30,000 2) ____ $30,000 - 39,999 3) ____ $40,000 - 49,999
4) ____ $50,000 up
8. My worksetting is: 1) ____ Hospital & Health 2) ____ Social Agency 3) ____ School (K-12)
4) ____ Court/Justice System 5) ____ Private Practice 6) ____ Other
9. Type of worksetting: 1) ____ Public agency 2) ____ Private agency
10. On the job I am: 1) ____ Very Dissatisfied 2) ____ Dissatisfied 3) ____ Satisfied 4) ____ Very Satisfied

Please go to page 2.
APPENDIX B
(continued)

Section II  Many workers in performing their job encounter confusion and burnout in the workplace. How much do you agree with the following statements? Write appropriate number in the blank beside each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role Ambiguity

11. _____ I feel certain about how much authority I have.

12. _____ Clear, planned goals and objectives exist for my job.

13. _____ I know that I have divided my time properly.

14. _____ I know what my responsibilities are.

15. _____ I know exactly what is expected of me.

16. _____ Explanation is clear of what has to be done.

17. _____ I am confident in performing my duties.

18. _____ I feel certain how I will be evaluated.

19. _____ The duties that come with my job are clear to me.

20. _____ My job duties change with time.

21. _____ I typically know what is expected of me as part of my job.

Burnout

23. _____ I feel emotionally drained from my work.

24. _____ I feel used up at the end of the workday.

25. _____ I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.

26. _____ Working with people all day is really a strain for me.

27. _____ I feel burned out from my work.

28. _____ I feel frustrated by my job.

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

30. _____ Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.

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

32. _____ I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.

Please return this copy. Thank you very much.
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TITLE Role Ambiguity and Burnout among Social Workers
Janon Wilson, PhD Program • Clark Atlanta University School of Social Work

Committee Members
Robert W. Waymer, Ph.D. Chairman
Narviar Barker, Ph.D.
Oghu Agburu, Ed.D.

DATA LIST
FIXED / ID 1-3
GENDER 4
AGEGRP 5
MARTIAL 6
JOBFUNCT 7
RACE 8
EDUCAT 9
INCOME 10
WRKSET 11
TYPSET 12
JOB 13
ROLEAM1 14
ROLEAM2 15
ROLEAM3 16
ROLEAM4 17
ROLEAM5 18
ROLEAM6 19
ROLEAM7 20
ROLEAM8 21
ROLEAM9 22
ROLEAM10 23
ROLEAM11 24
BURNOU1 25
BURNOU2 26
BURNOU3 27
BURNOU4 28
BURNOU5 29
BURNOU6 30
BURNOU7 31
BURNOU8 32
BURNOU9 33
BURNOU10 34.
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'Janon Wilson, PhD Program • Clark Atlanta University School of Social Work'

COMPUTE ROLEAMBU =
(ROLEAM1+ROLEAM2+ROLEAM3+ROLEAM4+ROLEAM5+ROLEAM6
+ROLEAM7+ROLEAM8+ROLEAM9+ROLEAM10+ROLEAM11)/11.
COMPUTE BURNOUT =
(BURNOU1+BURNOU2+BURNOU3+BURNOU4+BURNOU5+BURNOU6
+BURNOU7+BURNOU8+BURNOU9+BURNOU10)/10.

VARIABLE LABELS
ID 'Case'
GENDER 'Gender'
AGEGRP 'Age Group'
MARTIAL 'Marital Status'
JOBFUNCT 'Job Function'
RACE 'Race'
EDUCAT 'Education'
INCOME 'income'
WRKSET 'Worksetting'
TYPSET 'Type Of Work Setting'
JOB 'On the job I am satisfied/dissatisfied'
ROLEAM1 'I feel certain about how much authority I have'
ROLEAM2 'Clear planned goals and objectives exist for my job'
ROLEAM3 'I know that I have divided my time properly'
ROLEAM4 'I know what my responsibilities are'
ROLEAM5 'I know exactly what is expected of me'
ROLEAM6 'Explanation is clear of what has to be done'
ROLEAM7 'I am confident in performing my duties'
ROLEAM8 'I feel certain how I will be evaluated'
ROLEAM9 'The duties that come with my job are clear to me'
ROLEAM10 'My job duties change with time'
ROLEAM11 'I typically know what is expected of me as part of my job'
BURNOU1 'I feel emotionnally drained from my work'
BURNOU2 'I feel used up at the end of the workday'
BURNOU3 'I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and I have to face another day on the job'
BURNOU4 'Working with people all day is really a strain for me'
BURNOU5 'I feel burned out from my work'
BURNOU6 'I feel frustrated by my job'
BURNOU7 'I feel I am working too hard on my job'
BURNOU8 'Working with people directly puts too much stress on me'
BURNOU9 'I feel like I am at the end of my rope'
BURNOU10 'I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally'.
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VALUE LABELS
GENDER
1 'Male'
2 'Female'

AGEGRP
1 'Under 30'
2 '30-39'
3 '40-49'
4 'Over 50'

MARTIAL
1 'Married'
2 'Never Married'
3 'Divorced'
4 'Widowed'

JOBFUNCT
1 'Administrative'
2 'Direct Service'

RACE
1 'African American'
2 'White'
3 'Hispanic'
4 'Asian'
5 'Other'

EDUCAT
1 'BSW'
2 'MSW'
4 'DSW-PHD'
5 'Other'

INCOME
1 'Under $30,000'
2 '$30,000-$39,999'
3 '$40,000-$49,999'
4 '$50,000-Up'

WRKSET
1 'Hospital & health'
2 'Social Agency'
3 'School K-12'
4 'Court/Justice System'
5 'Private Practice'
6 'Other'

TYPSET
1 'Public agency'
2 'Private Agency'
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JOB
1 'Very Dissatisfied'
2 'Dissatisfied'
3 'Satisfied'
4 'Very Satisfied'!

ROLEAM1
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'!

ROLEAM2
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'!

ROLEAM3
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'!

ROLEAM4
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'!

ROLEAM5
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'!

ROLEAM6
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'!

ROLEAM7
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'!
APPENDIX C
(continued)

06 April 2000

TITLE Role Ambiguity and Burnout among Social Workers
Janon Wilson, PhD Program • Clark Atlanta University School of Social Work

ROLEAM8
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'

ROLEAM9
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'

ROLEAM10
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'

ROLEAM11
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'

BURNOU1
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'

BURNOU2
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'

BURNOU3
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'

BURNOU4
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'
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BURNOU5
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'/

BURNOU6
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'/

BURNOU7
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'/

BURNOU8
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'/

BURNOU9
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'/

BURNOU10
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly agree'/

ROLEAMBU
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/

BURNOUT
1 'Strongly Disagree'
2 'Disagree'
3 'Agree'
4 'Strongly Agree'/.
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MISSING VALUES
GENDER   AGE   GRP   MARTIAL   JOBFUNCT   RACE   EDUCAT   INCOME   WRKSET   TYPSET   JOB
ROLEAM1 RROLEAM2 RROLEAM3 RROLEAM4 RROLEAM5 RROLEAM6 RROLEAM7 RROLEAM8 RROLEAM9
ROLEAM10 RROLEAM11 RBURNOU1 RBURNOU2 RBURNOU3 RBURNOU4 RBURNOU5 RBURNOU6 RBURNOU7
BURNOU8 RBURNOU9 RBURNOU10 (0).

RECODE ROLEAMBU  (1 THRU 1.99=1)  (2 THRU 2.99=2)  (3 THRU 3.99=3)  (4 THRU
4.99=4).
RECODE BURNOUT  (1 THRU 1.99=1)  (2 THRU 2.99=2)  (3 THRU 3.99=3)  (4 THRU
4.99=4).

BEGIN DATA
001231212221321233231232322232222
002221212252344333344333112112222
00322112211144433443444111111111
00412224331344344334432113221122
00513121422234444444444222222222
0062221212212344111111124411111
0072222211523443443444344111212211
00812311422231111331332433343334
009222212211332322122122114433443344
0102311142413444444444111111111
011222212123443333333112221111
0122221212224444444334443333333
01323111422234444444444222222222
0142411124224444444443411111111
01534125221322222323332232222112
01623122523133424444442422222222
01723311221233323312323222322323
01822121222333444333322222112221
0191322142113444444334411111111
0202441222523444444444111111111
02123111221234433234331121211222
0222222114134433444344341312211132
023111221423441331343411444214422
02411221212343444341311134331131
0251211242114444434343113112111
026212232152343324432341112211122
0272311221232133423442211222111
028213211121222222222233333333
02923315212344443413111423333123
0302311241134411322331431134111
031231221314444444444111111111
0322221214211344434343433121121131
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Contact author for information about data set

END DATA.

FREQUENCIES /VARIABLES=GENDER AGEGRP MARRIAL JOBFUNCTION RACE EDUCATION INCOME WORKSET TYPSET JOB ROLE AMBUBURNOUT /STATISTICS = .
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