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ABSTRACT

HARDINESS AND JOB FITNESS FOR THE INTENSIVE FAMILY PRESERVATION COUNSELOR: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY

by

Sandi Fisher

It is costly to train the counselors who serve in Intensive Family Preservation Services (IFPS). The hiring agency must pay for traveling expenses in addition to any fee paid for training. When an IFPS worker chooses to terminate employment before the end of two years of employment, this puts a strain on an already tight budget. This problem could be alleviated by finding an efficient pre-hire screening instrument.

The three personality traits described in Hardiness Theory literature: commitment, challenge, and control, are traits often used to describe the ideal IFPS worker. This study assessed IFPS workers to determine if the competent IFPS worker possessed these traits and to discover if they are satisfied with their work, and not suffering from symptoms of burnout. Twenty null hypotheses were formulated.

Fifty-eight specialists from the Tennessee Home Ties programs completed: (a) a demographic survey; (b) the Personal Views Survey to measure Hardiness; (c) the Maslach Burnout Inventory; and (d) the Job In General scale to measure job satisfaction. Supervisors provided a copy of the Therapist Evaluation Form to measure employee competence. Eight specialists and three directors participated in additional telephone interviews.

The Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation statistic was used to determine statistically significant relationships between pairs of research variables. Nineteen of the 20 null hypotheses were rejected. The results of the study support the existence of a relationship between hardiness and competence, burnout, and job satisfaction. Pearson product-moment correlations were obtained to ascertain if a statistically significant relationship existed between any of the research variables and the demographic variables. Weak positive relationships were found between age and competence and between years of service and competence.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Many program managers admit that employee selection is one of the most important decisions they make (Guinn, 1991). Interviews provide only a small glimpse of a prospect’s true ability. Numerous applicants have learned how to give the interviewer appropriate responses to questions. Often, former employers refuse to provide the hiring agency with more than a confirmation that the applicant did work for them. The cost of hiring is high, and the cost of making a mistake in hiring is even higher.

This research examines one possibility for improving the process for hiring intensive family preservation counselors. For over 20 years the Homebuilders Model has been the model most widely used and researched in delivering intensive family preservation services (IFPS).

Homebuilders began in 1974 when a social services agency in Tacoma, Washington, wrote a grant proposal requesting funding to develop foster homes that would provide parent training and professional backup for respite care (Kinney, Haapala, & Booth, 1991). The funding agent requested that the agency try placing staff members in the
homes of troubled families before removing the child from the home. This approach was surprisingly effective. In fact, a professional social worker did not have to live on the premises to help the family. The Homebuilders model grew from this humble beginning. Homebuilders requires that an IFPS specialist be available to the family 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for 4 to 12 weeks. Typically, the specialist will work with only two families at a time and spend up to 20 hours a week in the home of the client-family. Characteristic duties include: (a) teaching a wide variety of skills (home management, parenting, problem solving, communication); (b) providing individual and family counseling; (c) approaching businesses and charitable organizations in the community to provide concrete services (payment of rent and utility bills, home repair, food, and clothing); and (d) networking with other agencies to provide specific services (addiction counseling, child sexual abuse treatment, domestic violence prevention). The IFPS specialist seeks to develop a safety net of support services for aftercare before terminating the case (Kinney et al., 1991).

The average cost of placing a dependent, neglected, delinquent, or mentally ill child outside the home varies from $403 a month to $11,250 a month (Kinney et al., 1991).
The average length of stay ranges from four months for acute psychiatric hospitalization to two years for foster care. The one-time cost of a Homebuilders intervention averages $3000 per family (not per child) and placement is averted in 70% to 90% of all cases. This cost-effectiveness is one reason that IFPS are attractive to policy-makers. Family preservation began in Tennessee in 1989 with two pilot programs. The Homebuilders model was selected because of its record for keeping families together while reducing the costs associated with serving multiproblem families. The passage of state senate bill no. 224, the Family Preservation Act of 1991, mandated that family preservation services be made available to every family with a child at imminent risk of placement where these services could be reasonably expected to prevent removal of the child from the home, while providing for the safety of the child, the family, and the community. Two federal bills, the Family Preservation and Family Support Act of 1991, and the Child Welfare and Preventive Services Act, made federal funds available to states that wished to establish or expand IFPS. In January, 1992, IFPS in Tennessee were expanded to include all 95 counties, and were known as Tennessee HomeTies (Fisher, 1992).
It is expensive to train those who serve in IFPS. Each specialist is required to receive 56 hours of model-specific curriculum from certified Homebuilders trainers. The hiring agency must pay for travel expenses in addition to any fee paid for the training. For most IFPS specialists it takes one year to become comfortable and competent in this career (Kinney et al., 1991). When an IFPS worker chooses to terminate employment, it puts a strain on an already tight budget (Kinney et al.). According to Kinney and her associates, stress and burnout caused by working with multiproblem families, and being on call 24 hours a day are the two reasons given most often by employees leaving IFPS. Helping to decide whether a child can safely remain in his or her family home is a solemn responsibility. This career is not for everyone and the question many IFPS specialists hear is: How can an IFPS specialist stand the stress? The problem could be alleviated by finding a more effective way to screen candidates for IFPS positions.

**Statement of the Problem**

The Personal Views Survey II (PVS) is an instrument based on Hardiness Theory, and was designed to measure psychological hardiness. The three personality traits described in Hardiness Theory literature, commitment, challenge, and control, are traits often used to describe
the ideal IFPS worker (Kinney et al., 1991). This study was conducted to discover if IFPS workers in Tennessee who exhibited job competence also possessed personal hardiness and job satisfaction while avoiding burnout.

**Significance of the Study**

Several studies have alluded to the possibility of using the PVS as a pre-employment test (Maddi & Khoshaba, 1994; Tang & Hammontree, 1992). To date, there has not been a study conducted for the sole purpose of exploring the possibility of using the PVS as a screening tool in the hiring process. This is the first study to specifically lay the groundwork to discover if it would be useful to include the PVS as one piece of the hiring process for potential IFPS specialists.

Psychological testing has enjoyed a revival of late because it is perceived to be a reliable and accurate method for selecting employees (Guinn, 1991). Reducing employee turnover saves an organization the cost of recruiting and training new personnel. According to Guinn, the right personality test can provide an agency with employees possessing job-relevant traits that make them ideal employees.
Purpose

The purpose of this study is to provide preliminary research investigating the feasibility of using the PVS as a pre-employment screening instrument for IFPS workers. This was accomplished by analyzing the relationships among the variables: hardiness; job competence; job satisfaction; and burnout. Specifically, the researcher investigated the relationships between job competence and hardiness; burnout and hardiness; and job satisfaction and hardiness. In addition, 11 interviews were conducted to assess how HomeTies personnel were handling an unexpected change in the delivery of IFPS in Tennessee. It is possible that in the future the PVS could be used in the pre-employment screening process. Candidates not possessing the vital traits of a hardy personality could be eliminated, and hiring an employee who does not fit the job could be avoided. The first step is to assess IFPS specialists to see if exemplary workers do indeed possess the hardiness traits, and if they enjoy their work while avoiding burnout.

Limitations of the Study

At the time of this study, the IFPS known as Tennessee HomeTies was a statewide intervention with teams in all 95 counties. Data sets were returned from counties that were rural, suburban, and urban. This population mix provides a
study that is representative of the total IFPS specialist population. Tennessee HomeTies workers may be different from workers in other Homebuilders programs in background, attitude, and aptitude, so caution is advised in interpreting the results of this study beyond Tennessee.

The PVS has never been used as a tool to define desirable worker personality traits. It may be that the PVS is not suitable for this use.

Another limitation centers on the way different supervisors rate employees. Some supervisors routinely give high scores on employee evaluations, while other program directors are more conservative when they are evaluating the specialists.

**Assumptions of the Study**

This study includes the following assumptions:

1. All self-reports of participants, as noted on the Demographic Survey (DS), and as recorded on the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), the Personal Views Survey (PVS), and the Job In General (JIG) are true and accurate statements.

2. All program directors completed the Therapist Evaluation Forms (TEF) accurately and objectively.

3. The MBI accurately measures burnout.
4. The PVS accurately measures psychological hardiness.
5. The JIG accurately measures job satisfaction.
6. The TEF accurately measures employee competence.

**Research Questions**

1. Is there a relationship between hardiness and employee competence?
2. Is there a relationship between hardiness and job satisfaction?
3. Is there a relationship between hardiness and burnout?

**Definitions of Terms**

**Hardiness:** "Hardiness is a constellation of personality characteristics that function as a resistance resource in the encounter with stressful life events." Those traits are: commitment, control, and challenge (Kobasa, Maddi, & Kahn, 1982, p. 169).

**Commitment:** Commitment is the characteristic of thinking of oneself as "someone who can find ways to make whatever is happening seem interesting, worthwhile, and meaningful." A person who is low in commitment feels "alienated...detached, and uninvolved in what is going on around (him), and prone to meaninglessness" (Hardiness Institute, 1994, p. 1).
Control: Control refers to the feeling that one can influence life events through personal perseverance. Control occurs when one possesses an internal rather than external locus of control (Kobasa et al., 1982). Persons without control feel powerless and view themselves as victims of circumstances (Hardiness Institute, 1994).

Challenge: "Challenge is expressed as the belief that change ... is normal in life" (Kobasa et al., 1982, p. 170). Life is made fulfilling by continually growing in wisdom based on learning from experience. Someone low in challenge belief feels entitled to comfort and security. Change is viewed as a threat (Hardiness Institute, 1994).

Burnout: "Burnout is a physiological and psychological state characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lack of on-the-job accomplishment" (Martinez, 1989, p. 272). Burnout is often associated with the emotional strain of dealing extensively with other people (Pierce & Malloy, 1990).

Job Satisfaction: "Researchers refer to job satisfaction as degrees of morale, types of motivation, willingness to take risk..." (Ashbaugh, 1982, p. 189).

Stress: "A life event is defined as stressful if it causes changes in, and demands readjustment of, an average person's normal routine" (Kobasa, 1979, p. 2). Selye, a
noted stress expert, pointed out that stress is essential to living a full and productive life and provides the spice that makes one feel fully alive (1974, p. 83). Stress is the first step toward burnout (Martinez, 1989).

**Organization of the Study**

This study is organized and presented in five chapters. Chapter 1 contains the introduction of the study. It includes statement of the problem, purpose, significance, limitations, and assumptions. The research questions are stated along with definitions of the terms and the organization of the study.

Chapter 2 is comprised of a review of relevant literature about hardiness, burnout, job satisfaction, pre-employment testing, and change theory. This chapter includes a synopsis of major research studies relating hardiness to burnout, stress, health, and job satisfaction. One section presents hardiness research conducted with specific populations. Another section summarizes literature about pre-employment testing, including its legality. A final section presents information about change theory and managing change effectively in organizations.

Chapter 3 presents a description of the proposed research design. The target population is defined and the data collection instruments analyzed. Planned statistical
procedures are explained as they relate to the research questions.

Chapter 4 consists of a detailed description of the research participants. The data are analyzed and the results reported. At this point the research hypotheses are discussed.

Chapter 5 aggregates the findings. This chapter includes the author's summary of the research, as well as recommendations for extending the present research project.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The cost of high staff turnover in organizations manifests itself in several ways. When an employee leaves unexpectedly, the remaining staff is stretched to "cover" for the missing person. When a recruit requires highly specialized training as does the IFPS specialist, preparing a replacement is immediately expensive. Then, it takes an average of a year for the new worker to reach the point where he or she does not require extensive support and supervision. Acclimating the new hire often takes the director of an IFPS team away from other duties as the new teammate is mentored into independence (Borofsky & Smith, 1993). There have been many factors identified as leading to premature turnover. These include: (a) poor morale, (b) conflict among employees, (c) low salary and inadequate benefits, (d) lack of support from superiors, (e) stress, and (f) inadequate training. Little attention has been paid to the individual personality traits which may be associated with high employee turnover (Borofsky & Smith, 1993).

Pre-employment inquiries have been part of the hiring
process for many years. Employers routinely require potential employees to provide a history of past employment and a list of references. Most employers believe that a person’s past performance will provide them with a prediction of future performance (McDaniel, 1989; Ryan & Lasek, 1991).

Employers can be held liable if convicted of negligent hiring. Negligent hiring occurs when: (a) an injury has been caused by person acting in the capacity of employee, (b) the employee was unfit, (c) the employer knew the employee was unfit, (d) the injury was a foreseeable consequence of hiring the employee, and (e) hiring the employee was the proximate cause of the injury (Ryan & Lasek, 1991). When there is a great amount of autonomy associated with a position, as with an IFPS worker, there is more room to dispute the conditions needed to establish negligent hiring.

Job fitness is difficult to define. Fitness is usually defined in terms of knowledge, skills, and abilities, but often goes beyond that. When hiring an IFPS worker, human resource personnel are looking for the "right type" of person, with the right "chemistry." When an employer is brought to court for negligent hiring of a counselor, the court's definition of fitness is not found on a typical job description. "Non-rapist" is not likely to appear on a list
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Justice O’Conner shifted the burden of proof in *Watson v Fort Worth Bank and Trust* (1988) from the employer to the employee. As quoted in Rudner (1992, p. 142), Justice O’Conner stated that legally, there should be a "legitimate business reason" for using the test, but she also stated that "employers are not required ... to introduce validity
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studies showing that a particular criteria predicts actual on-the-job performances."

In February of 1996 a bill was introduced in the Committee on Labor and Public Employees in the Connecticut legislature. This bill sought to extend existing laws prohibiting polygraph testing by also removing the employer’s right to administer pencil and paper integrity tests. Psychologists and attorneys representing the Association of Test Publishers met with the members of the Committee to advocate for testing rights. As a result, the Committee killed the bill (Kroeker & Arnold, 1996).

When the applicant pool is large, and only a small percentage will be hired (10% or less), even a test with very low validity can produce an improvement in the success rate (Rudner, 1992). Martin and Terris (1994) vigorously defended the use of valid psychological tests in personnel selection. Assessment centers, reference checks, personality and aptitude tests, can all be used in the hiring process. Interviews are the most popular method of personnel selection, but research has consistently failed to find that interviews possess reliability and validity (Rudner). There should never be one test or tool upon which a determination is made to hire or reject a potential applicant. Hiring
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from 24.6% to 47.9% nine months after introducing the testing program. Sackett et al. pointed out that none of these studies had a control group for comparison. They also expressed concern that aggressive marketing of these tests may lead to an overvaluing of the results of these tests.

The five-factor model of personality has received attention from personnel selection researchers recently. The five factors of this model are: (a) extroversion, (b) agreeableness (c) conscientiousness, (d) emotional stability, (e) openness to experience. Schmit and Ryan (1993) found when they compared the responses of 297 students to 293 job seekers that the model fit the students, but not the job applicants. They suggested that job seekers do not answer honestly either because of self-deception or a desire to be viewed as the ideal candidate and advised caution when using the five factor model as a screening tool for employment. In subsequent research by Schmit, Ryan, Stierwalt, and Powell (1995), results indicated that wording the test items to conform to an at-work frame of reference resulted in more positive responses and greater validity. In their meta-analysis of the big five, Barrick and Mount (1991) described the Conscientiousness scale as showing consistent relationships to job proficiency, training proficiency, and personnel data for five occupational groups.
including professionals. They discovered a negative correlation for professionals on the Emotional Stability measure, suggesting that individuals who are nervous and high strung may perform more competently than others in the professional arena. The authors admitted their sample was too small to form any conclusions from this finding. They agreed with other researchers that there is a future for personality testing in the hiring process.

Tett, Jackson, and Rothstein (1991) produced a meta-analysis of 494 studies (total n = 13,521) using personality measures as predictors of job performance. These authors iterated the importance of linking the personality traits being measured to the job description. This reinforces the importance of this study in determining if competent IFPS workers possess the three hardiness traits. They also emphasized the need to have a large sample size (more than 100) in order to produce meaningful results. When Tett et al. investigated faking, they found no evidence that faking had any effect on validity. These researchers indicate there is a future for personality testing in the hiring process.

Guinn (1991) compared the test performance of prospective managers for a Fortune 500 company who were screened with a pre-employment psychological test to those who were not. The tested managers scored higher in
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intellectual skills and in personality behaviors such as energy, persuasiveness, planning, and relationship building. Personality inventories have been used by Sears and AT & T for years. Correlations in the .40 to .60 range have been found in 20 year longitudinal studies (Guinn).

The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) is often used as a screening tool in hiring law enforcement officers and childcare workers. The MMPI has been used for over 50 years to assess psychopathology. Extensive research has consistently proved the MMPI to be accurate in detecting malingering, denial of symptomology, and mental health diagnoses (Pallone, 1992). Maddi and Khoshaba (1994) investigated the relationship between the PVS and the MMPI. The results suggest that hardiness is a measure of general mental health. Maddi and Khoshaba controlled for negative affectivity. They found the PVS to be a negative predictor of the MMPI score on Depression, Paranoia, Psychasthenia, Schizophrenia, Social Interest, Anxiety, and Dependency. Hardiness was a positive predictor of Ego Strength. The researchers suggested that because the PVS can be completed in 10 minutes, and scored by hand or by computer in much less time than the 566 item MMPI, the PVS could provide a quick screening device to indicate the robustness and resiliency of applicants.
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hypothesis, hardiness mediates the effects of stress through two avenues. First, hardy individuals perceive events as mildly stressful while nonhardy individuals will perceive the very same events as very stressful. Second, the hardy person expects to be more successful in coping with stressful conditions than the nonhardy person because the hardy person believes that he or she possesses the power to influence life events.

Most of the early hardiness research was conducted with white, middle-aged males. Wiebe (1991) noted a gender difference in response to her research in which she investigated the relationship between hardiness and stress in 60 male and 60 female college students. Results indicated that subjects high in hardiness appraised the same stressor as less threatening than did subjects low in hardiness. These findings suggest that hardiness does moderate stress. Men who were considered high hardy displayed a lower heartbeat when confronted with a stressor than low hardy men. There was no physiological difference among women subjects. High hardy participants of both genders showed more willingness to persevere in attempting to solve unsolvable tasks than low hardy participants.

Ganellen and Blaney (1984) studied the connection between hardiness and social support among 83 female
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This study will not analyze stress among IFPS workers directly. A job that entails working with multi-problem families where the children are victims of abuse and neglect, or have serious mental health and/or behavioral problems is by definition, stressful. It is this author's contention that the way one interprets this stress determines if one is successful in IFPS work. Selye (1974) taught that it is not our stress but our reaction to it that creates problems. A positive reaction can energize and motivate the worker to advocate for change, both within the client family, and out in the surrounding community. The successful IFPS specialist believes that he or she can help to bring about change. A negative reaction to distress may result in psychosomatic illness or burnout for the worker.

**Hardiness and Burnout**

Job burnout occurs when an individual is unable to deal with occupational stress. Burnout is characterized by physical and/or emotional exhaustion and a negative or depersonalized attitude toward other and self. Over the last 10 years burnout has been widely associated with individuals who work in the helping professions: nursing, ministry, social work, counseling, teaching, or criminal justice (Holt, Fine, & Tollefson, 1987).
The first symptoms of burnout are usually persistent feelings of extreme fatigue and irritability (Duquette, Kérouac, Sandhu, & Beaudet 1994). Feelings of helplessness and hopelessness follow leading to guilt and reports of physical ailments. The person suffering from burnout often has many absences from work, but burnout is not considered an illness. Pines and Maslach (1978) found that the rate of burnout was often very high in health and social service occupations. They felt burnout contributed to low morale, absenteeism, high job turnover, job stress, and the decline in the quality of services provided to client families.

Burnout is both a type of stress and a response to stress (Maslach, 1982, p. 3). As the helper-person becomes more and more overwhelmed by the demands of clients, the symptoms of burnout include withdrawing from the job. Sometimes victims of burnout turn into petty bureaucrats, avoiding involvement with people by conducting business strictly by the book. Distancing acts as a buffer against the emotional strain that comes from close involvement with a multitude of troubled clients day after day.

Pines and Maslach (1978) investigated the characteristics of staff burnout in a mental health setting. They discovered that frequent staff meetings correlated with negative attitudes toward patients. Attending a high rate of
staff meetings also correlated with workers who avoided contact with patients. Pines and Maslach found that when staff-patient interaction was positive, the worker enjoyed the job and coworkers. The workers who reported enjoying their job had fewer schizophrenic patients, worked fewer hours, and spent less time doing administrative tasks. Highly educated workers experienced a high burnout rate, perhaps because they entered their careers with high expectations of making a difference and found the work mundane and repetitive, with no opportunity for personal growth (Pines & Maslach).

School psychologists who possessed integrated personalities and were found to be well adjusted on the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) were less prone to burnout. Sandoval (1993) administered the CPI and the MBI to 50 randomly chosen school psychologists. Tolerant individuals were found to be less likely to depersonalize clients. This extends the idea that personality-type characteristics, such as hardiness, can act as buffers against stress and burnout.

**Hardiness and Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction has been defined as having high morale, and being motivated to go above and beyond the job description (Ashbaugh, 1982). Job satisfaction occurs when a
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predictor of job satisfaction. Neuroticism was a significant predictor of burnout and physical symptoms. They did not find evidence that hardiness functioned as a moderator of stress. Hardy persons may report lower stress because they do not perceive events as stressful as often as a non-hardy person.

Berwick (1992) investigated the relationship of job-related stress to job satisfaction and hardiness in 240 college administrators. She reported work-related stress was negatively correlated with hardiness and job satisfaction. She also found that hardiness, job satisfaction, commitment to the organization, and strength of culture increased together. Pierce and Molloy (1990) found in a sample of 750 secondary teachers that those who recorded high burnout scores also scored low on hardiness and reported low levels of career commitment and satisfaction.

**Hardiness and Health**

In a five-year study of patients who had suffered at least one heart attack, Fischman (1987), reported that of the patients who received counseling to change their Type A behavior, only 7% had another heart attack. In the group that did not receive the counseling, 13% experienced a second heart attack. The treatment focused on reducing anger, impatience, aggravation, and irritation.
Many of the early hardiness research produced results in which hardiness appeared to protect against stress-induced illness (Kobasa, 1979, 1982; Kobasa, Maddi, & Courington, 1981; Kobasa, Maddi, & Kahn, 1982). Type A behavior has been linked to increased health problems. Contrada (1989) investigated the reactions of Type A and Type B college students (n = 68) who performed a difficult task while being monitored with a blood pressure cuff. Hardiness was associated with significantly lowered diastolic blood pressure. Type B high hardiness subjects experienced the least blood pressure reaction under stress. The challenge component of hardiness accounted for this finding.

Kobasa, Maddi, Puccetti, and Zola (1985) examined the effects of the variables, hardiness, exercise, and social support as resistance to illness. When the dependent variable was illness, regression estimates showed hardiness to be the most effective buffer, with exercise second, and social support last.

Williams, Wiebe, and Smith (1992) investigated coping processes as mediators of the relationship between hardiness and health. The researchers conducted a series of regression analyses to assess whether hardiness would influence coping and coping would influence illness. They found that high
hardiness was positively associated with problem-focused coping and support seeking while low hardiness was associated with maladaptive coping such as wishful thinking and avoidance. Coping also served as a mediator between hardiness and illness reports. Nagy and Nix (1989) surveyed 151 female and 56 male college students, 74% of whom were age 20 or younger. Hardiness and preventive health behavior appeared related because lower stress levels and more positive health attitudes predicted hardiness. Nagy and Nix hypothesized that the positive coping skills observed in hardy subjects may reduce negative health behaviors, which in turn leads to better health.

Bernard and Belinsky (1993) did not find a relationship between hardiness, stress, and health center visits. The subjects of their study were 91 male and 138 female college students. They remarked that studies that have not supported the hardiness hypotheses have tended to use college students. Bernard and Belinsky pointed out that in this sample hardiness was positively related to self-esteem and negatively related to maladjustment and depression. They speculated that hardiness may be more related to the appraisal of stress than to illness.
AIDS Patients

Blaney et al. (1991) expected to find that hardiness and social support would buffer the effect of life stressors in 67 asymptomatic HIV volunteers. There was an absence of stress moderator interaction effects for both social support and hardiness, suggesting that neither moderated the effect of stressful life events on psychological stress in this sample.

The Chronically Ill

Pollock and Duffy (1990) developed a scale to test the hypothesis that hardiness is related to adaptation to chronic illness. Pollock, Christian, and Sands (1990) used the Health-Related Hardiness Scale to measure the hardiness characteristic in 43 patients suffering from hypertension, 42 with rheumatoid arthritis and 123 diagnosed with multiple sclerosis. The researchers found that hardy persons were more likely to engage in health-related activities and in patient education programs specific to their diagnoses. This research supported the hypothesis that hardiness positively impacts adaptation to chronic illness.
Hardiness and Childbirth

In Israel, 73 pregnant women were assessed for hardiness by Priel, Gonik, and Rabinowitz (1993). High hardiness mothers perceived labor as easier than the non-hardy mothers. The hardy mothers also indicated they had coped with the labor experience better than non-hardy mothers, and that their infants were healthier. All of the mothers included in the study were described as having a normal delivery that resulted in the birth of a healthy child. If having high hardiness can enable a woman in labor to perceive the experience positively, possessing hardiness must surely help the IFPS worker to think positively about the job.

Hull, VanTreuren, and Virnelli (1987) found little evidence that hardiness is a single construct. They encountered evidence that seemed to indicate commitment and control affect health-related outcomes, but the challenge factor was unrelated to health. Hull et al. stated that commitment and control were most likely to produce effects in situations that require coping techniques associated with the hardy personality style. For this study, whether or not hardiness predicts health is unimportant.
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Japanese Women

Nakano (1990) found that in a sample of 107 Japanese female college students, there was a relationship between depression and "hassles" from the Hassles Scale. Type A behavior protected psychological well-being. Hardiness did not have moderating effects in the relation between depression and hassles. However, Nakano used only the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire to measure hardiness. Nakano (1989) had similar results with a combined male and female sampling. Again she did not use a recognized measure of hardiness.

Athletes

Goss (1994) reported on hardiness and mood disturbances in swimmers who were overtraining. Overtraining is the technique used by some coaches wherein training is gradually increased to improve the athlete's muscular endurance, power, and aerobic capacity. In some athletes, the positive aspects of overtraining are reversed, resulting in decreased performance, fatigue, and mood disturbances. Goss surveyed 253 swimmers from middle school, high school, and collegiate swim teams in six locations at the beginning of the season, and at seven and 14 weeks. She found that hardiness increased with age but not significantly so. As hardiness increased, swimmers had lower feelings of tension.
depression, anger, fatigue, and confusion. Hardy swimmers displayed more energy throughout the season.

Lawyers

When Kobasa (1982) studied 157 lawyers, she found that increases in physical complaints (strain) were significantly negatively related to commitment. She discovered that lawyers who remained hardy did not use regressive coping techniques (avoidance, minimizing, denial). Kobasa did not detect a significant association among social support, exercise, and physical strain.

Law Enforcement Officers

According to Tang and Hammontree (1992) police stress is a unique form of occupational stress because of the potential for violence faced daily by law enforcement officers. When these researchers gathered data from 60 officers from seven suburban police departments they discovered that police stress was significantly related to absenteeism. They found that hardiness acted as a buffer against absenteeism only when stress was low.

Military

Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome (PTSD) has been diagnosed in some veterans but not others. Sutker, Uddo, Davis, and Ditta (1995) examined 775 soldiers who served in
the Desert Storm conflict. Diagnoses of PTSD were associated with lower hardiness commitment, more avoidance coping, less family cohesion, and lower perceived social support.

Florian, Mikulincer, and Taubman (1995) examined the changes in the mental health of 276 men undergoing four months of intensive basic combat training in the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF). During the first week participants completed the PVS, Mental Health Inventory, Ways of Coping Checklist, and a self-report scale to appraise the stress of military training and their estimation of their ability to cope with that stress. Control and commitment were found to be positively associated with the perceived ability to cope, and commitment was inversely associated with threat appraisal as well. Challenge did not show any significant correlation with any of these variables. The findings of Florian et al. lend support to the hypothesis that hardiness contributes to mental health through coping and appraisal mechanisms.

Solano, Battisti, Coda, and Stanisci (1993) considered the relationship between disease and psychosocial variables (including hardiness) in 112 Italian military cadets. They found that older cadets were found to be higher in hardiness and lower in reporting pathological episodes and infections. This may indicate that older cadets have learned to cope
with trauma more efficiently than the younger ones. A higher number of infections was noted in cadets who reported a higher level of stress.

**Nurses**

A convenience sample of 100 critical care nurses from two large teaching hospitals completed surveys to measure personality hardiness and sensitivity to noise (Topf, 1989). She found significant positive relationships between sensitivity to noise and the lack of hardiness and noise induced stress. Topf’s findings supported the hypothesis that less sensitivity to noise and greater hardiness would be associated with less noise-induced stress. In an extensive review of literature about nursing burnout, Duquette et al. (1994) described six studies that investigated the relationship of hardiness to burnout. All six reported similar findings—there was a positive relationship between the lack of hardiness and the presence of burnout in nurses. Commitment was the best predictor variable of burnout in a wide variety of types of nurses.

**Teachers**

In Australia 750 teachers from 16 secondary schools participated in a survey. Pierce and Molloy (1990) compared high and low burnout teachers and found that higher burnout
was associated with poorer health, more absenteeism, lower self-confidence, and more frequent use of regressive coping strategies. Regressive coping strategies are defined as avoidance, denial, and minimizing a problem. They also reported low job satisfaction and a desire to leave the teaching profession. Teachers recording high burnout rates also reported low hardiness, low social support, and higher levels of stress than the low burnout teachers.

Female elementary school teachers were the subjects (n = 211) for a study by Holt et al. (1987). The researchers found that the teachers who had high levels of stress and high levels of burnout had a significantly higher score for alienation than the teachers who had high stress and low levels of burnout. Teachers with high levels of stress and burnout were more likely to possess an external locus of control, but this finding was not statistically significant.

Kobasa's findings that feelings of alienation (lack of commitment) reduce resistance to the effects of stress were supported by this study. Martinez (1989) studied the problem of burnout in teachers and expressed the opinion that teachers can be taught a variety of techniques to help them interpret stress in a positive light and avoid burnout.
Change: Theory and Management

According to Fullen (1991) an effective change agent is one who can take responsibility and carry out the actions necessary to seize the many opportunities that exist for bringing about improvements. Fullen also states that conflict is a normal part of the change process.

When people are confronted with new possibilities, they are inclined to cling to the old tried and true methods that have served them well in the past (Robinson, 1995). There are some people who seem to seek out opportunities for change and enjoy the risk-taking associated with trying a new way of doing things. Change is uncomfortable, but the most productive way to face change is with a positive attitude, accepting it as a natural part of professional growth (Robinson). This sounds suspiciously like hardiness.

Change is inevitable in organizations (Cummings & Worley, 1993). Often it is easier for an outsider to see the necessity of change. People within an organization can find change unbearably disruptive if it means the culture must change in order to implement the change (Robinson, 1995). Lewin perceived change as a modification of the forces keeping an organization "frozen." Change is achieved by unfreezing the status quo; moving the organization to new
behaviors and then refreezing or stabilizing the new state of the organization (Cummings & Worley).

The Planning Model of organizational change posited by Lippitt, Watson, and Westley has two underlying principles. The first principle is that there must be open and honest communication between the change agent and the organization. The second is that information is only helpful when it directly relates to actions that can be taken (Cummings & Worley, 1993).

The Action Research Model proposes that change is a cyclical process that uses research to provide information on which to base the need for change. The emphasis is on using data gathering and analysis to guide planning and implementation of change. Results are carefully evaluated, often leading to further refinement of the change process (Cummings & Worley, 1993).

Rush, Schoel, and Barnard (1995) examined the effects of stress on 325 senior level public sector employees. In addition to measuring the hardiness of the participants, the researchers developed a Pressure for Change Index. Rush et al. also ascertained the subjects’ coping skills with Latack’s Control Coping and Escape Coping scales. To assess the level of stress experienced by each participant several measures from the Job Tension Index and Stress Diagnostic
Survey were administered. Questions from the Job Diagnostic Survey were used to assess job satisfaction. Rush et al. also developed an Intention to Quit measure. The authors concluded that psychological hardiness appeared to have a direct negative impact on stress and a direct positive effect on satisfaction. Rush et al. opined that "the effects of hardiness may serve as a significant counterforce to the effects of pressures for change on employees' intention to withdraw from the public sector workforce" (p.17). Kobasa et al. (1982) expressed the belief that control, commitment, and challenge are teachable qualities. If this is the case, then non-profit organizations in the private as well as the public sector need to take a long, hard look at the concept of psychological hardiness.

**Problems with Hardiness Research**

According to Bernard and Belinsky (1993), problems with hardiness research fall into five categories: (a) hardiness may not be a unified construct; (b) the instruments used to measure hardiness may be faulty; (c) statistical procedures used may have been inappropriate; (d) there is confusion over whether hardiness acts directly on health, or acts as a buffer against stress to promote health; (e) some research
projects have failed to find a significant correlation between health and hardiness.

All of these complaints are irrelevant to this particular study. This research examines hardiness as a unified construct and also as three separate constructs. The PVS II used in this study is an improved version that appears to have overcome previous concerns. The statistical methods employed in this project are based on the advice of those knowledgeable in statistical analysis. Health is not a concern in this study. For this study, the researcher is looking for a correlation between the hardy personality as measured by the PVS and the IFPS worker who is competent and is experiencing high job satisfaction and low burnout.

Summary

The three personality constructs of Hardiness are: commitment, control, and challenge. People high in commitment tend to be highly involved in whatever they are doing. A person high in control has an internal locus of control rather than a feeling of powerlessness in the face of adversity. One who is high in challenge regards life changes as normal and views these changes as opportunities rather than threats. Examining this definition of the hardy person in light of the job description that requires an IFPS
worker: (a) work with multiproblem families under extremely adverse conditions, (b) protect the integrity of the family, and (c) insure the safety of the children and the community, it is easy to understand why hardiness would be a desirable characteristic to possess.

This literature review summarizes research about pre-employment testing, Hardiness Theory, hardiness and stress, hardiness and burnout, hardiness and job satisfaction, and hardiness and health. Studies in which the PVS has been used to measure hardiness in specialized populations such as: military, AIDS patients, Japanese women, athletes, adolescents, law enforcement officers, attorneys, nurses, teachers, and families are also summarized. Facing change can be a time of great personal stress. One section of this chapter provides information about Change Theory and the management of change. The final section of this chapter outlines problems noted with past hardiness research.

Although a large body of hardiness literature exists, only Maddi and Khoshaba (1994) suggest that the PVS is suitable for use as a screening tool for prospective employees. Chapter 3 will describe the method by which the research questions for the present study were investigated.
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CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHOD

Sensenbrenner (1991), echoed the fears of many private and public social service workers when he stated, "deep federal deficits, budget-balancing requirements, and the trial of finding revenue in times of economic contraction or slow growth will make life challenging for ... years to come" (p. 75). With public and private sector agencies being forced to work with smaller budgets and fewer employees, it is important to make every hiring decision count. Hiring the wrong person for a job is a costly mistake. It is detrimental to the agency and to the person being hired. While there is no magic formula to assure job fit, there are cost-effective ways to improve the hiring process and assure job fitness by using psychological testing (Guinn, 1991).

If the PVS is to be considered as a pre-employment test for potential IFPS workers, it must first be documented that the PVS serves a legitimate business purpose by measuring traits truly related to the requirements of the job. To do this, research must show that competent IFPS workers possess the personality construct called hardiness. It must also be
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Variables

In this section the demographic characteristics of the sample are discussed. The variables used in the study are defined.

Demographic Characteristics

Every specialist participating in this study completed a demographic survey that provided information about age, gender, ethnicity, level of education, religiosity, family status, number of children, and length of service. The specialists also identified the setting in which the majority of services were provided (Urban, Suburban, Rural).

Hardiness

Hardiness is a personality construct measured by the PVS. Hardiness consists of three subscales: Commitment, Challenge, and Control (Kobasa, 1979).

Burnout

Burnout is characterized by a pattern of emotional overload and subsequent emotional exhaustion. This occurs when a person becomes overwhelmed by emotional demands imposed by others. Burnout is measured in terms of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and lack of personal accomplishment (Maslach, 1982, p. 3).
Job Satisfaction

When researchers refer to job satisfaction, they usually are considering worker morale, motivation, and willingness to take risks. High job satisfaction usually indicates an employee's desire to continue employment with that institution. (Ashbaugh, 1982)

Job Competence

To be competent is to perform a task capably. A competent worker possesses not only the necessary skills to do the job well, but the desire and willingness as well. Thus, job competence is the state of being capable on the job.

Instruments

The instruments used for data collection included: (a) the Personal Views Survey (PVS), (b) the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), (c) the Job In General (JIG), (d) the Homebuilders' Therapist Evaluation Form (TEF), (d) a demographic survey (DS), (e) a program directors questionnaire, and (f) an interview form titled, HomeTies View of Change Questionnaire. The PVS, MBI, and JIG, are all instruments that have been used previously for research of this type. They appear to possess validity and reliability and have been used with similar populations.
(Balser et al., 1997; Hardiness Institute, 1994; Maddi, 1997; Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). The HomeTies View of Change Questionnaire is an eight-item, open-ended questionnaire developed to qualitatively assess the effects of change on participants. Copies of all these instruments can be found in Appendix A.

Personal Views Survey (PVS)

The third generation Personal Views Survey (Kobasa, 1985, cited in Kashubeck, 1994) was developed to measure hardiness. The PVS consists of 50 items that measure overall hardiness and the challenge, control, and commitment dimensions of hardiness. The average literate person can complete the PVS in less than 10 minutes. Items contain positive and negative indicators (Maddi & Khoshaba, 1994). Sample items include: "I usually feel that I can change what might happen tomorrow by what I do today."; "I often wake up eager to take up my life where it left off the day before."; and "It bothers me when something unexpected interrupts my daily routine." The instrument is scored on a 4-point Likert scale. Responses range from 0, "complete disagreement" to 3 "complete agreement" (Maddi, 1997).

Internal consistency reliability for total hardiness is $\alpha = .80$ to .88. The three subscales have moderate internal
consistency ($\alpha = .60$ to $84.)$ (Maddi, 1997). The subscales correlate moderately with each other ($r = .44$ to $71$), but each correlates highly with the total hardiness score ($r = .80$ to $84$) according to Bernard and Belinsky (1993).

Stability is reported to be $.77$ for total hardiness and ranges from $.68$ to $.73$ for the subscales (Maddi). The PVS correlates at $.93$ with the earlier, longer version (Maddi).

An earlier hardiness measure combined the longer scales into a 71-item test that appeared to assess hardiness accurately for employed adults. With undergraduate subjects, the challenge component tended to measure political conservatism/liberalism instead of security/insecurity (Maddi & Khoshaba, 1994). This led to a question of whether hardiness is an integration of attitudes or another form of control (Maddi & Khoshaba). Maddi and Khoshaba indicate the third generation PVS is psychometrically adequate in internal consistency and in yielding commitment, control, and challenge subscales with interrelationships that justify a total hardiness score. The PVS appears unrelated to social desirability bias (Maddi & Khoshaba).

According to Williams et al. (1992) there has been criticism of this instrument in the past because it may actually measure neuroticism instead of hardiness. However it would be more accurate to say that those who score low in
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personal accomplishment (PA) (Pierce & Molloy, 1990). Each
category is measured separately. Emotional exhaustion
measures the extent to which the individual feels over-
extended emotionally by work. The depersonalization factor
discloses a lack of feeling and caring toward clients. The
personal accomplishment subscale measures feelings of
success and competency in the work arena. There are two
types of MBI instruments available, the Human Services
Survey and the Educators Survey. The Human Services Survey
was used in this study.

Each of the 22 items is rated according to a seven
point frequency scale that ranges from 0 ("never") to 6
("every day"). The MBI takes about 10 minutes to complete
(Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). The MBI has been used
extensively with those employed in the helping professions
(Duquette et al., 1994). There is no composite score for
Burnout (Walkey & Green, 1992).

Internal consistency reliability estimated by
Cronbach’s alpha was .90 for the Emotional Exhaustion
subscale; .79 for Depersonalization, and .71 for Personal
Accomplishment (Sandoval, 1989). Subscale standard errors of
measurement ranged from 3.16 to 3.80. Reported test-retest
reliability coefficients ranged from .60 to .82 after 2 to 4
weeks and .54 to .60 after 2 years. The second edition is
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done by hand or computer. Internal consistencies average above .90 for the JIG scale. Construct validity was supported because of high correlations with other well-documented measures of job satisfaction (Parsons, 1995). This instrument is described as being well researched and documented. The JIG is suitable to measure job satisfaction with a wide variety of populations (Sundberg, 1995). Using only the JIG scale of the JDI served to simplify the analysis of the data collected.

Homebuilders Therapist Evaluation Form

This instrument is used to conduct the annual evaluation of IFPS specialists who use the Homebuilders Model. The TEF is completed by the program director for each specialist he or she supervises. The form consists of nine subdivisions. The first five areas (Use of Homebuilders Model/Clinical Skills; Client Records; Case Consultation; Program/Institute Goals; Supervision) contain 35 items that are rated on a 5-point scale from 1 (significantly below expectation) to 5 (significantly above expectation). The last four categories (Improvements/Changes Since Last Evaluation; Areas of Strength/Qualities that are an Asset; Training Goals and Objectives; Employees Comments or Concerns) are to be answered in narrative style. For this

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
study, only the 35 items requiring a scaled response were used.

**Demographic Survey**

This survey contained items designed to identify the age, gender, ethnicity, educational level, religion, family status, and date hired by HomeTies of each specialist. The specialists were to identify the setting in which the majority of services were provided (Urban, Suburban, Rural). In addition, the nine program directors completed a questionnaire containing a check list for techniques used in the hiring process. This was to determine how closely the hiring procedure outlined by Homebuilders was followed. The accepted Homebuilders selection process includes: an initial screening based on a resume or application, a telephone interview, a face-to-face interview, and a group interview with the entire team present. During the group interview the applicant is typically asked to participate in role plays depicting potential IFPS situations. Even with all this, Kinney, Haapala, and Booth (1991) stated that it is difficult to select a good IFPS specialist because the characteristics of a competent specialist are hard to measure (flexibility, sense of humor, intelligence, courage, and self-confidence). The program directors were also asked to describe the agency
for which they worked (Mental Health Center, Private Not-for-Profit, Other).

**The HomeTies View of Change Questionnaire**

This questionnaire is based on the six phases of Critical Incident Stress Debriefing (CISD) as outlined by Jeffrey Mitchell, a pioneer of the CISD process. The phases are:

1. The fact phase “What is your role with HomeTies? Describe how you found out that HomeTies as we know it is ending?”

2. The thought phase “What were your thoughts when you first found out or soon after?”

3. The feelings phase “What has been the worst part of the change for you?; the best? Is there a best?”

4. The symptom phase “Have you experienced any physical, cognitive, or behavioral symptoms as a result of the change?”

5. The teaching phase “Are you doing anything special or different to take care of yourself?” “Is there anything your supervisor, or agency, has done differently to help HomeTies staff with the change? Is there anything your supervisor or agency has done that is not helpful at this time? Is there anything you wish your supervisor or agency would do at this time?”
6. The reentry phase "Where do you think you will be in six months?" and "Are there any other comments you would like to make?" (Mitchell & Everly, 1995).

Data Collection Procedures

After receiving permission to proceed with the study, a letter was sent to the State Coordinator of HomeTies and the four program managers, as well as the 28 program directors. Program managers were responsible for monitoring the programs to see that the Homebuilders model was being followed and to act as a resource for training. There were 28 HomeTies teams in Tennessee. Each team was composed of six or seven specialists and one program director. Nine teams responded to the survey. Confidentiality was a major concern. Every Home Ties director was given the option of coding evaluations before returning them. All participants were assigned a number and the names obliterated from data collection sheets to ensure the anonymity of the specialists.

After the initial phone call to each program director a packet was mailed containing a letter of explanation and instruction for the program director, and a packet for each specialist on the team. The packet for each specialist contained the four instruments (DS, PVS, MBI, and JDI) and a letter of explanation. Each specialist sealed the completed
instruments in the envelope provided. The program directors were responsible for collecting the sealed envelopes and mailing them along with the TEF for each specialist and the completed program director's questionnaire in the prepaid envelope.

Data Analysis

A data file was created in order to make it possible to analyze data with the SPSS-PC computer program. Descriptive statistics were computed. Because the null hypotheses were bivariate, Pearson's product-moment coefficients of correlation were obtained to discover if a relationship exists between hardiness and the outcome variables: job competence, job satisfaction, and burnout. The correlational method is useful for studying problems in the social sciences because it permits the study of relationships among a number of variables in a single study. If there is no linear relationship between two variables, the value of the coefficient is 0. If there is a perfect positive linear relationship, the value is +1. If there is a perfect negative relationship, the value is -1. There are situations, particularly with a large sample size, where the actual value of the coefficient is not very great, but it is still statistically significant (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).
Most hardiness researchers have studied hardiness by examining the total score and the three subscales scores for commitment, challenge, and control as well. This study was no exception. Hull, Lehn, and Tedlie (1991), state that one advantage to using the total score is that as the number of items increases, the reliability of a scale also increases. Because the items represent a broader sampling of a complex construct, the full scale will more accurately reflect the entirety of the model and the composite will possess greater content validity than any of the individual subscales. The disadvantage to using the total score is that some information may be lost. It would be unclear whether the result was influenced by all the subcomponents equally, or if one or two had more influence than the third; therefore, both methods were employed.

When it became apparent that return rate would be a problem, a decision was made to conduct 8-10 interviews with HomeTies personnel who were experiencing the effects of impending change and embed these case studies into the findings. Eight specialists were interviewed using the HomeTies View of Change Survey. To add additional layers of information, a program manager and two program directors were included in the interview process.
Hypotheses

The research questions for this study were:

1. Is there a relationship between hardiness and employee competence?

2. Is there a relationship between hardiness and job satisfaction?

3. Is there a relationship between hardiness and burnout?

To investigate these questions, 20 null hypotheses were constructed. They were:

1. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of hardiness as measured by the PVS and job competence as reported on the TEF.

2. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of commitment as measured by the PVS and job competence as reported on the TEF.

3. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of control as measured by the PVS and job competence as reported on the TEF.

4. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of challenge as measured by the PVS and job competence as reported on the TEF.

5. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of hardiness as measured by
NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript and are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.

Page 65-66

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI
18. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of commitment as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the PA subscale of the MBI.

19. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of control as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the PA subscale of the MBI.

20. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of challenge as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the PA subscale of the MBI.

Summary

The population studied consisted of 200 specialists employed in the Tennessee HomeTies program. Data were collected using 6 instruments: (a) the PVS to measure hardiness; (b) the TEF to measure job competence; (c) the JIG to measure job satisfaction; (d) the MBI to measure the three strands of burnout; (e) a demographic survey and (f) The HomeTies View of Change Questionnaire. A total of 52 specialists from nine programs returned usable data sets. Initially, program directors and regional managers were not included in the study. One regional manager and two program
directors participated in the gathering of data for the case study component.

As statistical information was collected, a data file was created to make it possible to analyze the data with the SPSS-PC computer program. Descriptive statistics were obtained and correlational statistics were calculated. The small sample size precluded obtaining multiple regression statistical information. Chapter 4 contains a detailed description of the research participants as well as reports of data analysis. An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests. After analyzing the data, 19 of the 20 null hypotheses were rejected.
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reported being single. There were 30 specialists (57.7%) who had no minor children living at home; 12 (23.1%) had 1 child at home; 7 (13.5%) had 2; 2 (3.8%) had 4; and 1 (1.9%) reported 5 children living with the specialist. Specialists working in a rural setting totaled 26 (50%); 7 (13.5%) worked in a suburban setting; and 19 (36.5%) in an urban setting. The information gathered from the program director's questionnaire indicated that all nine of the respondents used these techniques when hiring new IFPS specialists: (a) advertisements in newspapers, (b) advertisements in-house, (c) recommendations from existing staff, (d) resume review, (e) face-to-face interview, (f) group interview, (g) role playing, and (h) reference check. All but one used an agency application as well as a resume, and all but one program director used telephone interviews to narrow the field of applicants. Six directors requested a writing sample from applicants, two used an assessment instrument to measure job fit. Only one invited prospective applicants to lunch with the team. Five program directors were employed by private or public not-for-profit agencies and four worked in mental health centers.
Description of Hardiness, Burnout, Job Satisfaction, and Employee Competence Findings

Hardiness and the subscales: challenge, commitment, and control were measured with the PVS. The three components of burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lack of personal accomplishment were measured with the MBI. The JIG and TEF were used to survey job satisfaction and employee competence respectively. A table was constructed to summarize the descriptive statistics for these variables.

Personal Views Survey

The results from the PVS indicated, that 11 (21.2%) of the HomeTies specialists who participated in the study scored low in hardiness, 12 (23%) scored average in hardiness, and 29 (55.8%) scored high in hardiness. It is interesting to note that over half of those who returned the surveys were considered to be above average in hardiness.

Maslach Burnout Inventory

The results from the EE subtest of the MBI indicated that 29 (55.8%) of the specialists scored in the low burnout range, 17 (32.7) reported average burnout scores, and 6 (11.5%) scored in the high burnout range. On the DP scale 45 (86.5%) fell into the low burnout range and the other 7
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Table 1.

SUMMARY OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR HARDINESS, COMPETENCE, JOB SATISFACTION & BURNOUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Var.</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PVS</td>
<td>103.308</td>
<td>107.000</td>
<td>104.500</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>136.884</td>
<td>11.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAL</td>
<td>29.558</td>
<td>27.000</td>
<td>28.500</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24.879</td>
<td>4.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>36.519</td>
<td>39.000</td>
<td>37.000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16.647</td>
<td>4.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>37.327</td>
<td>42.000</td>
<td>38.000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.362</td>
<td>4.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEF</td>
<td>142.788</td>
<td>175.000</td>
<td>151.000</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>600.248</td>
<td>24.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIG</td>
<td>44.827</td>
<td>54.000</td>
<td>44.500</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55.283</td>
<td>7.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>16.577</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>15.500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57.112</td>
<td>7.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>2.692</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.943</td>
<td>2.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>40.346</td>
<td>46.000</td>
<td>40.000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29.446</td>
<td>5.426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Research Questions

The results of this study indicated that statistically significant relationships exist between hardiness and job competence, job satisfaction, and burnout in this sample. In this section results of the Pearson product-moment coefficients of correlation are given and each null hypothesis is reported as rejected, except one. Table 2 summarizes these findings. The information collected from the HomeTies View of Change Questionnaires will be discussed.
The Null Hypotheses

1. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of hardiness as measured by the PVS and job competence as reported on the TEF. The Pearson $r = .62$ and was significant at $p < .001$. As hardiness increases, the level of job competence increases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

2. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of commitment as measured by the PVS and job competence as reported on the TEF. The Pearson $r = .47$ and was significant at $p < .001$. As commitment increases, the level of job competence increases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

3. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of control as measured by the PVS and job competence as reported on the TEF. The Pearson $r = .60$ and was significant at $p < .001$. As the hardiness personality trait control increases, the level of job competence increases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

4. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of challenge as measured by the PVS and job competence as reported on the TEF. The Pearson $r = .53$ and was significant at $p < .001$. As the
hardiness trait challenge increases, the level of job competence also increases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

5. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of hardiness as measured by the PVS and job satisfaction as measured by the JIG. The Pearson $r = .55$ and was significant at $p < .001$. As hardiness increases, the level of job satisfaction increases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

6. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of commitment as measured by the PVS and job satisfaction as measured by the JIG. The Pearson $r = .62$ and was significant at $p < .001$. As the hardiness personality trait commitment increases, job satisfaction also increases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

7. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of control as measured by the PVS and job satisfaction as measured by the JIG. The Pearson $r = .44$ and was significant at $p < .01$. As commitment increases, the level of job satisfaction increases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

8. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of challenge as measured by the PVS and job satisfaction as measured by the JIG. The
Pearson $r = .33$ and was significant at $p < .05$. As the hardiness personality trait challenge increases, the level of job satisfaction also increases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

9. There is no statistically significant negative relationship between the level of hardiness as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the EE subscale of the MBI. The Pearson $r = -.49$ and was significant at $p < .001$. As hardiness increases, the level of emotional exhaustion decreases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

10. There is no statistically significant negative relationship between the level of commitment as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the EE subscale of the MBI. The Pearson $r = -.45$ and was significant at $p < .001$. As the hardiness personality trait commitment increases, the level of emotional exhaustion decreases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

11. There is no statistically significant negative relationship between the level of control as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the EE subscale of the MBI. The Pearson $r = -.42$ and was significant at $p < .01$. As the hardiness personality trait control increases,
the level of emotional exhaustion decreases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

12. There is no statistically significant negative relationship between the level of challenge as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the EE subscale of the MBI. The Pearson $r = -0.38$ and was significant at $p < 0.01$. As the hardiness personality trait of challenge increases, the level of emotional exhaustion decreases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

13. There is no statistically significant negative relationship between the level of hardiness as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the DP subscale of the MBI. The Pearson $r = -0.43$ and was significant at $p < 0.01$. As hardiness increases, feelings of depersonalization decrease. The null hypothesis was rejected.

14. There is no statistically significant negative relationship between the level of commitment as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the DP subscale of the MBI. The Pearson $r = -0.48$ and was significant at $p < 0.001$. As commitment increases, the feelings of depersonalization decrease. The null hypothesis was rejected.
15. There is no statistically significant negative relationship between the level of control as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the DP subscale of the MBI. The Pearson $r = -.46$ and was significant at $p < .001$. As the hardiness personality trait control increases, feelings of depersonalization decrease. The null hypothesis was rejected.

16. There is no statistically significant negative relationship between the level of challenge as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the DP subscale of the MBI. The Pearson $r = -.18$ and was not significant. Because no significant relationship was found between challenge and depersonalization the null hypothesis was retained.

17. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of hardiness as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the PA subscale of the MBI. The Pearson $r = .64$ and was significant at $p < .001$. As hardiness increases, feelings of personal accomplishment also increase. The null hypothesis was rejected.

18. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of commitment as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the PA
subscale of the MBI. The Pearson $r = .54$ and was significant at $p < .001$. As commitment increases, the feeling of personal accomplishment also increases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

19. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of control as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the PA subscale of the MBI. The Pearson $r = .50$ and was significant at $p < .001$. As the hardiness personality trait control increases, the feeling of personal accomplishment also increases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

20. There is no statistically significant positive relationship between the level of challenge as measured by the PVS and the degree of burnout as measured by the PA subscale of the MBI. The Pearson $r = .53$ and was significant at $p < .001$. As the hardiness personality trait of challenge increases, the feeling of personal accomplishment increases. The null hypothesis was rejected.

**Demographic Correlations**

Pearson product-moment correlations or chi-square statistics, as appropriate for the level of data, were
Table 2

BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PVS</td>
<td>-.79*</td>
<td>.86*</td>
<td>.86*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>-.50*</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHA</td>
<td>-.48*</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>-.76*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
<td>-.48*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>-.47*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>-.45*</td>
<td>-.48*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEF</td>
<td>-.49*</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIG</td>
<td>-.52*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 52

KEY:
1. Personal Views Survey to measure total hardiness
2. Challenge component of hardiness
3. Control component of hardiness
4. Commitment component of hardiness
5. Therapist Evaluation Form to measure employee competency
6. Job in General scale to measure job satisfaction
7. Emotional Exhaustion component of burnout
8. Depersonalization component of burnout
9. Personal Accomplishment component of burnout

*significant at the p < .001 level
**significant at the p < .01 level
***significant at the p < .05 level

calculated between research variables and the demographic variables. A weak correlation \( r = .29 \) was found between age and TEF. It was significant at < .05. Another relationship was found between years of service and TEF \( r = .33, p < .05 \). Intuitively one can understand that an older
person, and/or one who has been employed more years, has had more work experience and should score higher on an employee evaluation.

The HomeTies View of Change Questionnaire

The questionnaire established some interesting connections between personal hardiness and the ability to cope with radical change. In the past, the Tennessee Department of Children’s Services (DCS) has contracted with a variety of agencies to provide needed services to enable at-risk children to live at home safely instead of being placed in residential treatment centers. In the interest of providing services that are more responsive to the needs of regions, and services that are more comprehensive, and more cost effective, the State decided to award one contract for non residential children’s services in each of the 12 regions of Tennessee. This meant that the funding set aside for IFPS would be included in the budget of the new network of services. The State used a “Request for Proposal” and reviewing process to determine the agency that would be awarded this contract. This meant that HomeTies as a separate program would end, and the 200 specialists, and their supervisors, would be placed in the position of negotiating for new jobs under new contracts, in new agencies. The hardiness literature specifically mentions
organizational "rightsizing" as a time when personal hardiness is necessary to cope with change. Normally, hardiness scores falling between the 40th and 60th percentile (95 to 102) are considered sufficient to protect against the effects of stress. At times of extreme pressure, a score at the 60th percentile may not be sufficient to protect health and performance. The Hardiness Institute recommends that organizations undergoing drastic change provide Hardiness Training for their staff (Hardiness Institute, 1994). A complete transcript of responses to the View of Change Questionnaire can be found in Appendix B.

Of the 11 who agreed to be interviewed, specialist #7 scored the lowest in personal hardiness (86). She had not been aware that the change was going to take place until the last minute, even though others on her team had been aware of the impending change for months. She reported not seeing any prospects on the horizon for a new job and feeling jittery. Her appetite was affected as well. She did not have any clear idea of where she would be in six months and thought maybe she would go to New York because she had never been there. She was not doing anything special for herself to make this time easier.

Specialist #1 also scored low (86). He reported knowing about the change, but his responses were marked by a lack of
a plan. He seemed content to drift along and hope that the agency who won the contract with the State would hire him. However, this person did express a deep Christian faith and stated he was involved in prayer and meditation and building a support network for himself through the local church. He did not have a clear picture of where he would be in six months.

Specialist #6 also scored lower than average on the PVS. He had actually left the HomeTies program soon after hearing about the upcoming change. He reported that things had not been pleasant there for some time, but that he could not bring himself to leave for something new until he felt almost forced into it. He sees himself at his present job in six months.

Specialist #2 was just under the “average” mark on the PVS hardiness score (91). She had known about the change for awhile and reported thinking, “I have been there so long, what am I going to do for a job?” in the beginning, but now she is looking forward to something new. She admitted that she needed a change for a long time, but it took a crisis to force her to make some hard decisions.

Specialist #11 scored just into the average hardiness range on the PVS (96) but appeared to exhibit some “hardy” characteristics. The change did not really affect him
because he had already made a decision to leave and start his own program. It takes personal courage to start a small program on a one-year grant without any real guarantee of renewed funding. It was surprising that he did not score higher on the PVS. The only response that struck an "unhardy" chord was: "I thought they (the agency) would get it (HomeTies) back. I thought a version would still exist." Indicating a lack of acceptance of change.

The other three specialists all scored in the high hardiness range. Number 33 scored 107. She reported feeling like someone "let the air out of my tires," but she has updated her resume and is taking St. John’s Wort and vitamin B₁₂ to help with the physical stress associated with the change. She did not know where she wanted to be in six months but knew that she wants to be doing something similar.

Specialist #5 scored 107 on the PVS. She stated she always knew there was a possibility that HomeTies would end. She has felt angry about the change, but she has switched to a fat free, low sugar diet and has lost 40 pounds. She was the only one to say that the State has a good idea, but she worried that it was happening too quickly. She is watching the ads and wants to do something similar. She stated if she can find something "for a year, after that, my husband’s
business should be going well enough that I can work for him."

Specialist #3 showed her high hardiness (117) by proclaiming that she is not worried because her faith is in the Lord. In six months she expects to be still in a helping profession, even if she is doing volunteer work. She reports no physical problems and is doing nothing special to take care of herself.

Both program directors who were interviewed scored in the high hardiness range. Program director #1 (103) stated that in his heart he knew it was the right timing. Although, he has had some ups and downs, he is generally positive and looking forward to whatever the future holds. He is finding time for hobbies he only dreamed of participating in previously. Program director #2 actually scored higher (111) but was not as positive. It had taken her longer to "catch on" to the fact that the program was really ending. She stated that she may just decide to become a full-time grandmother instead of seeking other employment. She also stated that this proved it is good to diversify one's talents and that she wished she had taken advantage of taking university classes with a state fee waiver.

The regional manager who agreed to be interviewed also scored high (109) on the PVS. This could be another
indication of the correlation between job competence and hardness as all three of the supervisory personnel interviewed scored well into the high range on the PVS. The regional manager stated that for five years he suspected that HomeTies would end one day. His attitude was "it's about time, it needed to happen." For years he taught his clients stress relief and communication techniques and now he uses these tools to help himself and his staff to conquer feelings of uncertainty. He said he does not know where he will be in six months, but he is not worried. He is hoping that the agency he is employed by will win the contract, but if they do not, he feels he can obtain employment elsewhere.

Another very important issue that redounded through all three levels of the interviews was the importance of open and honest communication. There was a feeling on all levels that information was slow to filter down from above. People were left feeling frustrated and unappreciated. Many expressed a need to know about available options. One of the specialists stated she had no idea how to apply for unemployment. Many felt they were being ignored by their employers as though they were already gone. They had expected more after so many years of service.

The findings from the interviews generally supported the research questions. The HomeTies personnel who scored
high in hardiness appeared more sure of their ability to find new jobs. They seemed more comfortable with the impending change, and were actually looking forward to it in some cases. Many were taking positive steps to maintain control over themselves and the situation. A number of them expressed a commitment to the helping profession and a desire to continue on in some form or another.

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to discover if a relationship exists between hardiness and: (a) employee competency; (b) job satisfaction; and (c) employee burnout. The results of the study support the existence of a relationship between hardiness and the outcome variables. Of the 20 null hypotheses studied, all but one was rejected. To supplement the small data set size, 11 case studies based on telephone interviews with 1 regional manager, 2 program directors, and 8 specialists were embedded into the study. The findings from the case studies also supported the existence of a relationship between hardiness and employee competence, job satisfaction and burnout.

Chapter 5 will summarize the importance of the findings. Recommendations will be offered for extending the study in the future.
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screening tool. Of the 20 stated null hypotheses, 19 were rejected. There is no reason to conclude that the sample is not representative of the total population. The sample data returned represented all three types of service areas and a wide range of ages. Males and persons of color were underrepresented, but this is true of the entire population of IFPS specialists and counseling/social work interventions in general.

**Hardiness and Competency**

Hardiness was measured with the PVS. Four separate scores were recorded: hardiness, challenge, commitment, and control. Employee competency was measured using the TEF. All four of the hardiness measures correlated with the TEF at a significance level of $p = <.001$. Thehardier the employee, on all four hardiness measures, the more competency that specialist exhibited. This finding supports the conjecture that psychological hardiness predicts job competence in an IFPS specialist.

**Hardiness and Burnout**

Hardiness was measured with the PVS and burnout was measured with the three subtests of the MBI. Overall hardiness correlated significantly with emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment.
As hardiness increased, emotional exhaustion and feelings of depersonalization decreased. Personal accomplishment increased significantly as the PVS aggregated score increased.

The challenge trait of hardiness correlated significantly with emotional exhaustion. As the challenge trait increased, emotional exhaustion decreased. Challenge also correlated significantly with personal accomplishment. Specialists who were not threatened by change, indicated a greater sense of personal accomplishment. There was no correlation between challenge and depersonalization.

The control trait of hardiness correlated significantly with all three components of burnout. A specialist who indicated that he or she felt in control of life suffered less from feelings of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization while feeling a greater sense of personal accomplishment.

The commitment trait of hardiness correlated significantly with all three components of burnout at the $p < .001$ level. A specialist who indicated commitment to and interest in whatever he or she is doing also experienced fewer feelings of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization and indicated a greater sense of personal accomplishment.
Psychological hardiness in an IFPS specialist predicted low burnout in this sample.

**Hardiness and Job Satisfaction**

The PVS was used to obtain the four measures of hardiness. Job satisfaction was measured with the JIG. Overall hardiness and commitment correlated with the JIG at a significance level of $p = <.001$. Control correlated with the JIG at a significance level of $p = <.01$; challenge correlated with the JIG at a significance level of $p = <.05$. As the level of psychological hardiness increased, the job satisfaction of the IFPS specialist also increased. Hardiness served as a predictor of job satisfaction in this sample.

**Hardiness and Change**

Interviews with 11 employees of Tennessee HomeTies at a time when drastic changes were underway, revealed that those employees who scored higher on the PVS were able to adapt to the changes more readily than those who scored in the low to average range. Almost all those who were interviewed mentioned the lack of information as an added stressor.

**Conclusions**

The results of this study indicate that statistically significant relationships exist between hardiness and
employee competency, job satisfaction, and employee burnout in this sample. If the first step toward validating the PVS as a legitimate predictor of success for prospective IFPS workers is to assess IFPS specialists to see if exemplary workers do indeed possess the hardiness traits, and if IFPS specialists who are high in hardiness enjoy their work while avoiding burnout, then this research appears to have accomplished that goal.

**Recommendations and Implications for Practice**

Based on the researcher's personal observation, the sample appears to be representative of the total population that was to be studied. Although the sample size was smaller than is desirable, the results are such that this study should be extended to other IFPS to ascertain if similar studies produce the same findings. Ideally, all newly hired specialists could be given the PVS, and a longitudinal study conducted to compare hardy specialists to non-hardy specialists over time to see if hardy specialists do experience job satisfaction, and if they are competent workers who are able to avoid burnout.

The purpose of this study was to begin the process of validating the PVS as a pre-employment screening instrument to be used in the hiring process for IFPS specialists. This study offers preliminary support for the use of the PVS as
an employment screening tool for a very specialized field. Due to the unexpected changes that occurred in the child services delivery system during this study, it was discovered that employees indicate that management should provide more help during a time of change. Employees complained about a lack of information and communication; of feeling forgotten and unappreciated. The lesson learned here is stress can be alleviated in situations of changing policy and procedures by providing open and honest communication from the top down. It would also be helpful to allow the employees a time to vent, and to tell management what they need to help them over the rough spots (i.e. crisis counseling, job placement, resume writing workshop, refresher course on job search skills, etc.). Times of change are difficult for management as well as underlings, but retreating behind closed doors does not help an unhappy situation. Finally, Hardiness Institute personnel state that hardiness can be taught and organizations would do well to consider providing this training for their employees.

Public sector organizations are facing times of great change. Pressure is being brought to bear to change the very missions and practices of these organizations (Nutt & Backoff, 1993). The most effective way to build an organization that is proactive instead of reactive is to
hire employees who are committed to whatever work they are doing, view change as a natural and normal part of life, and believe that they have control over their lives and circumstances. Using the PVS as a pre-employment screening tool may help these organizations achieve this goal.
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**Therapist Evaluation Form**

Therapist Name ______________
Supervisor ______________
Date ______________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 = Significantly above expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = Slightly above expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 = Meets expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Slightly below expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Significantly below expectation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. USE OF HOMEBUILDER MODEL/CLINICAL SKILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Assessment/Goal formation</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Engaging skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Defusion skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Skills in giving feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Knowledge &amp; teaching ability in cognitive interventions (RET, values clarification, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Knowledge &amp; teaching ability in behavioral interventions (contingency management, shaping, environmental changes, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Knowledge &amp; teaching ability in parenting skills (child development, effective discipline, teaching interactions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Knowledge and teaching ability in communication skills (Active listening, “I” messages, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Knowledge &amp; teaching ability in other areas (Ex: decision-making, social support, problem-solving, anger and/or stress management, sexual abuse, spouse abuse, etc.) OR ability to adequately address these topics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Identification of need, and provision of concrete services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Advocacy &amp; networking with schools, courts, other service providers, and the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Responsive and flexible to client needs (is available, schedules appointments at convenient times, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Preparation, organization and time management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. CLIENT RECORDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Quality (concise, complete, avoids labeling or inferences, well written, good grammar, etc.)</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Timeliness (in on time, reasonable amount of time spent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Respects confidentiality (info releases when appropriate, avoids discussing clients to inappropriate people, records respect client's privacy).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### III. CASE CONSULTATION

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Attendance (on time, stays for length of meeting)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Presentation (clear, concise, asks for what's wanted or needed, states goals and actions taken, discusses progress as well as problems, presents often enough)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Participation (listens well, offers suggestions/resources, supportive and respectful of other team members)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Respectful of family (avoids labeling, inferences, blaming)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Requests additional consultation as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. PROGRAM/INSTITUTE GOALS

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Client load (18 families per year)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Client follow-up forms completed and on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Willingness to do other tasks (back-up supervision, committees, taking out visitors, special request, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Ability to work effectively and respectfully with colleagues (intake, office staff, upper management, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Supportive team member (back-up for therapists, help with team projects, encouraging to team members)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Ability to work well with colleagues in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Has grown professionally over past year (takes initiative to learn, shares skill knowledge with others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Meets other program goals (promotes program and agency to others, meets 24 hour intake deadline when possible, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Ability to balance work load/self care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. SUPERVISION

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Interacts in a cooperative manner (considers the supervisor's needs in using supervisory time, communicates assertively and respectfully, checks activities out when appropriate, etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Dependable (Can be relied on to do tasks with minimum supervision, on time to meetings, checks in daily with office, calls in when sick)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Keeps supervisor posted in emergency, difficult, dangerous or unusual situations with clients (follows guidelines)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Keeps supervisor posted on situations involving scheduling, coverage, or participation in other agency functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Accepts and utilizes feedback in a timely manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

Name______________________________________________________________

Educational Level__________________________________________________

Date hired as HomeTies specialist____________________________________

Agency________________________________________________________________

Age___________________________________________________________________

Marital Status_______________________________________________________

Number of children living in your home presently________________________

CIRCLE ONE ANSWER IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS:

1. Gender:
   (1) Male (2) Female

2. Ethnicity:
   (1) White, Caucasian
   (2) Black, African-American
   (3) Asian, Asian-American
   (4) Latino, Hispanic, Mexican American
   (5) Native American, American Indian/Eskimo/Aleut
   (6) Other (Please Specify)____________________________________________

3. Type of community in which you work the majority of the time:
   (1) Rural
   (2) Suburban
   (3) Urban

4. How religious do you consider yourself to be? (circle the appropriate number)
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Very religious       Not at all religious
   Thank you for your help!!!
PROGRAM DIRECTOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE

Name:______________________________________________________

Name of Agency_________________________________________________

Program #:________________________________________________________

Type of Agency:

    Private, not-for-profit
    Mental Health Center
    Other (explain)_______________________________________________

Date hired as director of HomeTies program_______________________________

Check all the strategies you utilize in the hiring process:

    ☐ Advertise in newspaper
    ☐ In-house advertising
    ☐ Recommendations from existing staff
    ☐ Resume review
    ☐ Agency application review
    ☐ Phone interview
    ☐ Face to face interview
    ☐ Group interview
    ☐ Role playing
    ☐ Invite to lunch
    ☐ Reference check
    ☐ Writing sample
    ☐ Pencil and paper testing
    ☐ Other (explain)__________________________________________

List the titles of any instruments that are used in screening potential employees:

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your help!!!
HOME TIES—VIEW OF CHANGE QUESTIONS

1. What is your role with Home Ties? Describe how you found out that Home Ties as we know it is ending.
2. What were your thoughts when you found out, or soon after?
3. What has been the worst part of the change process for you? The best? (is there a best?)
4. Have you experienced any physical, emotional or cognitive symptoms since finding out about the change?
5. Are you doing anything special or different to take care of yourself (diet management, exercise, meditation, etc.)?
6. Is there anything your supervisor, or agency, has done differently to help Home Ties staff with the change? Is there anything your supervisor or agency has done that is not helpful at this time? Is there anything you wish your supervisor or agency would do at this time?
7. Where do you think you will be in six months?
8. Are there any other comments you would like to make?

EXAMPLES OF SYMPTOMS:

Physical Signs and Symptoms
- Fatigue
- Muscle Tremors, Twitches
- Shock Symptoms
- Profuse Sweating
- Chills
- Dizziness
- Gastro-Intestinal Upset

Emotional Symptoms
- Anxiety
- Fear
- Grief
- Depression
- Hopelessness
- Irritability
- Anger
- Feeling Overwhelmed

Cognitive Symptoms
- Memory Loss
- Anomia (forgetting names of people)
- Decision Making Difficulty
- Problem Solving Difficulty
- Confusing Trivial with Major Items
- Concentration Problems
- Loss of Attention Span
- Calculation problems
APPENDIX B

VIEW OF CHANGE QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY
VIEW OF CHANGE QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Q1. What is your role with Home Ties? Describe how you found out that Home Ties as we know it is ending.
(S = specialist; PD = Program Director; PM = regional Program Manager)

S#1: I found out from gossip that was going around. I did not find out from my supervisor, but from other sources that I know in the mental health field.

S#2: An ‘insider’ told me, a rumor from another agency. I knew for sure when it was announced in case consultation.

S#3: found out from my co-workers

S#5: We always knew there was the possibility that the contract wouldn’t be renewed.

S#6: I heard it “through the grapevine”

S#7: I just found out from my supervisor yesterday that our agency is definitely not going to compete for the grant funding.

S#11: Specialist. At the office, from my supervisor

S#33: Our supervisor told us. Then the Program Manager came and explained it to us. Then the Executive Director of the agency came and explained how it would be different.

PD#1: It had been rumored “forever.” I was sure when the Executive Director received a letter from the State Coordinator stating that all Home Ties contracts would terminate June 30.

PD#2: When we received the RFP—after I studied it, I realized Home Ties would not be kept the same, it would change.

PM#1: I first heard 5 years ago. I’ve just been waiting for things to change, it’s been a slow process. My supervisor has kept good communications with us, it has not been abrupt

Q2: What were your thoughts when you found out about the change, or soon after?

S#1: Mixed emotions. On one hand, sadness, because Home Ties is a good program on the whole. On the other hand, excitement. We have been having problems with our supervisor. This is an answer to prayer. Some new doors may be opened.

S#2: I’ve been there so long....What am I going to do for a job? [she is a single parent with two young children] I just hope whoever get the contract...the program is comparable. I hope I can find a job with comparable benefits and salary.

S#3: I was sad, disappointed, I believe in the Home Ties Model.

S#5: At first, when I heard about the RFP, I was optimistic that our Agency might be awarded the contract. I was shocked when I heard that we weren’t going to go for it, then they explained why they couldn’t (too risky financially, the board of directors would not approve)

S#6: I better find a job...I was happy it was going to end
S#7: A little anger—disappointment. I like what I’m doing. I hope whoever gets it (the contract) can do what we’re doing (working with only two families at a time, up to 20 hours a week with each family).

S#11: I thought our Agency would win the contract, and a version of Home Ties would still exist but they are not going to compete.

S#33: We’re so different from everyone else (working with only 2 families at a time, able to personalize the intervention to fit each family). With the training and experience I’ve had, I would still be able to function, do some good, somewhere else.

PD#1: In my heart, I knew this was good timing. I’ve gone through a whole process of highs and lows. We’ve been pushing for several years to rebid the contract (to get a higher reimbursement rate). I see it as an opportunity one day, the next day I am frightened, depressed. I try to think positively “We can win this thing” and then I think “Agency XYZ has a lock on this” I go back and forth.

PD#2: I was shocked, because usually a program so successful is replicated, not ended. Why would they do that? I was angry, irritated, annoyed.

PM#1: Because of my background, it was expected. My thought was, “It’s about time” because there have been changes that needed to be made.

Q3: What has been the worst part of the change process for you? The best? (Is there a best?) W = worst; B = best

S#1: W—A lack of accurate information from the Agency
B—Although this door is closing, new doors will open. There will be new challenges—the best part has been the support from others.

S#2 W—Not knowing who will get the contract, where I’ll be working, what capacity
B—I look forward to something new, work with new people, I was ready for something different.

S#3 W—The lack of information, not knowing exactly what will happen and when—ambiguity—losing everyone (from the team)
B—I don’t see a best part

S#5 W—The frustration—feeling like no one cared
B—It’s not over yet. If there’s a best part it hasn’t come yet, unless, it’s shaken us out of our complacency.

S#6 W—having to leave my friends and start over, learn a new way of doing things
B—It forced me to find a new job...something I needed to do, but had been putting off (problems with supervisor)

S#7 W—I lose my job, don’t see any prospects for a new one. Some of my former clients had hoped to be re-referred in six months and I’ve had to tell them Home Ties is over, there won’t be any re-referrals.
B—I don’t see any good point at this point

S#11: W—A reaction for other people. It doesn’t affect me [has received funding to start a program of his own] Many have worked for Home Ties for 5-9 years.
B—My circumstances, I have a new position
S#33:  W—Not knowing, hanging on to hope of re-establishing service. Don’t know what I want to do. I have updated my resume. I’ll only be working until October, indecision over what to do then.
B—I don’t know of a best part. It’s taken a lot of air out of my tires, I’m just wandering around.

PD#1:  W—Lack of stability, chaos, pressure from home. I have entertained a great many options. I see what it does to my wife—she wanted to move to a nicer house, that has been put off. She feels “freaky” doesn’t know where we will be.
B—Opened me up to prospects of different and challenging things. I feel discouraged about the prospects of the Agency winning the contract. It has brought into focus what my life is about. Caused a re-evaluation. I am tighter with the Lord. There is a men’s support group at church. I shared this with them. I came to the conclusion it is time to have one job (with the church) instead of being bi-vocational. I would like to be in full time ministry.

PD#2:  W—Worrying about people, what will happen when the program ends. The Agency cannot absorb all of them. The Flex schedule has been good for single mom, and disabled counselor. If I knew they would be all right, I would be all right.
B—When something ends, new beginnings can be for the good.

PM#1 W—Unknowing, not knowing. The 3 month extension almost makes it worse—in limbo.
B—Those who can see the end know that this new process addresses issues that needed addressing. I am looking forward to the end result. This will provide a continuum of services where there were gaps in the old system.

Q4: Have you experienced any physical, emotional or cognitive symptoms since finding out about the change?

S#1:  Irritability, general nervousness, nothing major
S#2:  Anxiety, sadness
S#3:  No, my faith is in the Lord
S#5:  Gall bladder, feel angrier
S#6:  No, probably because I left before it got to that point
S#7:  Not able to eat, jittery
S#11: No
S#33:  Fear, anxiety, anger, didn’t see it coming, if you believe in Home Ties....
PD#1:  Memory loss, depressed (very at times), sleeplessness. Couldn’t see how it was all going to work out. My wife kept saying “No, I’m not going to do that” I feel frustrated, disgusted with the position the State put the vendors in. The RFP is set up in such a way it is difficult to “win” even if you get the contract. I have wished for a change, but this is disconcerting. I have had to hold back information (from the counselors) because they don’t understand. Wish you could tell.
PD#2:  I’ve been a little depressed, down, feel badly—fatigue, more than normal.
PM#1: I use the techniques I've taught to my Home Ties clients. I have felt anxious and experienced changes in my sleeping pattern, but I use the skills I've learned and that helps.

Q5: Are you doing anything special or different to take care of yourself during this time of change?

S#1: Prayer/meditation. Opening up to other support networks, reconnecting with support and friends from the past.
S#2: No
S#3: No
S#5: Fat free, low sugar diet
S#6: I left
S#7: I'm always on a diet, always exercise, [diabetic] nothing different
S#11: No
S#33: St. John's Wort, Vitamin B12,

PD#1: I have taken up river rafting. Developed a new appreciation for nature. I realize stuff goes on with or without me. I spend more time with my kids. Working in my yard is fun. I've lost a lot of weight. I have kind of a bad attitude about work right now. I've been taking a lot of sick leave—to work on my yard. I bought a big “Tim the Tool Man” chain saw, it's very therapeutic. I have a better prayer life. I feel better for working on the house and yard. I do a lot of physical labor, and little thinking.

PD#2: No—well I did join a gym, but I don’t exercise regularly
PM#1: Yes—diet, stress and anxiety management, RET

Q6: (a) Is there anything your supervisor, or agency, has done differently to help Home Ties staff with the change?
(b) Is there anything your supervisor or agency has done that is NOT helpful at this time?
(c) Is there anything you WISH your supervisor or agency would do differently?

S#1: (a) No
(b) General lack of communication about what’s going on—nothing definite, no game plan, no information about what will happen if we lose this contract. A supervisor who actually worked a 40 hour week and was an honest person would be a big help.
(c) Be more open and up front. Prepare a severance package—making terms clear and known to all.

S#2 (a) Executive Director has held meetings and asked for input
(b) No difference in behavior
(c) Be a little more reassuring about job possibilities—what will happen—job placement.
S#5  (a) Supervisor fighting for severance package
     (b) Higher ups don’t tell us what’s going on
     (c) They need to sit down and lay it out, what they know, how do you go about
         filing unemployment. What are our options?
S#6  (a) Not while I was there, I hear they are now
     (b) Just not telling the truth
     (c) Just be up front with people, tell people what their options are
S#7  (a) Nothing...oh, wait my Supervisor offered to write us all letters of reference
     (b) At the beginning I felt real confident that we had a good chance, then the
         Executive Director seemed less confident, then no information at all
     (c) I can’t think of anything
S#11 (a) Not a thing
      (b) I feel like they are being led along. People have not been kept “in the loop”
         We’ve had to ask too many questions. There are not enough answers
      (c) The Agency could give time off to exemplary employees, show appreciation
          with a dinner, something to recognize all those years of hard work.
S#33 (a) Nope, explanations were not aimed at us
      (b) Telling us if they do win the contract, we all have to re-apply for jobs—the
          scrutiny involved has nothing to do with merit, has to do with a cleaning out
          process.
      (c) No—they could have been more tactful. They haven’t been helpful in the past,
          why would they start now?

PD#1:  (a) Executive director called a meeting two times. He explained his side, trying to
        be positive and upbeat and put an end to rumors.
        (b) The planning process (for the proposal in answer to the RFP) I am disturbed by
            the lack of progress. Need someone to take charge and focus everyone.
            Terrible turf protection—“pissin’ contests” Bothered me that meetings were
            not more team oriented.
        (c) Leadership needs to have more empathy for people who have been caught in
            the downsizing process
PD#2:  (a) Executive director is negotiating to work with other people to provide
        positions for employees who will be left jobless on October 1.
        (b) They have been dwelling on the negative, why competing for the contract
            won’t work instead of why it could work.
        (c) If they would just keep us posted—don’t make us seek out information
PM#1:  (a) Teams that do get information out quickly, it takes about 4 weeks to synthesize
        material and become actively involved.
        (b) Supervisor has been extremely close-lipped. I know it is because of the
            political climate in Nashville. We have not been given feedback.
        (c) The key is information. There is a time element to processing change. Not
            doing things behind the employees’ backs is important. If there is information
available, and employees are not getting it, that’s unacceptable. It should be presented in as positive a light as possible.

Q7: Where do you think you will be in six months?

S#1: I will be involved in Mental Health, or Parent Training
S#2: Working, facing a new challenge, getting settled into a new position somewhere—if I don’t find one sooner
S#3: In the helping field somewhere, even it is on a volunteer or part time basis
S#5: Doing something similar. I’m watching the ads. I want to continue working with people. I may apply to whoever gets the contract
S#6: At my current job
S#7: Probably in New York. I’ve always wanted to go there. I’m single, no ties. There is nothing in Tennessee. I would like to do something similar to Home Ties.
S#11: Heading my own program
S#33: I don’t know
PD#1: My intention is to be living in this region, in full time ministry of some kind
PD#2: I may be a full time grandma in Pennsylvania; doing something similar in the field
PM#1: I may take the job the State has offered me, or if my Agency wins the contract, I will continue with them.

Q8: Are there any other comments you would like to make?

S#1: I’m sad that the Home Ties Program is going to end. I’m glad I was a part of the program because I learned a lot; including looking at people as individuals instead of stereotypes—building relationships, helping people discover for themselves the need for change.
S#2: Even though the Agency asked for our input, there is no sign that it’s acknowledged or utilized.
S#3: I think it’s a shame that Home Ties is not given as much acclaim as it deserves—it’s a good program—everyone likes it—I hope whatever comes out of the new contract is along the same lines as the Homebuilder’s Model.
S#5: I believe the State has done a stupid thing. The idea is good, but the move to one contract has been too quick. It cuts out smaller agencies who do a good job in their specialty area, but don’t have the resources to compete for a contract of this size.
S#6: I loved the work, and the team. We needed a better supervisor, but that had nothing to do with the change process
S#11: Tell the Executive Directors that the people who are losing their jobs deserve some recognition and appreciation before they leave.
S#33: Not really, I don’t mean to sound bitter
PD#1: Just talking about it is therapeutic. It's hard to find anyone to talk to that understands.

PD#2: No, not really. Well, I see now it is good to diversify your talents if you have the chance. I wish I had taken advantage of the free classes that were offered.

RM#1: Time is the important thing. When they first got the word, they were defensive, scared to death. Then they start job hunting. As they get more information they have settled down and helped to facilitate change.
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