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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation will examine the relationship between organizational climate (both objective and subjective measures) and the job satisfaction and professionalism (both attitudes and behavior) of the occupational group known as rehabilitation counselors. Also of interest is the relationship between various demographic characteristics and job satisfaction and professionalism.

A rehabilitation counselor is someone who interviews and advises a socially, physically, and/or mentally handicapped person in order to help the individual evaluate himself in relation to the kind of work that is suitable to his physical and mental capabilities, interests, skills, and talents. An increasing number of counselors specialize in a particular area of rehabilitation, such as working exclusively with blind people, alcoholics, drug addicts, the mentally ill, the mentally retarded, or with people who live in poverty areas (Occupational Outlook Handbook).

The work settings of rehabilitation counselors are typically called "sheltered" or "rehabilitation workshops". These workshops are non-profit facilities utilizing individual goals, wages, supportive services, and a controlled work environment to help vocationally handicapped persons achieve or maintain their maximum potential as workers. Sheltered workshops tend to provide employment for these individuals, whereas rehabilitation workshops attempt to train the handicapped so
that they can be employed in private industry (Nelson, 1971). Many workshops received mandates to organize and operate as a result of various pieces of federal legislation and federally-funded demonstration projects. However, federally-funded workshops do not predominate at the present time. Most workshops in the U.S. are funded by a mix of funding sources, including public funds. These include some rather well-known ones including those of the Salvation Army, Goodwill Industries, Easter Seals, the Jewish Vocation Service, the Rehabilitation Institute, and Lambs Pet Farm. A full history of the rehabilitation movement is discussed elsewhere in this study.
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND RATIONALE

Two distinct aspects of organizational climate are of concern in this dissertation—objective and subjective or perceptual climate. **Objective climate** refers primarily to structural properties of the organization which do not require membership in the organization to describe (Porter and Lawler, 1968), for example, size (number of clients or staff) and sources of funding. **Subjective (perceptual) climate** refers to descriptive responses from organizational members about how the organization or its subsystems deal with organizational members (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974). For example, leadership, motivation, levels at which decisions are made, and goal formation are all components of subjective climate (Likert, 1968).

Other variables included are job satisfaction and professionalism. **Job satisfaction** is defined as the extent to which individuals hold positive feelings on such aspects of their jobs as the work itself, pay, and relations with co-workers (Smith, 1969). **Professionalism** is the extent to which individuals possess certain attitudes towards and exhibit certain behavior about the occupational groups to which they belong (Hall, 1968).

The sociological problem then that this dissertation addresses is whether there are differences in the organizational climate of rehabilitation workshops that affect the job satisfaction and professionalism of rehab counselors. It is socially important that job satisfaction and professionalism of rehab counselors be high, since they are intimately concerned with the job adjustments of clients. Hence, they are more
attuned to and concerned with intrinsic factors of the job than are members of many other occupational groups. Additionally, most extrinsic factors such as high compensation and some intrinsic factors such as high status and recognition are typically not available to them.

If job satisfaction and professionalism are low, they may either leave the occupational group or perform at low levels.\(^1\) If there is an insufficient number of counselors or if the handicapped are not adequately rehabilitated, employers will have a more difficult time attracting and selecting and placing vocationally handicapped persons as they are legally mandated to do as a result of Section 507 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

\(^1\)It was decided by this researcher to omit any job performance or productivity measures from this study for a whole variety of reasons. The major theoretical reason relates to the two distinct sets of goals in the field of rehabilitation--the training and placement of the handicapped in jobs in private industry and the providing of a place of sheltered employment. And within these two distinct goal areas is the decision regarding the kinds of clients to accept. As long as the acceptance of all individuals as clients is not legally required, some workshops will focus on accepting the least severely handicapped, who can be quickly rehabilitated, resulting in this kind of workshop being able to accept more clients. Other workshops will accept the most severely handicapped, who are regarded by these workshops as being in most need of the services of the workshops. Thus, the most obvious measure of productivity, the number of clients rehabilitated is not a very good measure, especially in workshops serving the severely retarded or in workshops whose focus is on sheltered employment. Additionally, the independent variables of concern in this study, including education level, appropriateness of education, and years in the field would have to be controlled for--thus requiring a very large sample. It should be pointed out, however, that some measures of (professional) behavior were taken, such as belonging to professional organizations, attending professional meetings, etc., but no measure of day-to-day performance was taken.

Methodologically, the response rate would probably be lowered if a performance measure were included, since it would then be necessary for there to be two respondents for each workshop--the ratee (rehab counselor) and the rater. This might cast doubt on the representativeness of the sample. There are also problems associated with the measure of performance in general, such as consistency between raters, which would make comparisons between organizations difficult.
The contributions which this dissertation seeks to make may be divided into three categories: theoretical, methodological, and practical.

The theoretical contribution that this dissertation will attempt to make is that it will be validating theory developed elsewhere on organizational climate, job satisfaction, and professionalism on an emerging occupational group--rehabilitation counselors. A second theoretical contribution is that it will further the knowledge of the nature of the relationship between objective and subjective measures of organizational climate, a heretofore relatively unresearched area (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1974). Thirdly, while there has been a fair amount of research on job satisfaction and professionalism, there is little treating organizational climate as the proposed independent variable. There is also little using job satisfaction and professionalism as dependent variables. Lastly, this dissertation will contribute to the existing body of knowledge on whether differences exist in job satisfaction and professionalism because of basic demographic differences in age, race, sex, and level of education. Such differences are to be evaluated in an occupational group which does not have any preconceptions as to what the appropriate age, race, sex, and level of education is, either for entry or for commitment to the occupational group.

Methodologically, the contribution being made is that three previously constructed and validated instruments will be administered--Likert's measure of subjective organizational climate, Smith's JDI measure of job satisfaction, and Snizeck's measure of professionalism. Although the use of these instruments is not in itself a contribution, their use will facilitate comparability between the findings in this
study and in other studies. This comparability facilitates the development of theory. Additionally, these instruments will be used in settings for which they were not originally developed, thus enabling the theory on organizational climate, job satisfaction, and professionalism to be made generalizable to an emerging occupational group.

There are also practical implications. Inasmuch as many facilities where rehab counselors are employed are rather fluid in nature, they are subject to constant scrutiny and evaluation in conjunction with periodic funding and refunding. The findings of this study will be useful in restructuring the facilities at the time of funding or refunding so as to enhance the job satisfaction and professionalism of the rehab counselors. Hopefully, the findings will motivate the administrators of the workshops to consider ways of improving climate in their own organizations, assuming they are concerned with increasing the job satisfaction and professionalism of the rehab counselors in their workshops.
CHAPTER II

OVERVIEW OF REHABILITATION COUNSELING

DESCRIPTION OF SUBJECT GROUP AND COMPARISON WITH ANOTHER SIMILAR PROFESSIONAL GROUP--SOCIAL WORKERS

The rehabilitation counselor interviews and advises socially, physically, and mentally handicapped people in order to help them evaluate themselves in relation to the kind of work that may be suitable to their physical and mental capacities, interests, skills, and talents. An increasing number of counselors specialize in a particular area of rehabilitation, such as working exclusively with the blind, alcoholic, drug addicted, mentally ill, mentally retarded, or people who live in poverty areas. Thus, potential employment and employability becomes the focus of the rehab counselor, in contrast to other foci for other professionals in helping occupations (Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1978).

History of Rehabilitation Counseling

During most of human history, society not only refused to give the handicapped the help they needed, but instead discriminated against them. In primitive times, handicapped persons who could not contribute

It is difficult to trace the history of rehabilitation workshops. This researcher attributes this difficulty to the unwillingness of society to recognize and deal with the problems of the handicapped. Hence, there are few published records. Much of the following history is synthesized and developed from a book by Nathan Nelson entitled, Workshops for the Handicapped in the United States. He was able to write this history only because of his personal contacts and personal memos and documents, accumulated during a lifetime of involvement in the rehabilitation movement.
to society's basic survival needs were either destroyed, sold as slaves, or allowed to become beggars. The few exceptions were those who excelled in the arts, philosophy, or religion. In some Asian countries, special occupations were reserved for them (Nelson, 1971).

In Europe, during the Middle Ages, attitudes changed from hostility and contempt to charity and benevolence. Some handicapped persons lived in hospitals or asylums, where they were given work. Significant dates (or their approximates) in the origin of rehabilitation workshops in Europe are:

1254--Establishment of the first workshops for the blind by Quinze Vingts in Paris.

1500-1525--Development of new theories for care of the poor by some major thinkers including John Major, Martin Luther, and--the most influential--Juan Luis Vives, whose principles were widely applied with modification in seventeenth and eighteenth century England, in houses of correction, working schools, and houses of industry.

1575-1600--Establishment of workshops for the old and infirm by St. Vince dePaul in Paris.

1600-1800--Establishment of above-mentioned facilities in England. The focus was on discouraging the poor from seeking assistance rather than on helping the handicapped individual.


The development of workshops in the United States, beginning in 1837, is much more complex and diverse than reflected in the early European origins. This is in part due to the increasing complexity and diversity of society at this point in time. Nelson (1971) identifies at least 12 different origins of workshops, which served or serve at least a somewhat distinct client population. These are briefly described below:

1. The Blind--The period 1827 to 1837 saw the establishment of three school-associated, non-residential workshops. The most enduring
of these was the Perkins Institute near Boston, which lasted for 114 years. In contrast, the Pennsylvania Working Home for Blind Men was founded in 1874. It was residential (the clients lived on the premises) and was operated independently of a school (Best, 1934; Hemphill, 1951). The major objective of both was to provide employment for the blind for an indefinite term. In 1885, the Industrial Home of Mechanic Trades was founded, entirely with public funds, to prepare the blind for an occupation in industry, in contrast to providing indefinite terms of employment, which had previously been the practice (Barrett, 1957).

The passage of the Wagner-O'Day Act in 1938, resulted in requiring the federal government to buy substantial amounts of blind-made products (Goodpasture, 1965). Currently, many major corporations, including I.B.M., Proctor & Gamble, Boeing, and General Electric, subcontract work to the 120 workshops that are associated with the National Industries for the Blind (National Institute for the Blind, 1970).

2. Salvation of the Poor and Handicapped--The five religious organizations in this section have probably served more individuals than all the other workshops combined. The focus in these has been on the collection, renovation, and distribution of old clothing and household furnishings (Nelson, 1971).

a. St. Vincent dePaul Society--Although founded in Paris in 1833, the first U.S. service unit was established in St. Louis in 1845. In general, the service units did not provide training, but provided employment for the needed and handicapped individuals as a by-product of helping the destitute through the distribution of clothes and household furnishings (Taylor, 1961).

b. The Salvation Army--This organization founded by William Booth in 1891, was concerned with helping troubled men find salvation. Work provided in the salvage operation was a means towards that objective. Clients were not provided with a wage but with room and board and were expected to leave when able to face their problems. Today, the Salvation Army serves women and children as well as male clients (most of whom are alcoholics) (Katz, 1964).
c. Volunteers of America--This organization was founded by Ballington Booth, the son of William Booth, and is quite similar to the Salvation Army in its focus on spiritual guidance. There is more emphasis on longer stays in the workshop so that skills can be more highly developed (Wisbey, 1954).

d. Goodwill Industries--Goodwill was founded in Boston, in 1895. Its uniqueness is that it has blended humanitarianism with business skills. Like the three other programs mentioned above, Goodwill was a salvage operation. But its focus has shifted from the helping of the destitute to the training of the handicapped in the repair of shoes, clothes, and household appliances. This shift occurred in the late 1930s as a result of the increasing legislation for the relief of the destitute (Plume, 1965).

e. Deseret Industries--The basic objective of this organization is to provide useful work opportunities to members of the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints, who, through age or physical or mental handicaps, are unable to be employed in regular industry. It was founded in 1936.

3. Early Freestanding Workshops--These workshops were, as the name implies, not related to each other or to other institutions in the community. In general, they were responsive to the needs of the community in which they were located and had the following characteristics in common: (a) served people with all kinds of disabilities, (b) had a variety of both industrial and treatment activities, (c) offered both short-term and long-term care, and (d) derived most of their income from the work they produced (McCann, 1963).

4. Workshops for the Tubercular--The major objective of these workshops has been to develop in ex-patients (TB) an increased tolerance for work so that they could return to an industrial work setting without any jeopardy to health. The first workshop was Altro, founded in New York in 1915.

As drugs for TB became more effective, these workshops began to accept other kinds of clients, such as cardiac. In these workshops, two important practices emerged which contributed to distinguishing the
rehabilitation movement from social work: (a) comprehensive emphasis on individual abilities assessments and subsequent training, and (b) reliance on medical and supportive staff, specifically social workers. Hence, a client was served by both a rehab counselor and a social worker, thus establishing a distinction between the work of each (Black, 1960).

5. Crippled--Impetus for these workshops came from an emerging theory of rehabilitation, arising approximately between 1910 and 1920, which maintained that handicapped persons could be best served by being provided all needed services at one center. There were two major orientations in workshops for the crippled at this point in time: (a) vocational orientation--this included work (potential) evaluation and work adjustment counseling, and (b) medical orientation--emphasizing medical procedures as a means for rehabilitating clients. Typical of this kind of workshop was Easter Seals, founded in Ohio, in 1918. However, regardless of the major orientation of the workshop, other services were also provided at each facility.

6. Jewish Vocational Service--The clients of these agencies were not necessarily of the Jewish faith, but were the aged, the immigrants, and refugees from Nazi Europe. Founded in Chicago in 1951, these agencies focused on improvements in the disadvantaged clients' employability within a specified, pre-determined period of time. The programs have expanded to include individuals with various kinds of handicaps and young people from school systems, with or without handicaps, but with work adjustment problems (Gellman and Friedman, 1965).

7. Parent-Sponsored Workshops--Cerebral Palsied and Mentally Retarded--Diverse in the clients served, these workshops are similar in
that they were originally started by parents because existing public
and private organizations were not adequately serving their children.
The first United Cerebral Palsey workshop for adults evolved from a
school developed for cerebral-palsied children after the latter received
state funding. The workshop, which began in Seattle in 1952 with 22
clients, was at first a subcontractor of Boeing. Although a major ob­
jective of the workshops was the employment of the cerebral-palsied in
private industry, the workshops are currently places of permanent employ­
ment for the cerebral-palsied (Nelson, 1971).

Although workshops for the mentally retarded were not always
established by parent groups, the parent groups have played an impor­
tant role in the development of the largest group of workshops. The
first one on record is the San Francisco Aid to the Retarded, founded
in 1951, although earlier ones were probably in existence. The Federal
government funded a series of demonstration projects consisting of work­
shops for the mentally retarded during the period 1958-1965. These
demonstration workshops led to the permanent, partial funding of work­
shops by many states, including Wisconsin, Louisiana, Tennessee, and
Missouri (Nelson, 1971).

8. The Aged--The Society of St. Vincent dePaul, the Salvation
Army, and the Volunteers of America were among the early sponsors of
workshops which served the aged, among other handicapped persons. The
first non-residential workshop serving the aged exclusively was the
Utility Workshop of San Francisco, founded in 1943 to serve primarily
Jewish refugees. Subsequently, the Jewish Vocational Service became
involved in serving aged clients in projects which were in part funded
by grants of the Vocational Rehabilitation Service as demonstration
projects (Nelson, 1971).
9. **Epileptics**--The epileptic client category differs from most other handicapped clients in that, as a result of medication, they are able to function in an industrial work setting. The major barrier to the employment of epileptics has been discrimination on the part of the employer and other employees. Hence, workshops for epileptics tend to be transitional in nature, providing employment until the epileptic can be hired in private industry.

The first workshop for epileptics, the Epilepsy Research Program, was founded in 1948 as a result of the impetus of the Veterans' Administration. It was designed to investigate the medical, economic and social problems of epileptics, but a workshop played an important part in the research activities. The major finding of this project, high employability of epileptics, led to the establishment of Epi-Hab in 1955. These workshops provided for transitional employment and also demonstrated the employability of the epileptics in private industry (Risch, 1951).

10. **The Mentally Ill**--This group was the last large group of handicapped persons to be given special attention. The mentally ill were served by some religious organizations prior to World War I, but as persons having economic or personal, not psychiatric, problems. This is in contrast to the early establishment of workshops for the mentally ill in Europe.

The mentally ill were first put to work in large mental hospitals doing such chores as housekeeping, maintenance, and farming. However, the focus was more on getting the chores done, than on helping the clients. The Salvation Army and Goodwill began serving the mentally ill in multi-disability workshops in the period from 1905-1921. Later, the mentally ill clients were served in workshops for the blind.
In the period of 1950-1960, mentally ill clients were served in community workshops, in the V.A. and a few state mental hospitals. The first programs, designed especially for the mentally ill were the Altro Workshops in New York, beginning in 1953. Two interesting aspects of the Altro program were the use of money incentives to motivate clients and the use of experimental and control groups to test the results of their treatment of the mentally ill.

11. Workshops in Mental Hospitals--An interesting aspect of the history of these kinds of workshops is that their existence was often not admitted to by the administrations of hospitals. This was due in part to the fear that industry would object to having hospital patients produce goods that would be sold in the marketplace.

The first officially acknowledged hospital-based workshop for the mentally ill was in a V.A. hospital in Massachusetts founded in 1956. The first workshop in a state mental hospital was in Manhattan (N.Y.) State Hospital founded in 1954 (Nelson, 1971).

12. Recent Developments--There have been three recent developments worthy of note: (a) community-based workshops, (b) workshops for public assistance clients, and (c) workshops in school districts.

There has only been a slight movement in the direction of establishing workshops in community mental health facilities. This is surprising, especially in view of the recent emphasis on comprehensive mental health centers.

The largest and probably the first workshop for public assistance clients was founded in the City of Chicago. The objective of this kind of workshop was to place persons currently on public aid in employment in private industry. Vocational evaluation, personal
and social adjustment, vocational training and placement services were provided. Among the problems faced by the professional staff in these workshops is that monetary incentives are usually not provided, due to various legal and administrative barriers. Hence, rehabilitation of the client is impaired.

Workshops in school systems are also somewhat of a recent development and are administered in conjunction with special education programs. They also have their origins in the Chicago metropolitan area (Nelson, 1971).
Sheltered workshops were legally defined by Section 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act, originally passed in 1938, as follows:

A sheltered workshop is a charitable organization or institution conducted not for profit, but for the purpose of carrying out a recognized program of rehabilitation for individuals whose earning capacity is impaired by age or physical or mental deficiency or injury, and to provide such individuals with remunerative employment or other occupational rehabilitating activity of an educational or therapeutic nature.

Another prominent definition of a sheltered workshop is provided by the National Association of Sheltered Workshops and Homebound Programs:

A sheltered workshop is a non-profit rehabilitation facility utilizing individual goals, wages, supportive services, and a controlled work environment to help vocationally handicapped persons achieve or maintain their maximum potential as workers.

A more comprehensive definition of a sheltered workshop is provided by the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended in 1965:

The term "rehabilitation facility" means a facility which is operated for the primary purpose of providing vocational rehabilitation to, or gainful employment for handicapped individuals, or for providing evaluation and work adjustment services for disadvantaged individuals and which provides singly or in combination one or more of the following services for handicapped individuals: (1) Comprehensive rehabilitation services which shall include, under one management, medical, psychological, social, and vocational services, (2) testing, fitting or training in the use of prosthetic and esthetic devices, (3) prevocational conditioning of recreational therapy, (4) physical and occupational therapy, (5) speech and hearing pathology, (6) psychological and social services, (7) evaluation, (8) personal and work adjustment, (9) vocational training in combination with other rehabilitation services, (10) evaluation for the control of special disabilities, and (11) extended employment for severely handicapped who cannot readily be absorbed in the labor market; but all medical and related health
services must be prescribed by, or under the formal supervision of, persons licensed to practice medicine or surgery in the State.

Rehabilitation counselors work in close consultation with doctors, nurses, psychologists, and social workers and others in medical and health services occupations. In addition, there is a close liaison with officials of training schools, representatives of the personnel departments of private firms, and state employment counselors.

The rehabilitation counselor works intensively with handicapped persons. Primarily, the aim of vocational rehabilitation is to aid the handicapped person to become at least partially self-supporting. However, morale or emotional health is also of importance to the disabled person, and thus to the rehabilitation counselor. The physical well-being of the disabled person is also an important phase of the work, and the rehabilitation counselor works closely with medical personnel to promote or maintain a high level of physical health.

Persons come to the rehabilitation agency from many sources. They seek help on their own initiative, or their families bring them for help. They may be referred by a physician, hospital, clinic, social worker, employment agency, school, or accident commission.

The counselor's first step is to determine the legal eligibility of the person who has applied for assistance. The next step is to determine the nature and extent of the disability. When all available information about the present status of the individual has been compiled, the rehabilitation counselor will start to discuss with him his goals for the future.

If medical assistance is required, the rehabilitation counselor will help to get it. The next step is to help the counselee decide on the kind of vocation which may interest him and in which he may work
under the limitations of his kind of handicap. In conjunction with this, it may be necessary for the rehabilitation counselor to administer a series of tests to the counselee. On the basis both of interest and ability, the counselor and counselee reach a satisfactory decision about the kind of employment.

If training is necessary in order for the handicapped person to be able to seek employment, the counselor's job is then to find appropriate schooling for him. The agency for which the rehabilitation counselor works will usually provide certain financial support for the handicapped person who is attempting rehabilitation. When the training period is completed, the rehabilitation counselor will assist the disabled person to find a suitable job.

Requirements for Entry Into Field

A master's degree in rehabilitation counseling is the preferred preparation for a career as a rehabilitation counselor. However, a master's degree in related areas may be accepted in lieu of the preferred training. Related areas may be in social work, sociology, psychology, vocational counseling, or education.

Graduate programs leading to a master's degree in rehabilitation counseling may cover such courses as medical aspects of rehabilitation counseling, psychological aspects of rehabilitation counseling, testing techniques, statistics, personality theory, personality development, abnormal psychology, occupational information, vocational training and job placement. In 1975, there were eighteen colleges and universities awarding a master's degree and three offering a doctorate, although many more universities offer degrees in the related areas (College Blue Book, p. 626).

Professional associations include the American Rehabilitation Counseling Association and the National Rehabilitation Association.
These organizations are similar to other professional organizations in that they provide opportunities for individuals engaged in the same profession to interact at conventions and seminars. They also foster research and dissemination of knowledge through the publication of journals. A high proportion of rehab counselors—one study estimated 57%—belong to one or both (Sussman and Haug, 1969).

SOCIAL WORKERS

Social workers attempt to alleviate and prevent social problems caused by such factors as poverty; unemployment; illness; broken homes; family maladjustments; physical, mental, and emotional handicaps; antisocial behavior; limited recreation; and inadequate housing. Depending upon the agency for which he works, the social worker does this by individual casework, group work, or else through community organization (Occupation Outlook Handbook, 1978, p. 562).

History of Social Work

The history of social work traces its early beginnings in religious humanitarianism, the English Poor Laws, the Charity Organization movement, and the educational activities of the first social settlements. But as a would-be profession, social work is a product of the twentieth century dependent upon the social sciences for the study of interpersonal and intergroup problems. (See A. Miles, 1977; Meyer, 1968.)

Religious humanitarianism was one of the principal forces in the development of social work. Long before the advent of organized public and private charities, the poor were cared for by religious institutions, a practice that was prevalent in most modern societies.

During the Middle Ages, the Roman Catholic Church developed insti-
tutionalized programs for the care of the poor. Each bishop had the responsibility for the relief of the poor, who were cared for primarily in monasteries. The focus, however, was on the donor, who received special religious favor.

The secularization of welfare services was in large measure the result of English Protestantism. Despite the Puritan belief that poverty was a punishment of God, Protestantism created a social conscience, from which evolved modern social work.

The English Poor Law of 1601 marked the beginning of public responsibility for the care of dependent persons. This law instituted the office of Overseer of the Poor, which was authorized to set able-bodied persons to work, levy taxes for the relief of the poor, apprentice dependent children, operate workhouses and require financially responsible relatives to support dependent persons. The law placed responsibility for the relief of the poor upon a small local unit, the parish.

The English Poor Law came into being after Henry VIII (1491 - 1547) had abolished many of the monasteries, which had been the main resource of the poor. The English poor-law system, with its numerous modifications, remained in existence for more than 300 years.

A controversy over the relative merits of institutional versus home relief was resolved by the "Reforms of 1834" which compelled the parishes to unite into "Poor Law Unions". Each Union was required to operate a workhouse and to grant relief only to able-bodied persons and only in the workhouse. This law was designed to discourage applications for relief and to lower taxes. It did accomplish both of these purposes for a time, but it was unpopular with labor and political leaders. It was not officially abolished until 1871. Basically, the
poor law principles, together with the "poor-law mentality" which ascribed the causes of poverty to personal inadequacy, remained in operation until the establishment of a modern social security system in the twentieth century.

The English Poor Law was accepted by the American colonies. At an early date, relief was granted and almshouses were founded, later supplemented by special state institutions, such as insane asylums, prisons, and schools for the deaf. The first hospital for the insane was erected at Williamsburg, Va., in 1773; the first state prison in Philadelphia, Pa., in 1790; and the first state school for the deaf in Danville, Ky., in 1822.

By 1863, when Massachusetts established the first state coordinating authority, the State Board of Charities, there were thirteen special institutions in that state. Aid to the blind was first established in Ohio in 1898; aid to dependent children, in Illinois in 1911; and old-age assistance in Montana, in 1923. Several social insurance systems were also established by the states: workmen's compensation in New York in 1910 and unemployment compensation in Wisconsin in 1932. Present state and federal social security programs were set up with the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935.

The Charity Organization movement also contributed to the development of social work. This movement originated in London, in 1869 with the founding of the Charity Organization Society. Among the founders or early associates of the society were people in high positions, including the earl of Shaftesbury, the duke of Norfolk, Sir Charles Trevelyan, the archbishop of Canterbury, John Ruskin and Cardinal Newman. The immediate cause for founding the society was
the distress of the unemployed of London. Indirect causes included the inadequacies of the poor laws and the lack of system in private charities.

The Charity Organization Society was founded to organize charity. Originally, it did not grant relief, but investigated applicants referred to it by other agencies. A central index of relief recipients was also established as a means of preventing fraud and duplication. District committees carried out the work of the society with investigations by "friendly visitors" who endeavored to find substitutes for relief.

The movement was taken from London to the United States by Reverend S. Humphreys Gurteen, an Episcopalian minister from Buffalo, N.Y., who had been associated with a district committee in London. In 1873, he founded the Buffalo Charity Organization Society. The movement spread rapidly to other cities, so that by 1895, there were approximately 100 societies.

The reasons why the societies grew rapidly in numbers and in importance include the organized methods of investigation of applicants, first by friendly visitors and later by paid workers—the first professional social workers. This investigation grew into the preventive methods of social casework.

Social settlements also originated in London. Toynbee Hall, the first social settlement, was founded by Canon Samuel A. Barnett in 1884. A vicar of St. Jude's Church in the East End, he went to Oxford to tell undergraduates about the conditions of the poor. This stimulated a group of students to take up residence in the East End and to provide educational and recreational activities for the residents.
American settlements were founded as a result of first-hand experience with Toynbee Hall. The first was the Neighborhood Guild, started in New York City by Dr. Stanton A. Coit, in 1886. The second American social settlement, which became world-famous, was Hull House, founded in Chicago by Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr in 1889. The various activities at Hull House were typical of the work of the early settlement: establishing a day nursery; promoting factory inspections, regulation of the labor of women and children, and workmen's compensation; supporting the founding of the first juvenile court; assisting immigrants with "Americanizing" and providing public recreation programs in arts and crafts.

Social settlements and allied agencies, such as the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A., aided in the development of social work by their studies of poverty and their emphasis on a group work approach to social problems.

Federated fund-raising services and community welfare councils also assisted in the development of social work by giving the social agencies a more stable financial base and giving impetus to the development of community organization, another one of the basic processes of social work. The first attempt to federate fund-raising activities occurred in Liverpool, England, in 1873. The first successful community chest was the Federation for Charity and Philanthropy, founded in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1913. There was a pronounced expansion of the community chest movement as a result of campaigns to raise funds for military welfare services during World War I.

Social services in the United States today are administered in a wide variety of public and private agencies. In public welfare, the responsibility is divided into three areas of government--federal, state, and local. In general, the federal government assumes financial respon-
sibility by granting financial aid to the states. The states have the basic administrative responsibilities. They have delegated the work of providing services to local agencies. The federal government exercises its welfare authority primarily through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, including Social Security, financial grants for public assistance, old age and survivors' insurance and the state-federal systems of workmen's compensation. The Bureau of Prisons, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Veterans Administration also provide welfare services.

The states have created state departments to administer or supervise services. These may be multiple-purpose agencies, administering the state's responsibilities in public assistance (old age, dependent children, the blind, the disabled, and general assistance); child welfare (neglected, foster, and adopted); corrections (prisons, probation and parole); and mental hygiene. They may also be single-purpose agencies.

Public welfare services may also be administered by the courts, mental hygiene centers, correctional institutions, and schools. In these agencies, the social welfare function is secondary to the principal purpose of the host agencies.

Private welfare services are administered by numerous agencies, in part financed by community chests. These may be classified as casework agencies, providing counseling services; and group work agencies, providing coordination and integration of services. These agencies are subject to varying degrees of supervision by the state, depending on the type of services provided and on funding sources. Policy for private agencies is made by a board of directors, who, in turn, appoint a professional staff.
About 330,000 social workers were employed in 1975, nearly two-thirds of them women. Federal, state, county and city government agencies employ about two-thirds of all social workers. Most of the remainder work for voluntary or private agencies, schools, hospitals, and other medical establishments. A small number are directly employed by the Federal Government and the United Nations.

Nature of Work Performed

Social work is divided into three major categories: case work, group work, and community organization work. Often employing agencies specialized in one of the three approaches to community problems.

Casework is primarily concerned with face-to-face contacts between the worker and an individual or a family. It may involve conferences in the caseworker’s office, home visits, work with individual patients in a hospital setting, or work with children who need assistance, either in schools, institutions, or homes. Any "case" may entail all or any of these procedures.

Group work may involve either recreation or rehabilitation, or a combination of both. The group worker may work with groups of delinquent children in an effort to divert their interests to wholesome activities. Group workers may be employed by such agencies as Jewish Welfare; Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., or Y.M.H.A.; and Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts; 4-H Club, or Campfire Girls. They may work with old people, with groups who face similar handicaps (as, for instance, diabetic children), or groups with similar economic and cultural problems (as migrant workers).

The community organization worker attempts to analyze the problems of the whole community and to discover ways in which to meet them.
Problems inherent in juvenile delinquency, for instance, may require total community cooperation for solution. The community organization workers try to mobilize the efforts of all agencies to coordinate their approaches towards and treatment of such problems. Group work may also involve community action to remove the causes of pressing social problems.

In addition to the workers in the three basic types of social work, some are in teaching positions in colleges or one of the 64 recognized and accredited graduate schools of social work. There are also a few social workers who devote themselves to research either exclusively or to a large extent.

Caseworkers are employed to assist many other kinds of professional occupations, such as the teaching and medical professions, the courts, the penal institutions, and many others.

**Requirements for Entry Into Field**

A social worker should hold a master's degree in social work. The master's program in social work is a two-year training period, about half of which is spent in field work.

It is possible, however, to secure a position as a social worker with only a bachelor's degree if the applicant has had sufficient undergraduate preparation in social sciences. However, the positions available for bachelor's degree applicants do not carry the salary nor the responsibility comparable to master's degree-level jobs. Salaries for B.A. level positions were $9,500, compared to $11,500 for M.S.W. positions in 1977. Promotions come more slowly, too, for those with only the bachelor's degree.

There are a few positions open for "junior case workers" or "case
aides" which do not even require a college degree.

Those who are interested in college teaching or research need at least a master's degree in social work, with doctorate required for some positions (Occupational Outlook Handbook).

The professional organizations for social workers are the National Commission for Social Work Careers and the National Association of Social Workers.

Comparison of Social Workers and Rehabilitation Counselors

The basic similarities between rehab counselors and social workers are as follows:

Both occupational groups can trace their development from approximately the same period of time, from 1900-1920. Additionally, rehabilitation counselors use the same methods as social workers use in their group work. But there, the similarities stop.

Rehabilitation counselors are far less developed as an occupational group than are social workers. There are fewer entrance requirements and hence fewer "ranks" within this occupational group. It is not possible to be a rehabilitation counselor's "aid" to the same extent that it is possible to be a social work aid. In view of this, it is interesting to note that there is a greater proportion of women in social work than in rehabilitation counseling.

The number of rehabilitation counselors is far smaller than the number of social workers. There were approximately 19,000 rehabilitation counselors and approximately 330,000 social workers in the U.S. labor force in 1975. Additionally, there is much less variety in the kinds of settings in which rehabilitation counselors work when compared with

The two occupational groups have separate professional associations, different professional codes of ethics, different journals, and different training schools.

But the salient difference is the focus of the work of rehabilitation counselors--namely work adjustment. No one focus predominates in the work of social workers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>Social Workers</th>
<th>Rehabilitation Counselors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT SETTING</td>
<td>Two-thirds provide direct social services in public and private agencies. Remainder in development of social policy, community organization and administration of government agencies.</td>
<td>Seventy per cent in state and local government agencies. Remainder in V.A., rehab centers, sheltered workshops, hospitals, labor unions, and schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW DIRECTIONS</td>
<td>Gerontology, corrections, drug abuse, industry.</td>
<td>Community mental health centers, schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>Offered at graduate level in 170 colleges and universities.</td>
<td>Offered at graduate level in 75 colleges and universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-year MSW program includes psychology, clinical social work, or community organization, or group methods, social policy formulation, and a field placement.</td>
<td>Two-year MA program includes counseling theory, counseling techniques, educational information, tests and measurement, psychology of disability, medical and legal aspects of rehabilitation, and usually a field placement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Association of Social Workers. Twenty states have licensing or registration requirements.</td>
<td>Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification. No state licensing or registration requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEGINNING SALARIES 1976</td>
<td>BA $9,500</td>
<td>BA $10,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MA + 1 year experience $12,000</td>
<td>MA + 1 year experience $17,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODS</td>
<td>Case work, Group work, Community organization.</td>
<td>Work adjustment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS</th>
<th>Social Workers</th>
<th>Rehabilitation Counselors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Association of Social Workers</td>
<td>American Rehabilitation Counseling Association and National Rehabilitation Counseling Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 133 rehabilitation counselors who responded to the questionnaire in time to be included in the data analysis are described in this section. Also included is a summary of the information which they provided about their rehabilitation workshops. (Percentages do not always total 100% due to roundings and/or excluding of some responses.) The reader should also refer to the appendix which contains the questionnaire and also to Figures 1 and 2 in Chapter 6, which are the model and sources of data by kind of variable.

Age -- The range of the age of the subjects is from 22 to 64 with mean age of 34. Sixty per cent are under 30 and 87% are under 40. The relatively young age group is in part attributable to the relative newness of the occupational group and in part to the promotion possibilities which exist for older and more experienced rehabilitation counselors. (Table 2).

Race -- Virtually all the counselors are caucasian (96%); and virtually all the clients are caucasian, although to a lesser extent (86%).

Sex -- Fifty-one per cent of the subjects are male and 49% are female.

Educational Level -- Only 7.5% of the subjects have an educational level of less than a college degree. This was somewhat surprising to the researcher inasmuch as there presently exists in the field of counseling a trend towards the use of "peer counseling", i.e., counseling done by individuals who have or have had the same problem or disability as the client. Fifteen per cent had only a bachelor's degree, 23% have some graduate coursework, but no graduate degree. More than half of the respond-
TABLE 2 -- AGE DISTRIBUTION OF REHAB COUNSELORS IN SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ents (54%) have a graduate degree. (Table 3).

Major in College -- At the undergraduate level, 39% majored in counseling, and an additional 13% in a social science. At the graduate level, however, 62% majored in counseling, thus evidencing a substantial proportion having specific career preparation (Table 4).

Marital Status -- Thirty-three per cent of the subjects are single, 59% are married, and 7% are divorced.

Influential Person -- Thirty-eight per cent of the subjects indicated that there was a significant person influencing him or her to enter the field of rehabilitation counseling (Table 4).

In 10% of the cases, the influential person was a parent; for an additional 10% a relative other than a parent; and for 12% a teacher. But in 68% of the cases, the influential person was someone other than the above. For 22% of the respondents citing an influential person having an impact on career choice, that influential person was someone personally in need of rehabilitation (Table 5).

Years Employed by Present Employer -- The range of years employed by present employer is from two months to 22 years. Thirty-three per cent of the subjects were employed by their present employer for one year or less, 49% cumulatively for two years or less, and 62% cumulatively for three years or less. The mean number of years employed by present employer is only 3.3 years, but this value is skewed by several long-service counselors (one with 18 years of service, one with 20, and one with 22 years of service) (Table 6).

Years in Rehabilitation Counseling -- The same relative short term "tenure" also exist in this category. Twenty-four per cent have been in rehabilitation counseling for one year or less, 43% cumulatively for two years of less, and 57% cumulatively for three years or less. The mean
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGHEST GRADE LEVEL</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Graduate School</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School Degree</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3 -- EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF REHAB COUNSELORS IN SAMPLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE</th>
<th>GRADUATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABSOLUTE</td>
<td>RELATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other social science</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5 -- RELATIONSHIP OF INFLUENTIAL PERSON IN CAREER CHOICE OF REHAB COUNSELORS IN SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6 -- YEARS EMPLOYED BY PRESENT EMPLOYER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF YEARS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One but less than two</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two but less than three</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three but less than four</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four but less than five</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five but less than ten</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over ten</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is 3.6 years, with a range of two months to 17 years (Table 7).

Plans to Remain in Field of Rehabilitation Counseling -- Fifty-three per cent of the subjects indicated they planned to be in rehabilitation counseling five years from now, 20% indicated ten years from now, and 27% indicated that they would remain in rehabilitation counseling for the rest of their lives. It is not possible to explain the large increase from the ten year response to the rest of life response, except by reasoning that perhaps some of the subjects misinterpreted this question by checking only the highest response, instead of responding separately to each part of the question.

Experience of Stress -- Sixty-five per cent of the subjects indicated that they experienced situations which caused them stress or conflict in their work.

Number of Clients -- There was substantial variation in the number of clients served in a given workshop. The range was from 20 to 6,000, but 50% of the workshops served 85 or fewer clients and 75% served 140 or fewer clients (Table 8).

Number of Staff -- Of the rehabilitation workshops in the sample, 50% had 15 or fewer total staff members, and 75% had 25 or fewer staff members. The range of number of staff varies from two to 6,500, however, (the latter is assumed to be the number of staff in a large staff rehabilitation agency) (Table 9).

Kind of Clients -- The most unexpected distribution in the sample was the one relating to kinds of clients. Ninety-three per cent of the workshops had a mixture of kinds of clients; that is, no one kind of client predominated in the 123 of the 133 workshops in which respondents in the sample worked.
TABLE 7 -- YEARS AS A REHAB COUNSELOR BY SUBJECTS IN SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF YEARS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One but less than two</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two but less than three</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three but less than four</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four but less than five</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five but less than ten</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over ten</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 8 -- NUMBER OF CLIENTS IN THE FACILITIES IN THIS STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-74</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-99</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-500</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+500</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 9 -- NUMBER OF STAFF IN FACILITIES IN THIS STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ten or fewer</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 133 facilities
Sources of Funds -- The sources of funds for the workshops were as follows: 24% had entirely public funding--primarily state, although some federal funding; 5% had entirely private funding; and 71% had a mixture of public and private. Thus, 95% exist in part or whole by public funds (Table 10).

Client Case Load -- The client caseload (number of clients per counselor) that each counselor in the sample was personally responsible for ranged from one to 203, although 50% had 30 or fewer clients and 75% had 50 or fewer (Table 11).

Final Decision -- In response to the question, "Who has the final decision with regard to the rehabilitation aspect of client care?", only 22% indicated he or she alone had responsibility for the final decision, while 14% indicated that the workshop director had final responsibilities and 1% the medical personnel. Perhaps the two most interesting responses, however, are the responses that the client himself (or his parents or relatives) has final responsibility in 22% of the workshops and--the most frequent response--that a combination of the above have the final responsibility (38%) (Table 12).

Professional Activities -- In terms of membership in professional organizations, 58% reported belonging to some professional organization and 40% did not. The percentages are approximately the same for attendance at professional meetings: 53% reported attending and 40% did not. In addition, 53% were taking courses to keep up with new developments in the field of rehabilitation counseling, whereas 43% did not; and 76% reported reading professional journals, whereas 22% did not (Table 13).
TABLE 10 -- SOURCES OF FUNDING OF FACILITIES IN THIS STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KIND</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 11 -- NUMBER OF CLIENTS IN CASELOAD OF COUNSELORS IN SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 12 -- FINAL DECISION FOR CLIENT CARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop director</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/relative of client, client himself</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAVIOR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Professional Meetings</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Professional Literature</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in Continuing Education</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND -- ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE,
JOB SATISFACTION, PROFESSIONALISM, & REHABILITATION COUNSELING

ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

One of the early concerns in sociology was the definition of organization. This concern in many ways centers around Max Weber. Weber first of all distinguished the "corporate group" from all other forms of social organization. It is a "social relationship which is either closed or limits the admission of outsiders by rules,...so far as its order is enforced by the action of specific individuals whose regular function this is, of a chief or head and usually also an administrative staff" (1947, 145-56). To this idea of the corporate group, Weber added additional criteria. In organizations, interaction is "associative" rather than communal. Organizations carry out continuous purposive activities of a specified kind. This definition has served as the basis for many others, in part due to its close focus on reality.

Barnard's focus in part agreed with Weber and in part stressed a different basis for organizations. His basic definition of an organization was "a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more persons" (1938, 73). Barnard thought organizations required communications, a willingness on the part of members to contribute, and a common purpose.

Efforts to make the definition more concrete were developed by many theorists including Etzioni:
Organizations are social units deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek specific goals. Organizations are characterized by: (1) divisions of labor, power and communication, divisions which are not randomly or traditionally patterned, but deliberately planned to enhance the realization of specific goals; (2) the presence of one or more power centers which control the concerted efforts of the organization and direct them towards its goals; these power centers also continuously review the organization's performance and repattern its structure, where necessary, to increase its efficiency; (3) substitution of personnel, i.e., unsatisfactory persons can be removed and others assigned their tasks. The organization can also recombine its personnel through transfer and promotion (1964, 3).

The work of Scott (1964) also furthered the work of defining organizations:

...organizations are defined as collectivities...that have been established for the pursuit of relatively specific objectives on a more or less continuous basis. It should be clear...however, that organizations have distinctive features other than goal specificity and continuity. These include relatively fixed boundaries, a normative order, authority bands, a communication system, and an incentive system which enables various types of participants to work together in the pursuit of common goals (p. 488).

The state of theory is such that Scott's work (or slight modifications of it) is accepted as the definition of organization.

The focus of attention has shifted away from defining organization to explaining both the components of structure and the processes in organizations. The work of R. Hall (1972) contains an excellent review of the theoretical development of such organizational structural properties as size, complexity, and formalization, as well as such internal organizational properties as power, conflict, leadership, and decision-making.

Organizational climate refers to a set of attributes that can be perceived about a particular organization and/or its subsystems which may be induced from the way the organization and/or its subsystems deal with their members and environment (Campbell, 1970). Several themes are implicit in this definition of climate:
a. Perceptual responses sought are descriptive rather than evaluative

b. The level of inclusiveness of the items and scales are macro rather than micro

c. The units of analysis then are taken to be attributes of the organization or specific subsystems rather than the individual

d. These perceptions have potential behavioral consequences (Dachler, 1975; Schneider, 1972; Taguiri, 1968).
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE -- OBJECTIVE MEASURES

Sociologists and social psychologists from Albion Small to Floyd Allport, Kurt Lewin, George Mead, and Talcott Parsons have struggled in the development of the concept of organizational climate.

Early writers seem to let the reader extract one from the context. For specific purposes, climate concepts have been defined operationally. In their work on "climates of values in medical schools," Christie and Merton (1958) write:

"It is true that we often find ourselves speaking of 'climate' and 'atmospheres', of a climate conducive to research or of an atmosphere conducive to learning. Everyone senses what is meant by these expressions. Some recognize that these should not be treated only as figures of speech, that these not remain meteorological metaphors. But if climates of values are to be examined and methodically related to the ways they affect the learning of students, then methods must be devised to describe and compare them (1958, 127)."

There are, for certain, difficulties that are salient in the development of the concept. Particularly important among these are:

a. Distinguishing between the objective and subjective environment

b. Distinguishing between the person and the situation

c. Determining which aspects of environment need to be specified and which can be excluded

d. Identifying the structural aspects and the dynamic aspects of the environment (Taguiri, 1968).

After a careful examination of the literature, Taguiri (1968, 24-25) concluded that certain attributes are more or less common to the concept of organizational climate:

a. Climate is a synthetic concept like personality.

b. Climate is a particular configuration on situational
variables.

c. Its component elements may vary, however, while the climate may remain the same.

d. It is the meaning of an enduring situation configuration.

e. Climate has a connotation of continuity, but not as lasting as culture.

f. Climate is determined importantly by characteristics, conduct, attitude, expectations of other persons, by social and cultural realities.

g. Climate is phenomenologically external to the actor, who may, however, feel he contributes to its nature.

h. Climate is phenomenologically distinct from the task for both the observer and the actor.

i. It is in the actor or observer's head though not necessarily in a conscious form, but it is based on characteristics of external reality.

j. It is capable of being shared, as consensus is, by several persons in the situation and it is interpreted in terms of shared meanings (with some individual variation around a consensus).

k. It cannot be a common delusion since it must be veridically based on external reality.

l. It may or may not be capable of description in words, although it may be capable of specification in terms of response.

m. It has potential behavioral consequences.

n. It is an indirect determinant of behavior, in that it acts upon attitudes, expectations, states of arousal, which are direct determinants of behavior.

Only a few writers who use the term, "organizational climate", have actually defined it. Gilmer (1966) writes, "By organizational climate we mean those characteristics that distinguish the organization from other organizations and that influence behavior of people in the organization ...climate affects not only the behavior of individuals, but how organizations themselves interact" (p. 57).
In 1964, with Forehand, Gilmer redefined organizational climate to avoid a specific shortcoming, namely, that his earlier definition was very similar to early descriptions of personality types. His 1964 redefinition was, "Organizational climate is a set of characteristics that describe an organization and that (a) distinguish that organization from other organizations, (b) are relatively enduring over time, and (c) influence the behavior of the people in the organization." Forehand and Gilmer chose these defining properties in the effort to focus the discussion about features of organizational variation that are amenable to specification, measurement and incorporation into empirical research (p. 362).

Based on the above discussion, Taguiri concluded that a suitable definition of organizational climate is as follows: "Organizational climate is a relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization that (a) is experienced by its members; (b) influences their behavior, and (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics or attributes of the organization."

In order to gain a sense of what these writers have in mind, it is necessary to examine what operations and what variables they use to define organizational climate. Most of the earlier measures of organizational climate concerned only particular aspects of the organization. Usually only a few dimensions were focused on and were seldom combined to capture the essence of the climate, only some of which were behavioral dimensions. Among those that have been studied are informal social relations in small groups (Blau, 1954); democratic vs authoritarian management policies (Stanton, 1960); interdependence of employees in a work group setting (Vroom and Mann, 1960); stability and homogeneity
of various groups outside the firm, such as customers, competitors, regulatory groups (Dill, 1958); hiring process, formal policies, leadership style (Argyris, 1958); and group characteristics such as control, stability, intimacy (Hemphill, 1956).

Parsons' (1960) AGIL scheme can be thought of as work in organizational climate, since this scheme has described the four major types of exigency that confront social systems. The integrative and latent "activities", for example, relate to the general internal ambience of organizations.

Fiedler (1962), in a study of leader attitudes was among the first to define group climate in terms of a set of bipolar scales:

Friendly--unfriendly
Rejecting--accepting
Unhelpful--helpful
Unenthusiastic--enthusiastic
Lots of fun--serious
Non-productive--productive
Distant--close
Cold--warm
Cooperative--uncooperative
Supportive--hostile
Boring--interesting
Successful--unsuccessful

In 1964, Gilmer and Forehand, proposed that five aspects of an organization play an important role in an organization's climate:

Size and shape
Leadership patterns
Communications networks
Goals
Decision making procedures

Likert (1961) made a major contribution to organizational climate theory by identifying four distinct kinds of organizational systems:

(1) authoritative, including (a) exploitive and (b) benevolent; and
(2) participative. He considered these to be on a continuum. He subsequently called these Systems I, II, III, and IV, respectively. In addi-
tion, he identified what he called "operating characteristics." More commonly, these would be called organizational processes. The dimensions of these operating characteristics and their interrelationships form a particular organizational climate or system. Initially these operating characteristics or processes included (1) motivation, (2) communication, (3) interaction-influence, (4) decision-making, (5) goal setting, (6) control processes, and (7) performance characteristics. For example, if communication is of such a kind so that there is little, it is initiated at the top and is downward, combined with decision-making primarily located at the top, with limited consultation with organizational members, an exploitive authoritative kind of climate exists. (This assumes that the other processes were likewise of the same exploitive nature.)

Subsequent efforts to measure the operating characteristics through the use of Likert-like scaling and subsequent work on the theoretical aspects of the concept (1967) resulted in some modification of the operating dimensions. But this work has become a highly regarded one for its theoretical and methodological soundness in the assessment of organizational climate.
RESEARCH FINDINGS -- ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Some of the more recent researches on organizational climate have been in perceptual or subjective measures of climate. It is assumed to be necessary to be a member of the organization in order to perceive these dimensions of climate.

This part of the survey of the literature is divided into three sections--the first section will review studies which have used perceptual measures of organizational climate as the independent variable; the second section studies which have considered organizational climate as the intervening variable; and the third section studies which have used perception of organizational climate as the dependent variable.

Climate as an Independent Variable

Researchers which take perceptual measures of organizational climate as the independent variable and use dependent measures of organizational effectiveness (such as performance, job satisfaction, etc.) draw the following conclusions: Kaczka and Kirk (1968), Friedlander and Margulies (1969), Schneider (1973), Cawsey (1973), Pritchard and Karasick (1973), and Litwin and Stringer (1968) all found relationships between organizational climate and job satisfaction.

There is quite a lack of consistency, however, in how organizational climate is defined. In Kaczka and Kirk (1968, 256), organizational climate contains the following five dimensions:

1. Grievance behavior--the percentage of grievances submitted that were settled by the foremen and superintendents.

2. Cost emphasis--the weight given to cost performance by superintendents in the evaluation of the foremen and the
deviation of actual costs from budgeted costs that management regarded as tolerable.

3. Leadership style--the percentage of working time devoted to employee-oriented behavior by foremen and by superintendents.

4. Congruence of leadership style--the differences between the leadership styles employed by foremen and by superintendents.

5. Attitudes of industrial engineering departments--the percentage of tight work standards loosened or the percentage of loose work standards tightened by the industrial engineering department.

Each of these experimental dimensions was assigned two extreme levels on the continuum of managerial climate from employee-oriented to task-oriented.

Friedlander and Margulies (1969, 173-174) used a sixty-four item questionnaire, which was a modification of Halpin and Crofts (1963) Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ). The former contained eight organizational climate dimensions applicable to any organization. The respondents were asked to express strong agreement or strong disagreement with each statement on a seven-point scale. The eight climate dimensions are:

1. Disengagement--describes a group which is "going through the motions," a group that is "not in gear" with respect to the task at hand (10 items).

2. Hindrance--refers to those feelings by members that they are burdened with routine duties and other requirements deemed as busy work. Their work is not being facilitated (6 items).

3. Esprit--is a morale dimension. Members feel that their social needs are being satisfied and, at the same time they are enjoying a sense of accomplishment (10 items).

4. Intimacy--refers to members enjoyment of friendly social relationships. This is a dimension of social need satisfaction, not necessarily associated with task accomplishment (7 items).

5. Aloofness--refers to management behavior characterized as formal and impersonal. It describes an "emotional" distance between the manager and his subordinates (9 items).

6. Production Emphasis--refers to management behavior char-
acterized by close supervision. Management is highly directive and insensitive to communication feedback (7 items).

7. Thrust--refers to management behavior characterized by efforts to "get the organization moving." This behavior is marked by attempts to motivate through example. Behavior is task-oriented and viewed favorably by members (9 items).

8. Consideration--refers to behavior characterized by an inclination to treat members as human beings and to do something extra for them in human terms (6 items).

Schneider's (1973) operational definition of organizational climate was designed for the organization in which the study was to be conducted. It was also designed for the clients (customers) rather than for the members of the organization to be the respondent. Components of this climate measure were: (1) convenience, (2) short waiting time, (3) personal friendly service, (4) full-service banking, (5) safety, and (6) decoration.

Schneider, however, in approximately the same period of time, but in another study operationally defined climate so that the scale would be more applicable to a wide variety of organizations. As senior author with D. Hall (1972), in a rather famous study of parish priests, Schneider operationally defined climate to include the following dimensions: (1) tasks and goals representing a challenging level of aspiration, (2) task goals determined autonomously, (3) task goals central to self-concept, and (4) autonomy.

Pritchard and Karasick (1969, 132-134) used an eleven-dimension scale specifically designed for their study. The respondents rated the climate in their own organizations on a six part scale ranging from never true to always true. The dimensions on their scale were:

1. Autonomy--degree of freedom managers have in day-to-day operating decisions such as when to work, when not to work, and how to solve job problems.

2. Conflict vs. cooperation--degree to which managers either
compete with each other or work together in getting things done and in the allocation of scarce resources such as materials, clerical help, etc.

3. Social relations--degree to which the organization has a friendly and warm social atmosphere.

4. Structure--degree to which the organization specifies the methods and procedures used to accomplish tasks; the degree to which the organization likes to specify and codify, and write things down in a very explicit form.

5. Level of rewards--degree to which managers are well rewarded; this includes salary, fringe benefits, and other status symbols.

6. Performance-reward dependency--extent to which the reward system (salary, promotion, benefits, etc.) is fair and appropriate; degree to which these rewards are based on worth, ability, and past performance rather than factors such as luck, who you know, how well a manager can manipulate people, etc.

7. Motivation to achieve--degree to which the organization attempts to excel; the strength of its desire to be number one. A high rating reflects a lack of complacency even in the face of good profits, growth, etc.

8. Status polarization--degree to which there are definite physical distinctions (e.g., special parking places and office decorations) as well as psychological distinctions (informal social boundaries, treatment of the subordinate as inferior, etc.) between managerial levels in the organization.

9. Flexibility and innovation--willingness to try new procedures and experiment with change which is not really necessary due to some potential crisis situation, but rather to improve a situation or process which may currently be working satisfactorily.

10. Decision centralization--extent to which the organization delegates the responsibility for making decisions either as widely as possible or centralizes it as much as possible. Decentralization includes the idea of shares authority in decision-making.

11. Supportiveness--degree to which the organization is interested in and is willing to support its managers in both job and non-job related matters. The organization's degree of interest in the welfare of its' managers.

Litwin and Stringer's (1968, 81-82) operational definition of organizational climate contains the following components:

1. Structure--the feeling the employees have about the con-
constraints in the group, how many rules, regulations, procedures there are; is there an emphasis on "red tape" and going through channels, or is there a loose and informal atmosphere.

2. Responsibility--the feeling of being your own boss; not having to double-check all of your decisions; when you have a job to do, knowing that it is your job.

3. Reward--the feeling of being rewarded for a job well done; emphasizing positive rewards rather than punishments; the perceived fairness of the pay and promotion policies.

4. Risk--the sense of riskiness and challenge in the organization; is there an emphasis on taking calculated risks, or is playing it safe the best way to operate.

5. Warmth--the feeling of general good fellowship that prevails in the work group atmosphere; the emphasis on being well-liked; the prevalence of friendly and informal social groups.

6. Support--the perceived helpfulness of the managers and other employees in the group; emphasis on mutual support from above and below.

7. Standards--the perceived importance of implicit and explicit goals and performance standards; the emphasis on doing a good job; the challenge represented in personal and group goals.

8. Conflict--the feeling that managers and other workers want to hear different opinions; the emphasis placed on getting problems out in the open, rather than smoothing them over or ignoring them.

9. Identity--the feeling that you belong to a company and you are a valuable member of a working team; the importance placed on this kind of spirit.

There does exist some criticism of the overlap and redundancy between the concepts of organizational climate and job satisfaction. This criticism is discussed elsewhere in the section, "Criticisms of the Construct of Organizational Climate."

A relationship between job performance and organizational climate has also been found in numerous studies. Kaczka and Kirk, (1968); Dunnette, (1973); Frederickson, (1968); Hall and Lawler, (1968); Pritchard
and Karasick, (1973); Friedlander and Greenberg, (1971); Schneider, (1973); Cawsey, (1973); and Schneider and Hall, (1972) have all reported data indicating that climate and performance are related.

The ways in which performance measures were operationally defined in these studies is worthy of note. Performance measures of Kaczka and Kirk (1968, 256-258) were performance of the total organization measures rather than individual performance measures. The six measures were:

1. Profit--gross profit per period
2. Sales--sales in excess of seasonal and cyclical changes
3. Ratio of sales to inventory--ratio of sales revenue to the value of the inventory in a given period of time
4. Unit cost--total cost divided by the number of units produced in a given period of time
5. Group pressure--the aggregate of the work pressures felt by each of the work groups
6. Group cohesion--average of each of the cohesive measures of each of the groups.

While Hall and Lawler's (1969) operational definition of climate is typical of the bipolar, objective measures of climate, as reported by the members of the organization, their operational definition of performance is unique to the organization. Hall and Lawler measured performance in terms of quantity of product produced during the past year. This is also organizational, rather than an individual measure of performance.

Pritchard and Karasick's (1973, 134) operational definition of performance is an individual one. These researchers had a consultant rate each respondent on an overall measure of job performance on a scale from one to five. These ratings were done by an interview with the respondents' supervisors. Subsequently, the ratings were reviewed by the supervisors who reported a high level of agreement.
Friedlander and Greenberg (1971, 290) looked at productivity in terms of job retention (simply total number of weeks worked on the job); work effectiveness consisting of competence, congeniality, effort and reliability measures as determined in supervisory ratings; and work behavior, consisting of smart, friendly and conscientious measures, again assessed by supervisory ratings.

Schneider's (1973, 249) performance measure was obtained from clients by assessing banks' performance, which motivated the clients to switch their accounts to other banks. This is an organizational, rather than an individual measure of performance.

Schneider and Hall (1972, 449) relied on the respondents to assess measures of performance. The respondents, who were parish priests, were asked to indicate the amount of activity performed and the importance of that activity for a list of 35 duties.

One important aspect of the Frederickson (1966) study was the perception of the consistency of the climate and its impact on performance. That is, those individuals who consistently viewed climate (as either closely supervised or loosely supervised) had much better performance than those individuals who were inconsistent in their perceptions. Furthermore, in a reanalysis of the data, Frederickson (1968) found that the subjects employed different work methods under different climate conditions. For example, under climate conditions permitting more freedom, administrators tended to work more directly with peers, while in restrictive climates, the administrators tended to follow channels more.

Other researchers have also found that a particular type of climate was associated with high performance. Friedlander and Greenberg's (1971) study of the hard-core unemployed indicated that workers who perceived their climate as supportive had higher performance than those who perceived
their climate as less supportive. Hall and Lawler (1969) found that higher performing research and development laboratories were more likely to be described as low on measures of emotional control and high on measures of dominance.

It should be noted, however, that significant differences in subjects' perceptions of climate do not always result in varying levels of performance. Kaczka and Kirk's (1968) computer simulation indicated that an employee-centered climate does not always lead to higher performance levels. Pritchard and Karasick (1973) found that only two of their eleven climate variables (performance-reward dependency and achievement) correlated significantly with managerial performance. And Cawsey (1973) found salesmen were rated as higher performers by their supervisors if they perceived the organization to be achievement-oriented, while clerical personnel were rated higher if they perceived the climate as power-oriented. Individuals who were achievement-oriented set realistic, achievable goals for themselves. In contrast, individuals who were power-oriented valued the control of people or resources. And individuals who were affiliation oriented valued warm, supportive relationships. These values can impact on the nature of inter-personal relationships in organizations, in that achievement-oriented individuals would focus on goals, whereas affiliation-oriented individuals would focus on the feelings of the individuals in the organization.

Climate as an Intervening Variable

Climate has been used principally as an intervening variable when the independent variables were human relations training, leadership styles, or managers' personality needs. The dependent variable in these studies was either job performance or satisfaction.
Three studies in which human relations training was the independent variable (Costley, Downey and Blumberg, 1973; Hand, Richards, and Slocum, 1973; and Watson, 1973) yielded inconsistent results. In an attempt to reconcile the differences in the studies, Hellriegel and Slocum (1974), concluded that some of the difference may be attributable to either the kind of technology of the firm or the level of the individual in the organization. A good climate for managers at a relatively low level in a technical and static environment might not be a good climate for a manager at a relatively high level in a non-technical and dynamic environment.

In a study in which leadership was the independent variable and organizational climate was the intervening variable, Litwin and Stringer (1968) simulated three different climates: (a) authoritarian-oriented business, (b) democratic, friendly business, and, (c) achieving business. They found a significant effect of different leadership styles in creating different organization climate and resultantly different levels of performance. The subjects in the achieving climate produced the most, but the subjects in the democratic, friendly climate experienced the highest level of worker satisfaction. The authors later replicated the study in a setting in which leadership style was not experimentally controlled.

In two studies that were conducted in which personality needs were the independent variable and climate the intervening variable, a relationship was found between organizational climate and job satisfaction and performance. Pritchard and Karasick (1973) considered six personality needs (needs for achievement, affiliation, autonomy, order, dominance, and authority) and found that a highly supportive climate was related to job satisfaction regardless of the managers' personality needs. However, with regard to performance, managers with a high need for order performed better in a highly structured climate; and managers with a high need for
autonomy were more satisfied in a climate characterized as low in decision centralization. Cawsey (1973) found a low, but significant relationship between need for achievement, need for power, and need for affiliation when using the nine scales which comprise Litwin and Stringer's climate instrument. Regardless of a subject's personality needs, subjects who perceived their climate to be achievement-oriented were more satisfied with their jobs than subjects who perceived the climate as power- or affiliation-oriented.

**Climate as a Dependent Variable**

Many researchers have studied the impact of the internal properties of the organization (such as locus of decision-making, rules, position in the hierarchy, etc.) and how these affect climate. These researchers include George and Bishop, (1971); Cawsey, (1973); Payne and Phesey, (1971); Schneider and Hall, (1972); and Stimson and LaBelle (1971). The findings of these studies indicate that perceptions of climate vary among employees at different levels in the hierarchy. For example, Schneider and Hall (1972) found that position level in the priesthood moderated the priest's perception of climate. Schneider and Bartlett (1968) found that perceptions of climate varied between managers and assistant managers. Organization level has been found to be related to both how the individual describes his climate and his evaluation of it.

With respect to other structural variables affecting climate, researches by Stimson and LaBelle (1971); George and Bishop, (1971); Payne and Phesey, (1971); and Marrow, Bowers and Seashore, (1967); showed that the perceived degree of bureaucratization influences employees' perception of climate. The research by George and Bishop and that of Stimson and LaBelle found that highly bureaucratic (large number of rules and regula-
tions, use of formal structures to make decision, etc.) educational systems were more likely to be perceived by teachers as "closed climates".

Litwin and Stringer (1968), Sorcher and Danzig (1969), and Davis (1968), all indicated a strong relationship between an employee's discretion to make a decision and an employee's perception of climate. Litwin and Stringer experimentally matched technology, structure, lines of authority, location, environmental constraints, and performance in two chemical plants. In the experimental plant, the job discretion of the employees was enlarged so as to make the operations more meaningful to the individual employees and to enable the employees to set their own objectives. The experimental group, in contrast to the control group, had higher responsibility and achievement motives, felt a closer relationship to management and felt that rewards were more closely tied to performance.

One of the emerging issues in organizational climate is whether or not climate can be changed over time. In a series of studies, Golembiewski and Munzenrider (1973) have concluded that sensitivity training reduces the trainee's discrepancy score between what his climate preferences are and what he perceives the organization's climate ought to be. These changes persist over time. Similarly Holloman (1973) noted significant changes in problem-solving effectiveness after an intensive seminar designed to improve the participant's decision-making effectiveness. These individuals were better able to identify and evaluate alternative courses of action and better able to seek participation of others in the decision-making process.
RECENT RESEARCH ON ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

(OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE)

The recent research on the subject of the relationship between organizational climate and the other variables of interest in this dissertation, namely job satisfaction and professionalism, can be characterized by the following:

1. Research studies designed to improve the methodology used to measure organizational climate and/or job satisfaction.

2. Research studies done to extend the known relationships between various aspects of objective and subjective climate and job satisfaction and/or professionalism, but primarily the former.

3. Studies done to define or further refine existing models of organizational environments.

Some recent work in the first category has been done by Schneider and Snyder (1975) and Gavin (1975). The former researchers have empirically distinguished between organizational climate and job satisfaction. They began by defining organizational climate as a summary of global impression about the organization and job satisfaction as a personalistic evaluation of conditions existing on the job. They then proceeded to obtain two measures of climate and two measures of job satisfaction for all levels of employees in numerous organizations. Each of these measures was shown to be statistically dependent within each grouping of two measures, but statistically independent of each other. That is, there was a statistically higher correlation between the two measures of organizational climate and the two measures of job satisfaction than between either measure of climate and either measure of job satisfaction.

Additionally, they confirmed the following:
a. People agree more on perceptions of climate than they agree on job satisfaction.

b. There is no relationship between climate and job satisfaction for the managers in these organizations, but correlations of as high as .70 for "professionals" in these organizations.

c. Although there were few significant relationships between perception-based measures and other indices of organizational effectiveness, when there are significant relationships, they are more related to employee turnover than to any other measures of effectiveness.

Gavin (1975) found that both personal and organizational variables accounted for a statistically significant amount of variance in the perceptions of individuals about organizational climate. Clusters of biographical data (including job involvement, social activities involvement, income, job tenure, etc.) and clusters of organizational data (including line-staff, level, extent of clerical and repetitious tasks in unit) were shown to be statistically related to some or all of the following organizational climate measures: (1) clarity and efficiency of organizational structure, (2) hindrance, (3) rewards, (4) esprit, (5) managerial trust, and (6) challenge and risk. However, the expected interaction between the biographical and organizational variables did not occur.

Two recent studies fall into the second category--extending known relationships between various aspects of climate and job satisfaction and professionalism.

Shapiro, Schwartz, and Moscato (1976) investigated the characteristics of organizational climate and non-managerial job satisfaction. They concluded that there was a strong preference for open as opposed to closed characteristics of organizational climate. Additionally, there was a more favorable disposition towards these theories, the more the subjects claimed to be familiar with the behavioral science theories.
Finally, among those subjects who perceived closed characteristics, there was a marked desire for a diminution of the impact of these characteristics.

Work by Osborn and Hunt (1975) indicates that there is not a simple, direct relationship between unit size and subordinate satisfaction. There is an intervening variable of leadership style that conditions the relationship. They showed that the dimensions of leadership, including consideration of supervisor, initiating structure, and lateral orientation outside of the organization (of supervisor) were related to subordinate satisfaction—but the first two were positively related, while the latter were negatively related to satisfaction.

A third study in this category (which also contains a model and might be more appropriately classified in the third category) looked at changes in patient behavior after changes in the physical setting due to remodeling in a psychiatric ward. Holahan (1976) found statistically more social behavior and less passivity among patients in the remodeled ward. The model developed from this work was a social systems analysis in which there was a social process going from petrification, unfreezing, resistance, and personalization as a result of changes in the physical climate.

The third category of studies are less related to the issues addressed in this dissertation, but which nevertheless are indicative of emerging trends in organization climate research—comprehensive models of organizational climate.

One model, by Mileti and Gillespie (1976), posits an integrative relationship of organization-environment dependencies for system adaptation. It is shown on the next page. This model is an integration of the existing theories of organization-environment interaction and attempts to explain how the organization's boundaries are permeated by the environment.

The other model was an extension of the matrix model in which tran-
Transactions in organizations are categorized into four distinct cells depending on organizational boundaries:

**Transactional Categories in Organizational Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRA-ORG.</th>
<th>EXTRA-ORG.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureaucratic encounters (service, client relations, admissions, compensation, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Organizational behavior&quot; (leadership, peer relations, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P₁</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic encounters (law enforcement, taxation, sales, outreach, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P₂</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family relations, friendships, neighborhood relationships, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cell 1 represents most of what is usually called organizational behavior—the interpersonal behavior of people in organizational roles. Likert’s New Patterns of Management (1961), McGregor’s The Human Side of Enterprise (1960), Argyris’ Personality and Organization (1957), and Fiedler’s major work on Leadership (1971) consist primarily of findings and inferences at this level. Likert’s principle of supportive relationships and McGregor’s well-known contrast between Theory-X and Theory-Y styles of management are statements about the behavior of managers and employees in organizational roles.
A basic premise in this model is that outcomes or processes within organizations are in part dependent on phenomena (boundary-spanning activities) outside the organization. Activities or processes that span the boundaries of the organization, but which nevertheless have an impact on organizational climate include laws, economic conditions, norms, revenue raising, etc.
A sizeable portion of behavioral science research in organizations has focused on the possible connections between job attitudes or job satisfaction and various job behaviors. Scholars from many disciplines have examined the association between job satisfaction and such behavioral variables such as job tenure, absences, accidents, grievances, illnesses, life expectancies, technology, and task design, to name only a few.

These studies have been conducted in a wide variety of work situations: (1) among organization members ranging from unskilled workers to managers and professionals, (2) in diverse administrative and technological environments, (3) using individuals or groups as units of analysis, and (4) employing various measures of both satisfaction and performance (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955; Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capwell, 1975; Vroom 1960, 1964).

There are at least three major points of view that have been identified with regard to the nature of the relationship between job satisfaction and performance: (1) the view that satisfaction leads to high performance, a position generally associated with early human relations concepts; (2) the view that the satisfaction-performance relationship is moderated by a number of variables, a position which gained acceptance in the fifties and continues to be reflected in current research; and (3) the view that high performance leads to satisfaction, a recently stated position. These three points of view will be briefly discussed.
Satisfaction-Performance

The early behavioral scientists advocated the point of view that there is greater productivity when workers are first satisfied with their jobs, which was inspired by the findings of the Hawthorne studies. This is true even though Roethlisberger, the principal investigator of the Hawthorne studies, noted that "the factors which make for efficiency... are not necessarily the same as those factors that make for happiness."

The work of Herzberg and his associates (1957) provides perhaps the best examples of current theory and research on the point of view that greater satisfaction leads to greater performance. They, however, make a distinction between those aspects of the job that are potential sources of dissatisfaction but not sources of positive work attitudes, such as working conditions, salary and benefits, and those factors closely associated with the work itself that can contribute directly to work satisfaction and hence work performance, such as challenging assignments, recognition, and opportunity for professional growth.

Although there have been many partial replications of Herzberg's work, criticisms are also prevalent and center around the failure to validate the relationship between satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction and performance.

Satisfaction-?-Performance

There are also numerous research findings which conclude that the relationship between satisfaction and performance might be independent. In extensive and empirically well formulated studies conducted at the Survey Research Center, Katz, et. al. (1950, 1951) were unable to establish a relationship between satisfaction and productivity for either office workers or railroad employees.
Brayfield and Crocker (1955), in a review of over fifty studies, suggested that satisfaction and job performance might be concomitantly related. In addition, they felt that high satisfaction and high productivity could be expected to occur together especially when productivity is a path to certain important goals and when these goals are achieved.

The work of other less-known theorists also illustrates the uncertain research findings in this area. Dawis and his colleagues (1968), in their theory of work adjustment, hypothesized that work adjustment is a function of both employee satisfaction and his satisfactoriness (his level of performance). Satisfaction results from the correspondence between the individual's need set and the organization's reinforcer system. That is, are the individual's needs being met by what the organization offers in the form of rewards? Satisfactoriness refers to the organization's evaluation of its members. It is a function of the correspondence between the requirements imposed by the job and the abilities possessed by the employees. This theory thus enables one to explain variation in employee satisfaction without reference to his performance, by comparing the needs being met with the organizational rewards being offered.

Triandis (1959) shares with Dawis the notion that satisfaction and performance need not covary under all conditions. Triandis hypothesized that organizational pressure for high production influences both satisfaction and performance, but not in the same manner. As pressure increases, job satisfaction is hypothesized to decrease, irrespective of concomitant variation in performance. At several locations within the typical range of employee satisfaction, increasing pressure is hypothesized to result in increased performance; while at other locations, the relation between
pressure and performance is assumed to be negative. Also, satisfaction may lead to moderate performance under the utopian condition of no pressure to perform.

March and Simon's (1958) model suggests that performance and satisfaction can both be viewed as dependent variables—that performance is a function of two variables: (1) the degree of dissatisfaction experienced, and (2) the perceived instrumentality of performance for the attainment of valued rewards. The model suggests that a state of dissatisfaction is a necessary but not sufficient condition for performance. It is necessary because dissatisfaction of some sort is assumed to be required to activate the organism toward search behavior. But it lacks sufficiency because a dissatisfied employee may not perceive performance as leading to satisfaction.

March and Simon also specify conditions where performance may lead to satisfaction: (1) when job satisfaction results from the receipt of rewards which are not based on performance; (2) when the actual rewards of performance do not correspond to the perceived rewards; and/or (3) when the worker's level of aspiration is raised as much as or more than the value of the anticipated rewards.

Performance→Satisfaction

The third point of view is that good performance may lead to rewards, which in turn lead to satisfaction.

This point of view is most prominently reflected in the work of Porter and Lawler (1965). Their basic hypothesis is that, when performance leads to rewards which are seen by the individual as equitable, high satisfaction will result. For this satisfaction to exert an influence on subsequent performance, there must be a linkage between effort exerted and
the rewards. There are, however, numerous intervening variables in the model, including role perceptions and certain abilities and traits. That is, these variables intervene in the relationship between the effort exerted and performance. The individual's perception of whether a reward is equitable intervenes in the relationship between performance and satisfaction.

This somewhat limited review of the early literature on the relationship between job satisfaction and performance leads one to the conclusion that the nature of the relationship is currently an unresolved issue.

There are some essentially methodological reasons for this. For example, consider the measurement of "job satisfaction". Smith (1969) has empirically identified five subcomponents of overall satisfaction (work, pay, promotion, supervision, and co-workers), which show adequate convergent and discriminant validity. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Weiss, 1967) has 20 factors which have shown only moderately high correlations. Hinricks (1968) factored a 60 item satisfaction questionnaire and obtained nine fairly independent factors. There is also the fact that little is known about the interrelationships of the separate factors with the more global feelings of satisfaction.

There are also methodological problems related to the measurement of performance. It is quite typical to find that researchers once thought that performance was a unidimensional construct. The result of this was to arrive at an operational measure of performance by an overall rating or ranking of the workers' effectiveness. Recent research severely questions the adequacy of this. For example, Ghiselli and Haire (1960) have noted that these measures are neither particularly stable over time, nor are the subfactors highly intercorrelated. Despite this evidence, the theorists interested in satisfaction-performance
relationships have generally treated performance as a homogeneous variable.

There are also numerous moderator or intervening variables which have not been adequately taken into account. For example, Korman (1970) found that subjects' self-esteem moderated the relationship between performance and satisfaction. Carlson (1969) recently reported that the measured correspondence between individual ability and the ability requirements of the job moderated in the relationship between performance and satisfaction.
RECENT RESEARCH ON JOB SATISFACTION

A 1975 work on the state-of-the-art on job satisfaction by Seashore and Taber made a substantial contribution both methodologically and conceptually. The first portion of this article discusses the issues that bear upon the operationalization of job satisfaction for survey research purposes. Unresolved issues include facet-free or facet-specific questions, derived responses as opposed to responses to direct questions and the weighting or clustering of them. (They also note the merits of the instrument used in this dissertation, the JDI, as useful for survey research purposes.)

The model developed in the paper, which is shown below, provides a mechanism for categorizing variables known to be correlated with job satisfaction.
Other conceptual points which they raised in the article include the fact that antecedent conditions influencing job satisfaction are not very well known; that there are objective and subjective work environments, each with differing degrees of determinateness; and the level of analysis for assessing job satisfaction might include both individual and group levels, although most studies to date have used the individual level as the appropriate level of analysis.

Three recent articles on job satisfaction deal with the impact of organizational factors on the role stress or role conflict of individuals.

A 1976 study by Burke hypothesized that, while the literature is replete with studies on the dysfunctional aspects of occupational stresses, some types of stress are dysfunctional while others are not. The subjects in Burke's study, all males, were engineers and accountants and were broadly defined by Burke to be professional. In general, the occupational stress index was significantly related to satisfaction—the greater the strain, the less the satisfaction. But 30% of the correlations, primarily those associated with enlarged or challenging jobs, were in the opposite direction to that expected. There are some kinds of strains, such as high responsibility and heavy workload, which result in increased satisfaction.

In a 1977 study, R. Miles examined the role-set distance and relative authority for scientists and engineers with varying amounts of either administrative or technical and "boundary-spanning" responsibility. He found that individuals with high levels of distance between themselves and their role senders experienced role conflict as did individuals having high levels of relative authority. Those individuals having both high levels of organizational distance and high levels of relative authority had greater levels of role conflict than persons having one or the other, but not both.
Another recent study looked at the effects of informational inputs on the stress experienced by the members of organizational decision-making groups. O'Connel Cummings, and Huber (1976) found that role-related tension was positively related to information overload, but that general feelings of tension occurred only when information specificity is low. Low information specificity refers to communicating in vague generalities, to avoiding issues, rather than dealing with them, etc. Additionally, they found that role-overload tension and role-ambiguity are lower in groups having a more structured hierarchy.
Theoretical Background

Professionalization

There is a certain looseness or even confusion in the terminology used by the theorists in the study of professionalization. It was up to Vollmer and Mills in their 1966 book *Professionalization* to make a clear-cut distinction with regard to the use of the terms (a) professionalization, (b) professionalism, (c) professionals, (d) professional groups, and (e) professions.

They suggested that the concept of "profession" be applied only to an abstract model of occupational organization and that the concept of "professionalization" be used to refer to the dynamic process whereby many occupations can be observed to change certain crucial characteristics in the direction of a profession. "Professionalism" refers to an ideology and associated activities that are held by and performed by members of many occupational groups that aspire to become professional. "Professional groups" is the term that Vollmer and Mills suggested be used to refer to associations of colleagues in an occupational context and "professionals" be used to designate individuals considered by their colleagues to be members of the professional groups. It is the third concept—professionalism—that is of concern in the empirical part of this dissertation. However, since the early sociologists did not make this precise distinction, no attempt will be made to do so in describing their contributions.

The theoretical basis for the work on professionalism can be found in the writings of the early sociologists. Emile Durkheim in *The Division of Labor in Society*, written in 1893, should be credited for pointing out
the importance of professionalization to society. In the contrast between mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity, he pointed out that, in the former, mechanical solidarity, everyone did essentially the same kinds of tasks and shared essentially the same kinds of values. But in organic solidarity, members of society no longer have a general consensus on norms and values but rely on the interdependence of the tasks they do for the interdependence in society. Formal occupational associations help individuals in diverse occupational pursuits to relate to the social structure.

Another early contribution to the concept of professionalization was made by Robert MacIver in a paper first published in 1922. MacIver thought that a key characteristic of professional groups was the degree to which they established autonomy and collective self-control over their standards of performance and behavior. It is primarily a characteristic of professional groups that they develop ethics and standards with regard to relations with individuals outside the group. Additionally, these standards are usually developed with regard to the behavior of the individual professionals, rather than with regard to the behavior of the professional group as a whole.

A. M. Carr-Saunders' contribution was that he was among the first to analyze systematically the process of professionalization. As early as 1928, Carr-Saunders discussed the development of what he called professionalism in its historical perspective. He defined professionalization in terms of the specialized skills and training, minimum fees or salary, formation of professional associations, and codes of ethics governing professional practice. He noted, moreover, that all special entrance associations are not necessarily professional in character. Professional associations are distinguished by the degree to which they seek to establish
minimum qualifications for entrance into professional practice or activity, the degree to which they enforce appropriate norms and rules of conduct upon members of the professional group and the degree to which they enhance the status of the professional group in the larger society. Carr-Saunders also noted that members of the professional groups tend to become unduly attached to their professional associations and codes of conduct, and these characteristics of professionalization can be expected to have important negative consequences for society.

Ernest Greenwood's work (1957) involved describing the essential elements of the ideal type profession. He thought that professions were occupational groups distinguished by:

1. a basis of systematic theory;
2. authority recognized by the clientele of the professional group;
3. broad community sanction and approval of this authority;
4. a code of ethics regulating relations of professional persons with clients and with colleagues;
5. a professional culture sustained by formal professional associations.

Although Greenwood discussed his ideal-type profession in terms of professions and non-professions, he pointed out that there are no clear cut distinctions between them, that the occupations are distributed along a continuum of professions. His model has provided criteria for evaluating the extent to which an occupation has become professionalized.

Alvin Gouldner (1957) made a contribution to the concept of professionalism when he wrote about the analysis of latent social identities in a number of different types of organizations. Latent social identities involve criteria for classifying people in ways that are not prescribed by the organization, but that nevertheless are often used and exert pressure
upon the manifest organizational roles. The two ideal types of latent social identities he described are cosmopolitans and locals. Cosmopolitans are those individuals who are low on loyalty to the employing organization, high on commitment to specialized role skills, and are likely to use an outer reference group orientation. Locals are those individuals who are high on loyalty to the employing organization, low on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an inner reference group orientation. The implication is that those individuals classified as cosmopolitans are more professional than those individuals classified as locals.

Hughes' *Men and Their Work* (1958) marked a turning point in the study of professionalism in that he synthesized many of his insights in professionalism in this book. Some of these concepts, which were liberally illustrated by examples, included personality type, institutional office, social roles, license and mandate, professional mistakes, and career problems of sociology. His essays provided the base for other researchers to subsequently empirically test many of the concepts and directed the field of professionalism beyond the study of the process by which an occupational group becomes a profession.

The work of Harold Wilensky (1964) can be cited as one of the turning points in the development of an operational definition of professionalization. His now classic article pointed out that many occupations pass through a consistent sequence of stages on the way to becoming professions. The stages that were identified by Wilensky are:

1. Creation of a full time occupation--this involves the performance of functions which may have been performed previously, as well as new functions, and can be viewed as a reaction to needs in the social structure.

2. The establishment of a training school--this reflects both the knowledge base of a profession and the efforts of early leaders to improve the lot of the occupation. In the more established profes-
sions, the move is then followed by affiliation of the training school with established universities. In the newer professions, university affiliation is concurrent with the establishment of training schools.

3. Formation of professional associations—the formation of such associations is accompanied by a change in the occupational title, attempts to define more clearly the exact nature of the professional tasks, and efforts to eliminate practitioners who are deemed incompetent by the emergent professionals. Local associations unite into national associations after a period of some political manipulations. As stronger associations are formed, political agitation in the form of attempts to secure licensing laws and protection from competing occupations becomes an important function.

4. Formation of a code of ethics—these ethical codes are concerned with both internal (colleague) and external (clients and public) relations. They are designed to be enforced by the professional associations themselves and, ideally, are given legal support.

Caplow (1966) has also developed a similar sequence of stages through which occupations pass on the route to becoming a profession.

Additionally, Wilensky pointed out that there are many barriers to professionalization, including the fact that an optimal technical base is a vague and elusive concept and conflict between professional orientation and client orientation as well as a conflict between bureaucratic orientation and professional orientation are distinct possibilities. Wilensky's contribution is the development of an index of professional-discipline orientation and the development of another index of career orientation. This index is based on the following:

1. A ranking of reference groups—"Here are some groups that inevitably judge the quality of professional performance. Whose judgment should count the most when your overall performance is assessed: Clients, superiors, colleagues, community leaders, leaders of professional associations?"

2. Free responses to the question, "Different people want different things out of their jobs. What are the things you yourself feel are most important?"

3. A question concerning professional journals read regularly: "Generally speaking, would you say you read your professional
journals thoroughly, partially, or do you just glance through them?"

The more a respondent had colleagues as the important reference group, mentioned technical tasks and autonomy as important, and thoroughly read professional journals, the more he was regarded as possessing a professional-discipline orientation. The more a respondent had supervisors as a reference group, thought economic security, mobility, status and recognition important and thoroughly read professional journals (this dimension has the same scoring on both indices), the more a respondent was regarded as having a career orientation.

Krause's (1971) contribution to the study of professionalism was one of identifying four perspectives, which could be used to analyze occupations: (1) historical, (2) biographical, (3) structural and functional, and (4) conflict.

The first, the historical perspective is what it appears to be---a perspective in which the origins of various occupations are traced. The biographical perspective is concerned with such issues as socioeconomic background of individuals who achieve high status occupation, the issue of aspiration, career patterns, socialization and alienation.

In the structural and functional perspective, division of labor is viewed as an important mechanism which serves to integrate society. Issues such as occupational prestige, occupational mobility, and bureaucratization of work are of concern.

A conflict of interest perspective considers such professionalism issues as the relationships of the occupations to each other, the relationships between the interests of a given occupational group and the public interest and the impact of technological change on various occupational groups.
RECENT RESEARCH ON PROFESSIONALIZATION

The recent work on professionalism can be characterized by stating that they are studies of the behavior engaged in by those labeled as "professionals". Included in these are studies of formal and nonformal communication patterns, professional-client relationships, and conflict between the professional and the bureaucracy.

Brieger (1976) inferred the nature of social relationships among scientists by observing both the nature of internal organizational relationships as well as external relationships with others in other organizations. Although the major objective of his research was to develop a procedure called block-model analysis for analyzing social networks, the data were used to draw some preliminary conclusions about both the visibility and awareness of scientists. Categories of visibility that were developed included: (1) elder statesmen--whose contributions are widely acknowledged (high visibility) but who are not keeping abreast of the contributions of younger scientists (low awareness); (2) activists who have made real contributions and who are still active researchers (high on both visibility and awareness); (3) newcomers--who are far more aware of the work of others (high awareness and low visibility); and (4) outsiders--who are working outside the discipline (low on both).

Morrissey and Gillespie (1975) in a refinement of Richard Hall's 1968 data suggested that the bureaucratic and professional models of organizations imply that they are different but not necessarily conflicting forms of organization.

Using Thompson's (1967) classification of technology: intensive
(hospitals, law firms, schools), mediating (CPA firms and stock brokerage firms), and long-linked (manufacturing firms), Morrissey and Gillespie studied two dimensions of professionalism (self-regulation and autonomy) and three dimensions of bureaucracy (rules, procedures, and technical competence).

The conclusions are basically the following two: (1) There is no statistically significant difference in any of the components of bureaucracy for organizations having different technologies. (2) The interrelationships between the components of rationality in bureaucracy and of professionalism do differ depending on the kind of technology. For example, there is a statistically significant negative relationship between procedures (an element of bureaucracy) and autonomy (an element of professionalism) in long-linked organizations which does not exist at all in mediating types of organizations.

Lopata (1976) noted that there is seemingly a paradox in the required behavior of (professional) "experts". At the same time that there is an explosion in the knowledge and skills required of experts, there is an increased reliance on the experts for assistance in the development of governmental and educational programs. Additionally, there is a concomitant decrease in the willingness of the clients of the experts (be it patient, customer, student, etc.) to passively accept the services of the professional (expert).

There have been some articles recently about the professional behavior of social workers. In a 1975 article, Meinert discusses the factors influencing the levels of job satisfaction of social workers. He notes that, relative to the other items in the study, satisfaction with recognition by society-at-large and recognition by other professions are lowest. Those items related to structural or organizational attributes such as
satisfaction with monetary rewards, the function of the profession, and the function of the employing organization are in the middle. Highest, relative to the other items, are satisfaction with own work performance and satisfaction with social work as a career choice. Additional findings from this study included a characterization of highly satisfied social workers. Those individuals having master's degrees, being accredited by the Academy of Certified Social Workers, earning salaries above the median for social workers with comparable experience, and being engaged in autonomous, nonsupervised practice, were more "satisfied" than those who were not.

In a 1975 article, Gartner draws the following conclusions about the profession of social work (and education) in comparison with medicine and law:

1. No mandate to define work
2. No autonomy for practitioners
3. Low salaries to faculty in professional schools
4. Clients more likely to be women
5. Social class origins of both practitioners and clients lower
6. More emphasis on theory, less emphasis on practice
7. No private practice of faculty

In 1976, Meinert empirically analyzed over 4,000 responses to the question, "As a social worker, what do you do?" These responses were categorized as to whether they were socially specific or non-specific and whether they were professionally or non-professionally oriented. Socially specific items were those involving human association and social interaction on the part of the social worker; whereas professional behavior was that engaged in by someone who required professional training in social
work.

Thirty-nine per cent of the behavior was regarded as both socially specific and professionally-oriented. Twenty-five per cent was professionally-oriented only, and 12% was socially-oriented only.

Only two of the 11 sociodemographic variables exhibited any difference--sex and field of practice. Females reported more professionally-oriented behavior than males. Individuals working in organizations which were under the auspices of social work or another profession only had more socially specific professionally-oriented behavior than those working under a mixed auspices.

In a recent series of three articles in *Sociological Review* (Great Britain), there is a discussion of the professionalization process of what heretofore had been assumed to be in the strictest sense two non-professional groups--personnel administrators and health care visitors.

In the first of the three, Timperley and Osbaldeston (1975) described the occupational group of personnel administrators in England in terms of Wilensky's (1964) model of the stages in the development of a profession. These authors have determined that personnel administration is in the later stages of the professionalization process, since the professional organization is currently increasing the prescribed training for entry. Timperley and Osbaldeston have also identified the major work activities of the sample. In addition, in a poll of the subjects who were engaged in the work of personnel administration, 62% indicated that they regarded personnel administration as a developing profession. The authors noted, however, that relatively few of the subjects had advanced educational backgrounds, indicating perhaps that a weak theoretical base is sufficient to perform in the occupational role.

Watson (1976), in a critical note to Timperley and Osbaldeston,
pointed out that they have not really shed any light on the professionalization process. His criticisms of their work also noted that they failed to treat the concept of professionalization as a process, and the mediating effect of organizational context in which the personnel administrators worked.

Dingwall (1976) proposed a scheme for determining whether or not a particular occupational group, specifically health care visitors, were professionals. The scheme contained the following components: (1) personal qualities; (2) autonomy and self-evaluation; (3) membership in an occupation that selects its recruits, has formal qualifications, is self-governing, has its own body of knowledge, etc.; (4) has responsibility for supervising others; and (5) has equality with other professionals. His point of view is that this scheme can be extended to other occupational groups.
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

REHABILITATION COUNSELING

Although the sociological literature is almost devoid of studies on the job satisfaction and professionalism of rehab counselors, the literature on rehabilitation is replete with it. However, there are some serious deficiencies in this literature, the most crucial of which is a definition of professionalism, which is somewhat unique. Oberman (1962) notes "that at least five requirements must be satisfied by a rehabilitation counselor if he would be a professional person: he must be competent, he must be effective, he must facilitate the work of others, he must have integrity, and he must communicate."

There is also the perspective that rehabilitation is not a profession at all, but rather an area of work (Moses and Patterson, 1971) in which a number of professions are involved, including the rehabilitation counselor, the social worker (Moore, 1962), the psychologist (Woods, 1964), the psychiatrist (Cubelli, 1965), and even the sociologist (Overs, 1967, and Sussman, 1966).

Much of the literature on rehabilitation counselors deals with either the personality characteristics of the counselor or the tasks performed by them. For example, Patterson (1962) studied verbal reasoning ability, personal preferences, vocational interests and empathy in an attempt to ascertain normative data on how rehabilitation counseling students compare with graduate students in related disciplines.

Another large proportion of the literature consists of attempts to describe the tasks performed by the rehab counselors. In a nation-wide
study of the professional roles and functions of rehabilitation counselors, Muthard and Salomone (1969) obtained the following information regarding the counselors' perceptions of their jobs: counselors placed different degrees of importance on the different tasks performed by them, with placement, affective counseling, and vocational counseling rated as of most importance and test administration, test interpretation, medical referral, and eligibility of lesser importance. This study also examined the relationships between background and personality variables and the extent to which the rehab counselor was satisfied with certain job duties. The conclusion was, however, that neither of the hypothesized independent variables, background or personality, was highly predictive. A low positive relationship was shown to exist between the "Attitude Towards Rehabilitation Counseling as a Profession" measure and specific duty satisfaction. Sussman and Haug (1969) found that the length of time in the field was positively related to the perception of rehabilitation counseling as a profession. The extent of professional autonomy enjoyed by the rehabilitation counselors was another research concern. Organizational structure and goals were found to be of major importance in determining the range of autonomy permitted to the counselor.

Sussman and Haug also found that there was a high degree of identification with a professional organization. Fifty-seven per cent of the counselors in their study identified with either the American Psychological Association, the American Rehabilitation Counseling Association, or the National Rehabilitation Counseling Association. Finally, it was reported that there was a large proportion of individuals, only one year after graduation from a master's degree in rehabilitation counseling, who had not entered into the field of rehabilitation counseling or were no longer in the field.
Another study very relevant to this dissertation is the one conducted by Rockenbeck and Moses (1973) on the rehabilitation counselor's role, function, and job satisfaction. Findings of that study that are of note include the fact that age was negatively related to job turnover, that there were no significant differences in job turnover due to differences in sex and that younger workers were the most likely to seek additional training. The major determinant of job satisfaction was whether there was congruence between preferences for the tasks and the actual tasks assigned.

There were several methodological weaknesses in what would otherwise be a significant contribution, the most notable being the way in which job satisfaction was defined in terms of differences between preferred and actual tasks. Additionally, since the study was of a non-random sample of only 66 counselors in one agency, generalizability is limited.

Miller and Muthard's 1965 study of the relationship between the job satisfaction and job performance of professionals used rehabilitation counselors as the subject group. The instrument used to measure job satisfaction, called the Job Satisfaction Index, was especially designed for rehabilitation counselors. It consisted of the following dimensions: physical and mental exertion; relations with associates; relations with employer; security, advancement and finances; interest in, liking for, and emotional involvement in the job; job information, training and status; physical surroundings and work conditions; and future, goals and progress.

Job performance was measured in terms of co-worker ratings, supervisor ratings, present state ratings (instrument developed by the state in which the workshop was located), case load velocity (length of time coun-
The counselor has control over a case, average case load and average closures. The study found the following results: Satisfaction with physical and mental exertion correlated with present state ratings, number of closures, and case load velocity. There was a negative relationship between satisfaction with future, goals, and progress and number of closures—that is, the more dissatisfied a counselor was, the more cases he or she closed.

The limitations of the study are primarily methodological; specifically both of the instruments used to measure job satisfaction and productivity were developed by the researcher for the purposes of the study. Additionally, it is narrower in scope than the present dissertation in that it does not consider any climate variables.

There are three interesting studies which deal to a limited extent with the relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction of rehab counselors.

Dunn, Allen, and Miller (1973) analyzed the extent to which vocational needs were met in the jobs of the rehab counselors through the use of the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire, the Minnesota Job Description Questionnaire, and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. This widely replicated battery of tests is used to ascertain the work adjustment of an individual, the primary indicator of which is job tenure (Dawis, 1968). Individuals were regarded as better adjusted to work if they remained on their job. Whether an individual remained was dependent on his satisfaction and on his satisfactoriness as ascertained by his employer.

In the study, the rehab counselors reported themselves as generally satisfied with their jobs but were relatively more satisfied with the intrinsic aspects of their jobs than the extrinsic aspects. A follow-up
study indicated that rehab counselors who had changed jobs, left their previous jobs because of dissatisfaction with extrinsic factors, but selected new jobs in rehab counseling because of intrinsic factors.

Fay and Moses (1972) also using the Minnesota battery of tests, examined the extent of congruence in the perceptions of the rehab counselors and their supervisors and found an extremely high correlation (.97) between the two groups. A composite statement of the job characteristics descriptive of the rehab counselor would sound like this: "Workers on this job make decisions on their own, make use of their individual abilities, plan their work with little supervision, get a feeling of accomplishment, have work where they do things for other people and do not tell other workers what to do."

Again, using the same methodology, Smits and Aiken (1969) focused on the jobs of the supervisors of rehab counselors in order to ascertain if the job-related behavior of the supervisor has an impact on the job satisfaction of the rehab counselor. The results indicated that the counselors saw their supervisors' leadership behavior as more characteristic of "tolerance of freedom" and "consideration" than of "initiating structure" and "production". Overall, 62 of the 81 correlation coefficients showing the relationship between rehab counselor perceptions of supervisory behavior and rehabilitation counselor job satisfaction were significant at or beyond the .001 level.

This brief survey has attempted to illustrate that, although the literature contains research findings on rehabilitation counselors, it is either descriptive of the tasks performed, perceptual in terms of preferences for the various tasks, or inferential in terms of the sources of job satisfaction of the rehab counselors. There were many studies of very small, biased, non-random samples or studies in which the instru-
ments were developed especially for the study. Since the present dissertation is based upon a national, random sample, used validated instruments, and focused on the impact of organizational climate variables on job satisfaction and professionalism, it will hopefully make a contribution both methodologically and theoretically, in a little researched area.
CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES IN THE RESEARCH DESIGN

CRITICISMS OF THE CONSTRUCT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

The major criticisms of the construct of organizational climate center around the assumptions made in research on it—namely, that all individuals at a given hierarchical level have similar perceptions about their "climate". While this criticism is in general thought not to be valid (Hellriegel, 1974), it is also thought to warrant additional investigation. Specifically, while a number of studies report climate consistencies which would be difficult to explain only in terms of averaging of individual differences, there is a lack of a systematic effort to determine whether perceptions of climate vary significantly when evaluated on the basis of such objective measures as age, sex, years of service, organizational practices, educational level, and the like.

Another criticism which is perhaps more cogent to this dissertation concerns the possible overlap and redundancy between job satisfaction and climate (Guion, 1973; Johannesson, 1971, 1973).

These critics attribute this redundancy to:

a. researchers culling climate items from satisfaction scales;

b. identical or similar methods of measurement;

c. the influence of affective (i.e., desirable or undesirable) predispositions of perceptual climate measures, which are assumed to elicit descriptive responses.

However, the intent of organizational climate scales is to "...clearly evoke perceptual, rather than attitudinal or other types of responses;
"that is, they stimulate the responding participant to orient himself with specific facts and express his opinion as to how he perceives those facts; not whether he likes them or not" (Stimson and LaBelle, 1971; Taylor and Bowers, 1972). Thus, climate instruments allege to evoke descriptions of work environments, whereas satisfaction instruments serve to call forth evaluations of them (LaFollette and Sims, 1973).

The paradox, however, posed by the critics is that "...description of one's environment or situation is directly affected by the satisfaction with that environment" (Johannessen, 1972). Factors such as attitudes, values, and motives are widely recognized as playing an important role in the perceptual process. While a number of studies report significant correlations between organizational climate and satisfaction, it is premature to assert that job satisfaction causes climate or climate causes job satisfaction. From a systems point of view, it is reasonable to expect considerable interrelationships between the two concepts.

One of the arguments advanced by Johannessen supporting the view that satisfaction affects perceived organizational climate is based on findings obtained with the Job Description Index (JDI). He assumes that the JDI is an instrument used to describe rather than evaluate jobs and that these descriptions are a function of underlying satisfactions or dissatisfactions. An examination of the items in the JDI indicates that they are primarily affective rather than descriptive in nature, however; and the JDI is typically interpreted as a measure of worker satisfaction.

The primary criticism of the construct seems to exist at the operational rather than the conceptual level. In one of the few rigorously designed experimental studies utilizing the organizational climate construct, Litwin and Stringer (1968) found job satisfaction to be highest in "affiliation"-induced climate, relatively high in the "achievement"-
induced climate, and low in the "power"-induced climate. Findings such as these suggest satisfaction may be an outcome which exists under different types of climate to varying degrees.
OVERVIEW OF SUBJECTIVE CLIMATE INSTRUMENTS AVAILABLE

Campbell et al. (1970) have reviewed the literature on organizational climate and synthesized the data from approximately ten different sources. He and his associates conclude that four factors seem to be common across investigations:

1. Individual autonomy. This is perhaps the clearest composite and includes the individual responsibility, agent independence, and rules orientation factors found by Litwin and Stringer (1968), Schneider and Bartlett (1969), and Kahn et al., respectively and Taguiri's (1968) factor dealing with opportunities for exercising individual initiative. The keystone of this dimension is the freedom of the individual to be his own boss and reserve considerable decision-making power for himself. He does not have to be constantly accountable to higher management positions.

2. The degree of structure imposed upon the position. Litwin and Stringer's structure (1968); Schneider and Bartlett's managerial structure (1969); Taguiri's first factor dealing with direction, objectives (1968); and Kahn et al.'s closeness of supervision seem similar enough to be lumped under this label. The principal element is the degree to which the objective of, and methods for, the jobs are established and communicated to the individual by the superior.

3. Reward orientation. Another meaningful grouping included Litwin and Stringer's reward factor; Schneider and Bartlett's general satisfaction factor, which seems to convey reward overtones; Kahn et al.'s promotion-achievement orientation; and Taguiri's being with a profit-minded and sales-oriented company. These factors do not hang together quite as well as the previous two groups and seem to vary a great deal in breadth. However, the reward element appears to be present in all.

4. Consideration, warmth, and support. This dimension lacks the clarity of the previous three. Managerial support from Schneider and Bartlett's general satisfaction study and nurturance of subordinates from Kahn et al. seem quite similar. Litwin and Stringer's warmth and support also seem to belong here since apparently this is a characteristic attributable to supervisory practices. Taguiri's mention of working with a superior who is highly competitive and competent does not fit quite so easily, but nevertheless seems to refer to the support and stimulation received from one's superior. However, the human relations referent is not as clear as in the factors derived from the other studies.
It is tempting to label a fifth group and include Litwin and Stringer's tolerance of conflict, Schneider and Bartlett's presence of conflict, Taguiri's working with cooperative and pleasant people, and Kahn et al.'s universalism. All these factors seem to represent the interpersonal relationships between peers, but from somewhat different perspectives. The Schneider and Bartlett and the Taguiri factors appear to fall on opposite ends of the same continuum, a kind of cooperativeness dimension, while the Litwin and Stringer factor reflects more a willingness to be honest and open about interpersonal conflict, and the Kahn factor represents the effect of group identification on how interpersonal relationships are handled.

Hellriegel and Slocum (1974) have also conducted an extensive examination of the instruments used to measure climate. They make the following observations:

Dimension--The number of items, in the instruments ranged from a low of one (Dewhirst, 1971) to a high of 254 (Payne and Pheysey). The bulk of the instruments consisted of from 20 to 80 items.

Type of organization--Generally the instruments were for use in any type of organization, but Schneider and Bartlett's was designed for use in insurance agencies, and Halprin and Croft's measure was designed for use in school systems.

Hellriegel and Slocum point out that, while in general they agree with Campbell's finding as to the common dimensions of autonomy, structure, reward, consideration and warmth and support, there is an increasing diversity beyond this. Some instruments, such as those of Halpin (1967), Halpin and Croft (1962), and Dewhirst, are narrower in scope and tap only a few dimensions. Campbell and Pritchard's instrument in Pritchard and Karasick (1973), Payne and Pheysey (1971), Burns and Stalker (1961), and House and Rizzo (1972) use instruments that seem to be somewhat more encompassing.

Leavitt's (1965) conception of an organization consists of four components: task, structure, people, and technology. According to this typology, people are given strong emphasis in climate components, structure is given moderate emphasis, task is given moderate to slight emphasis and the
technology is given only slight emphasis.

The response categories of virtually all the instruments utilize nominal scales. A liberal interpretation of some instruments, such as those of Schneider and Bartlett (1969), Campbell and Pritchard (1973) and Hall and Lawler (1969), among others, suggests that they approach the requirements for classification as interval scales. This is especially important, since the climate researcher typically employs parametric statistical methods, which assume an interval level of measurement.

The samples used in the development of climate instruments are generally drawn from middle or lower level management. In terms of one of the contingency frameworks, this group seems to fit the organization (i.e., administrative) subsystem. However, in applying these instruments, it is assumed that they are also valid for measuring the climate in the technical (i.e., productive) or institutional subsystems. While these are probably reasonable assumptions, they remain questions needing empirical evaluation.

The reliability of climate instruments is generally established through test-retest methods. The reliability is typically evaluated through inter-item, item-scale and split-half techniques.

The degree of effort and sophistication varies to a much greater extent is ascertaining validity than reliability. Factor analysis is more often used to establish and evaluate the construct validity of climate instruments than in establishing concurrent validity. One effective technique for evaluating the concurrent validity of a climate instrument is presented by Payne and Pheysey (1971). They identified two organizations which differed substantially on objective measures of organizational structure. The findings obtained from the climate instrument were in
the direction predicted by the objective measures of organizational structure.

For the most part, considerable effort is expended in assessing the content validity of the items within the scales chosen for inclusion in the climate instrument. However, there has been no adequate balancing or representation of the dimensions to be included in a climate instrument.

Another problem is that the ideal response may be transparent. That is, the respondents answer based on the response that appears to be best to them, regardless of how they actually feel. Golembiewski and Munzenrider (1973) conclude that social desirability responses pose a problem for Likert's (1967) climate instrument. Their data indicate that respondents who attribute socially desirable properties to their organization scored higher on an independent measure of social desirability than members who describe their organization's climate as less socially desirable on Likert's instrument.

Some climate instruments have as one of their objectives the classification of organizations or subsystems into one of several categories. This usually requires combining scores from each scale of the instrument into one or more grand classifications of climate, such as organic versus mechanistic, as described by Burns and Stalker (1961); exploitive, benevolent, consultative and participative, as used by Likert (1967); or affiliative, power-related, and achievement-related, as used by Litwin and Stringer (1968).

As long as complete analyses of the scales are undertaken and reported, there is no need to be overly concerned with the natural and potentially desirable goal of generalization. However, movement from a middle range of abstraction as represented by the scores on each scale
within a climate instrument to a higher level of abstraction must be undertaken with caution. It is important to avoid such errors as inappropriate stereotyping and reducing complex relationships to simplistic relationships. These errors result in losing data which might suggest possible incongruencies between the dimensions of an organization's environment and its climate. They may also produce an averaging of differences with the possible result that the general climate does not match up with any of the scales from which it is constructed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golembiewski &amp; Carrigan</td>
<td>96 salesmen</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>Independent variable: T-group training Organizational development efforts closed the gap between the individual's perceptions of his perceptions of his ideal climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golembiewski &amp; Carrigan</td>
<td>96 salesmen</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>Independent variable: T-group training T-group training helps induce and maintain changes in the employee's perceptions of climate over a longitudinal period of time (18 months).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golembiewski, Munzenrider, Blumberg, Carrigan &amp; Mead</td>
<td>43 salesmen</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>Independent variable: T-group training and external environment Employee's perceptions of the climate were affected by training. The external environment (reduction of the work force, market uncertainty) greatly reduced the magnitude of the changes in the employee's perceptions of the climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand, Richards, &amp; Slocum</td>
<td>42 middle managers</td>
<td>intervening</td>
<td>Independent variable: Human relations training program and time (18 months after training program) Employees who perceived the organization as consultative and who participated in a human relations training program had greater increases in their performance than employees who perceived the organization as autocratic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloman</td>
<td>21 city managers</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>Independent variable: Training program Significant changes occurred in the problem-solving effectiveness (measured by Likert's climate instrument) after a one week organizational development conference designed to improve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Researchers | Sample | Variable | Results
--- | --- | --- | ---
Marror, Bower, & Seashore | 27 managers & supervisors from a plant in the pajama industry | intervening | Independent variables: Changes in top management, technology, training programs, and reward systems. The climate of the organization shifted to become oriented toward System IV after the change in top management. This change in climate was accompanied by a 26% increase in productivity, a 20% decline in manufacturing costs, a 50% drop in employment turnover and a reduction in the time it took to train an employee.

Watson | 30 executives from around the country | intervening | Independent variable: University managerial training program (one month duration) and six month time elapse after completion of program. Employees who perceived the organization as consultative and who participated in the program were not rated significantly higher performers by the superiors and co-workers than men who perceived the climate as less participative.

RATIONALE FOR USE OF LIKERT CLIMATE INSTRUMENT

The rationale for the selection of Likert's measure of organizational climate is based on the following three reasons:

1. It is a form that is currently in wide use, both as an instrument for the construction of theory and for organizational development purposes. Hence, the result of its administration in this study could add more to the body of knowledge than a questionnaire constructed specifically for this study.

2. It contains the following six dimensions of organizational climate: (1) trust in leadership, (2) motivation based on reward and involvement, (3) pervasive communication, (4) participation in decision, (5) mutuality in goals, and (6) controls used for self-improvement. It contains a total of 18 questions, for each of which there are 20 possible gradations of response possible. (Some of the dimensions of climate have two questions, others have three or four.) This instrument contains all the dimensional factors which Campbell, et al., (1970) identified as being common in instruments used to assess organizational climate. This was as previously discussed.

3. It permits the ascertaining of a wide range of subjective organizational climate characteristics through the use of only 18 questions. It is not thought to be substantially less valid than the 45-item questionnaire developed by Litwin and Stringer (1968).

4. It has two other advantages, which although not salient in this study, nevertheless add to its theoretical relevance. The first is that it is possible to determine deprivation on each item— that is, it is possi-
ble to ascertain how much of a particular aspect of climate exists presently as well as how much of that element is thought to be desirable by the respondent. The second is that it is possible to compile the responses into four kinds of climate, which Likert calls systems:

a. System 1 (lowest quartile)—exploitative authoritative
b. System 2—benevolent authoritative
c. System 3—consultative
d. System 4—participative
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND EMPLOYEE ATTITUDES

Porter and Lawler (1965) are among the researchers who have investigated the relationship between organization climate and employee attitudes specifically between structural variables and employee attitudes. The seven structural variables they considered are:

Suborganizational properties
1. Organizational level
2. Line and staff hierarchies
3. Span of control
4. Size of subunits

Total organizational properties
5. Size of total organization
6. Shape: tall or flat
7. Shape: centralized or decentralized

The seven are not necessarily independent of each other, although they have been investigated separately.

Porter and Lawler note that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that organization level has a recognizable effect on morale. Recent studies seem to be in agreement that job satisfaction or morale increases with increases in managerial rank within the organization. Porter's own work (1962, 1963) confirms this relationship. A 14-country study of managerial attitudes by Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter (1963) also shows cross cultural similarities between organizational level and job satisfaction. These findings concur with the earlier studies of Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capwell (1957), and Morse (1953).

With regard to line-staff hierarchies, Porter and Lawler report that people in line positions experience greater satisfaction than people in staff positions. Rosen (1961) found that line managers reported greater
incidents of desirable conditions of work than did staff managers.

There is very little research to support the statement that there is a relationship between size of span of control and job satisfaction. What little work that has been done would lead one to conclude that at least the level of management and type of production mitigate in this relationship. (Woodward, 1958).

Porter and Lawler also report subunit size as being significantly related to differences in job attitudes. There is strong evidence to support the hypothesis that workers in small departments and work groups are more satisfied than workers in large departments and work groups. There are many additional studies which confirm this relationship, including Kerr, Kopelmeier, and Sullivan (1951), and Indik and Seashore (1961).

Many more studies have been conducted on the relationship between subunit size and job satisfaction than have been conducted on total organizational size and job satisfaction. Two exceptions are Benge (1944), who reported that job satisfaction is better in small organizations than in large ones; and Talacchi (1960), who found a high negative correlation between size and employee satisfaction as measured by the S.R.A. Employee Inventory. However, Porter (1964) found no advantage for either large or small organizations in terms of employee satisfaction at the managerial level.

Although there was significant disagreement in the literature about the advantages of tall vs. flat organizations (Worthy, 1950; Graicunas, 1957), no empirical research on the topic was conducted until 1962. Tallness refers to the relative number of levels between the highest and lowest levels in the organizations. But in a 1962 study on the job satisfactions of 704 physiologists, Meltzer and Salter were unable to confirm a relationship between tallness or flatness and job satisfaction. Porter and
Siegel (1964) also found that, for up to 5,000 employees, flat structures will result in greater need satisfaction for managers, but beyond that size, there was no difference between tall and flat structures. In flatter organizations, communication and participation in decision-making are facilitated. There are more feelings of teamwork. These factors are all related to job satisfaction. However, beyond 5,000 employees, sheer size counteracts the positive aspects of flatness.

Although the movement towards decentralization as the ideal shape can be traced back to the 1920s, most of the research efforts have been of the case study variety. In a 1954 empirical study of industrial relations managers, Baker and France found that those managers who worked in centralized industrial relations departments preferred centralized departments and those who worked in decentralized departments preferred decentralized ones. Litzinger (1963) compared the attitudes of bank managers with regard to the centralization-decentralization issue. However, his results indicated no clear attitude differences between centralized and decentralized organizations in regard to satisfaction of the managers.

Summary

Five of the seven properties of organization structure, with span of control and centralization-decentralization being the two possible exceptions, have been shown to have some kind of significant relationship to job attitudes.

The strengths of the relationships do differ. The two properties of structure that have the strongest relationships to job attitudes are respondents organization level and subunit size. Three other properties, line-staff type of position, total organization size, and tall-flat shape account for only a moderate amount of the variance in the studies
to date. But these variables have not been researched to the same extent as organizational level and subunit size.

The direction of relationships of certain structural variables is clear and well-supported: (a) organization level and job satisfaction—positive relationship; (b) line-staff hierarchies—positive relationship between line position and job satisfaction; (c) subunit size—negative relationship between size and job satisfaction.

The remaining organizational structure variables—span of control, size of total organization, shape—tall or flat, and shape—centralized or decentralized and their relationships to job satisfaction—are fertile fields for inquiry.
SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS REGARDING JOB SATISFACTION

There is a great deal of evidence to permit the conclusion that there are significant differences between occupational groups with regard to job satisfaction.

Blauner (1964) and Wilensky (1965) asked the question, "If you had the chance to start your working life over again, would you choose the same kind of work as you are doing now?" Ninety-three per cent of urban university professors responded affirmatively, as did 85% of firm lawyers, 75% of solo lawyers but only 43% of white collar workers. Among the working class occupations, the highest groupings responding affirmatively were skilled printers (52%), skilled auto workers (41%), but only 24% blue collar workers in general would choose the same occupation.

Gurin, Veroff, and Feld, (1960) in a national cross section study of 2,460 Americans, noted occupational group differences with regard to percentages dissatisfied, percentages reporting work problems, percentages self-reporting average or not very good at work, and percentages mentioning intrinsic and extrinsic satisfactions from work.

Kilpatrick, Cummings, and Jennings (1964) found that not only are there differences between occupational groups with regard to intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of job satisfaction, but there are differences within groups depending on such factors as whether the individuals were publicly (but not federally) employed, federally employed, the geographic region of residence, the size of the community of residence, and
the sex of the individual.
JOB SATISFACTION INSTRUMENTS

The purpose of this section is to present the justification for selecting the Job Description Index (JDI) as the measure of job satisfaction in this dissertation. It was selected after considering five of the most prominent measures of job satisfaction which are referred to in the literature: Brayfield-Roth, Porter and Lawler, Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, and the SRA Employee Inventory (Science Research Associates). It was selected on the basis of a very strongly worded evaluation by Victor Vroom, a prominent social psychologist who regards the Job Description Index as "...without a doubt the most carefully constructed measure of job satisfaction in existence today." James Price, in his book, *Handbook of Organizational Measurement*, (1972) concurs.

There are at least two approaches to the measurement of job satisfaction in the organizational literature. One approach is to collect information about general satisfaction with membership in the organization. The other approach is to collect information about specific dimensions of satisfaction such as work, supervision, pay, etc. The Brayfield-Roth measure illustrates the general approach. The Porter & Lawler measure and the Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (JDI) illustrate the specific approach (Price, 1972). However, they differ in two significant ways. The Porter and Lawler measure is based on Maslow's category of needs and measures differences between actual and anticipated fulfilment.

The JDI measure on the other hand, is based on no explicit theory and measures satisfaction in terms of actual fulfilment (Price, 1972). Since what is required is a measure of actual fulfilment, the JDI was
selected over the Porter and Lawler measure. Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) developed the JDI using a total of approximately 1000 subjects in four studies. Job satisfaction is defined quite broadly as "the feelings a worker has about his job." Five dimensions of job satisfaction are distinguished: work, supervision, pay, promotion, and co-workers. Five different scales are used to collect the data for these dimensions.

In discussing the advantages of the JDI, Smith, et.al. stated the following:

1. First, the JDI is directed towards specific areas of satisfaction, rather than towards global or general satisfaction. This does not imply that satisfaction in several areas are necessarily statistically independent, but it does provide for those important situations where there are discriminable differences.

2. A second advantage of the JDI according to Smith, is that the verbal level required to answer the JDI is quite low although this is not salient in this dissertation.

3. Thirdly, the JDI does not ask the respondent directly how satisfied he is with his work, but rather asks him to describe his work. Thus, the respondents have a job-referent rather than a self-referent. This removes the JDI from the category of a projective test, which typically require specially trained researchers to interpret it. Additionally, Smith and her associates think that it is easier to describe specific aspects of one's job than it is to describe internal states or feelings.

4. Another advantage is that a study using over 2,600 subjects was conducted to obtain the average satisfaction scores. In addition to the means, standard deviations are available for both male and female employees. Norms have also been established to enable researchers to control for sex, income, education, job tenure, community prosperity, in order to ascertain if any of these had any influence on overall measures of job satisfaction.

The validity of the JDI has been analyzed using a multi-trait, multi-method matrix. Convergent validation showed that the JDI measures and the following other measures of job satisfaction produced the same results, i.e., the same assessments of job satisfaction: graphic ratings, interview ratings, and a "Faces" scale. (Respondents are given six faces and asked to check which indicated their feelings about their job, in general.)
Discriminant validation showed that each of the five scales on the JDI are distinct from each other.

The reliability was computed using a split half correlation technique. Although the reliability of each scale of the JDI varies, the average correlation coefficient is .85. Among recent empirical studies using the JDI is Hall and Schneider's study, Organizational Climate and Careers: The Work Lives of Priests, 1973.
PROFESSIONALIZATION INSTRUMENTS

It was not until 1968 that an operational definition of professionalization that could facilitate theory construction was formulated. Richard Hall, taking into account the contribution of Wilensky (who formulated and empirically tested the structural aspects of occupations as they move along the continuum to professionalization), developed a scale for measuring the attitudinal aspects of members of these occupational groups.

The attitudinal attributes considered by Hall are as follows:

1. The use of the professional organization as a major reference--this involves both the formal organization and informal colleague groupings as the major source of ideas and judgments for the professional in his work.

2. A belief in service to the public--this component includes the idea of the indispensability of the profession and the view that the work performed benefits both the public and the practitioner.

3. Belief in self-regulation--this involves the belief that the person best qualified to judge the work is a fellow professional and the view that such a practice is desirable and practical. It is a belief in colleague and not client control.

4. A sense of calling to the field--this reflects the dedication of the professional to his work and the feeling that he would probably want to do the work, even if fewer extrinsic rewards were available.

5. Autonomy--this involves the feeling that the practitioner ought to be able to make his own decisions without external pressures from clients, those who are not members of his profession or from his employing organization.

The combination of the structural measures of professionalization formulated by Wilensky and the attitudinal measure of Hall serve as the basis for the general professional model.

Hall used Likert scaling procedures to formulate ten items to measure each of the five attributes of professionalism mentioned above.
However, in 1972, Snizek used orthogonal rotations to factor analyze the items on the five separate scales. He concluded that at least half of the fifty items formulated by Hall have less than the acceptable factor loadings on the appropriate theoretical dimensions.

The criticisms Snizek has of Hall's scales are that some items have little if any fit within any of the five theoretical dimensions. Also some of the items appear empirically to correspond to several dimensions and as such to contribute to the empirical overlap of the scales. Other items have high factor loadings on dimensions other than those originally intended.

Snizek proposed a shorter 25 item version of the professionalism scale which would take into account these deficiencies. His work had led him to the conclusion that there was not a substantial reduction in the proportion of the variance explained when the number of items was reduced from 50 to 25.

In a subsequent comment on Snizek's empirical reassessment, Fox and Vonk (1974) are critical of Snizek's deleting half the items from the scale. Their criticisms center essentially on the fact that the results of the factor analysis may be unique to the interaction of the items and populations under consideration. That is, there may be great enough differences between Hall's data and Snizek's data to invalidate Snizek's assessment across both sets of data.

Since, at present, the issue of which scale is a better measure of professionalism has not been resolved, this dissertation will make use of the shorter form, that is, Snizek's revised form, in order to increase the response rate.
A random sample of 330 rehab facilities (15%) was drawn through the use of a random number table from a list of workshops compiled by the Wage and Hour Division of the U.S. Department of Labor. This list is comprised of those workshops who use wage incentives in conjunction with their work adjustment programs. The application to the Wage and Hour Division is mandated by law if the average hourly rate of the incentive is less than the legal minimum rate (which it almost always is in rehab workshops). Since work adjustment is a basic distinguishing factor of rehab counseling (distinguishing it from counseling and social work) and since the number of workshops in the list corresponds to the number of workshops estimated to be in existence by Nelson (1971) in the same year, this list was regarded to be the total population of workshops in the U.S.

One questionnaire was sent to each of the directors of the randomly drawn workshops, with the instructions to distribute it to the rehab counselor whose name was alphabetically first in his or her facility. A self-addressed stamped envelop was provided so that the counselor could return it directly to the researcher. The rationale for the use of this list was that it was thought to be a more representative of rehab counselors than lists of counselors from a professional organization, who were probably biased with respect to the professionalism variable.

A total of 133 usable questionnaires were returned in time for the
Two additional questionnaires were received after the data analysis was completed. This represents a response rate of 40.9%.

The completed questionnaires were tabulated and coded and analyzed through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. The statistical techniques used to analyze the data depended on the nature of the data. Since the sample was a large, random one of the whole population, normal distribution was assumed. In addition, whenever the data were interval, Pearsonian correlations were computed. Gamma and Phi or Cramer's V were used when it was necessary to compute measures of association between ordered and unordered classes of data respectively, based on a Chi-Square distribution (Hays, 1976).

Two distinct aspects of organizational climate were of concern in this study—objective and subjective or perceptual. Questions related to size in terms of number of clients, number of staff, sources of funding were used to obtain measures of objective climate. Likert's Climate Instrument was used to assess subjective climate.

Other variables included were job satisfaction and professionalism. Job satisfaction was measured by Smith's Job Description Index (JDI). Professionalism in terms of professional behaviors were obtained through questions such as "Do you belong to professional organizations?", "Do you attend professional meetings?" Professional attitudes were measured through the use of Snizek's refinement of R. Hall's Professionalism Instrument.

The sociological problem that was addressed was whether there were differences in the organizational climates of the rehabilitation workshops that affect the job satisfaction and professionalism of the rehab counselors. Also of concern was whether there were basic demographic differences that would result in differences in job satisfaction and professionalism.
DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSES TO SUBJECTIVE
ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE VARIABLES

The attention of the reader is directed to Table 14 in this chapter, in which are summarized the responses to these variables, to the appendix which contains both the actual questionnaire, and to Figure II, which is the sources of data by kind of variable. The Likert measure of subjective organizational climate used in this dissertation contains six scales of subcomponents: (1) leadership; (2) motivation; (3) communication; (4) decision; (5) goals; and (6) controls.

Each question had four major gradations, corresponding to Likert's System I--Exploitative Authoritative to Systems IV--Participative. Within each major gradation are five sub-gradations. Thus, a possible range of 20 exists for each question. Scales consisting of two questions have a possible range of 40, scales consisting of three questions have a possible range of 60, and so forth. (The actual instrument appears in the Questionnaire, which is in the Appendix.)

The organizational variable leadership was based upon the following questions:

1. How much confidence and trust is shown in subordinates?
2. How free do they feel to talk to superiors about job?
3. How often are ideas sought and used constructively?

The possible responses based on a 20-point Likert scale ranged from "virtually none" to "a great deal," "not very free" to "very free" and "seldom" to "very frequently," respectively. The minimum possible score was 0 and the maximum possible was 60. The subjects' actual scores ranged
from a minimum of eight to the maximum of 60. The mean was 36.65 and the 
standard deviation 11.52. Approximately 50% of the subjects scored 37 or 
below and 75% of the subjects scored 46 or below (See Table 14).

The next subjective organizational variable was motivation. The 
three questions which comprised the motivation scale were:

1. Is predominant use made of (1) fear, (2) threats, (3) punish-
ment, (4) rewards, (5) involvement?

2. Where is responsibility felt for achieving the organization's 
goals?

3. How much cooperative teamwork exists?

The possible responses on the scale ranged from "motivation based on fear, 
punishment and threats" to "rewards based on involvement" for question 
number one; "mostly at top" to "at all levels" for question number two; 
and "very little" to "a great deal" for question number three. The posi-
ble range of response was again from zero to 60. The actual range was four 
to 57 with a mean of 34.53 and a standard deviation of 12.07. Fifty per-
cent of the subjects scored 34 or below and 75% of the subjects 44 or below.

The third organizational variable, communication, consisted of the 
following four questions:

1. What is the usual direction of information flow?

2. How is downward communication accepted?

3. How accurate is upward communication?

4. How well do superiors know problems faced by subordinates?

The possible responses were from "downward" to "down, up and sideways" 
for question number one; "with suspicion" to "with a perceptive mind" for 
question number two; "usually inaccurate" to "almost always accurate" for 
question number three; and "not very well" to "very well" for question 
number four. On the four 20-part Likert scales, it was possible to score 
zero to 80. The actual scores range from a minimum of 10 to a maximum of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>Range Possible</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>50% Score</th>
<th>75% Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>8-60</td>
<td>36.65</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>4-57</td>
<td>34.53</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0-80</td>
<td>10-74</td>
<td>48.05</td>
<td>13.96</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>3-57</td>
<td>34.29</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>5-37</td>
<td>23.24</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>3-58</td>
<td>36.71</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean was 48.05, and the standard deviation 13.96. The score at which 50% scored that score or below is 50 and the score for 75% of the subjects was 58 or below.

The fourth subjective organizational variable was decisions. The three items in the decisions scale were:

1. At what level are decisions made?
2. Are subordinates involved in decisions related to their work?
3. What does the decision-making process contribute to motivation?

The responses possible on the 20-part Likert scale for each question were as follows: Answers to Question #1 were: "Mostly at the top" to "throughout but well integrated." Question #2 answers were: "Almost never" to "fully involved." The answers to Question #3 were: "Not very much" to "substantial contribution."

The possible range for the scores on this scale was from zero to 60. The actual range scored by the subjects was from three to 57. The mean score was 34.29, with a standard deviation of 11.39. Fifty per cent of the subjects scored at least 34, and 75% scored at least 43.

Goals were the fifth variable in the measure of subjective organizational climate. Only two questions comprised the measure. They are:

1. How are organizational goals established?
2. How much covert resistance to goals is present?

The responses possible are "orders issued" to "by group action" for question number one and "strong resistance" to "little or none" for question number two. The possible range of scores is zero to 40. The actual range was from five to 37. The mean was 23.24 and the standard deviation 7.37. Fifty per cent of the subjects scored 22 or less, and 75% of the subjects scored 30 or less.
Control was the sixth and final subjective organizational variable. The three questions in this scale were:

1. How concentrated are review and control functions?
2. Is there an informal organizational resisting the formal one?
3. What are cost, productivity, and other control data used for?

The possible responses were as follows: Question #1: "Very high at the top" to "widely shared". The answers that were possible to Question #2 were: "Yes" to "No--same goals as formal." The responses to Question #3 were: "Policing, punishment" to "self-guidance, problem-solving."

The possible range of responses was from zero to 60. The actual range scored by the subjects is from three to 58. The mean score was 36.71, with a standard deviation of 10.52. The 50% score was 37, and the 75% score was 43.
DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSES TO
JOB SATISFACTION VARIABLES

The Smith Job Description Index used in this dissertation contained five scales: (1) satisfaction with work (18 items); (2) satisfaction with supervision (18 items); (3) satisfaction with pay (9 items); (4) satisfaction with promotions (9 items); (5) satisfaction with co-workers (18 items). The format of the index was one in which the subjects were asked to respond "yes" if an item describes his or her present job; "No" if it does not, and "?" if he or she cannot decide. The scoring was such that three points were scored for a "Yes" to a positively worded item or "No" to a negatively worded item. One point was scored for a "?" response and zero was scored if the response was "Yes" to a negatively worded item or "No" to a positively worded item. The theoretical justification for this scoring may be found in Smith, et.al., 1969. Hence, the possible range of scores was from zero to 54 for the 18 item scales and zero to 27 for the nine item scales. The attention of the reader is directed to the Appendix, which contains both the actual questionnaire, and to Figure 2--the sources of data by kind of variable, which is in Chapter 6. In addition, the reader should note Table 15 in this chapter which is a summary of responses to questions comprising the job satisfaction variable.

The items in the satisfaction with work scale are:

Fascinating
Routine
Satisfying
Boring
Good
Creative
Respected
Hot
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Range Possible</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>50% Score</th>
<th>75% Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Work</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0-54</td>
<td>4-54</td>
<td>37.98</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Supervision</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0-54</td>
<td>3-54</td>
<td>42.48</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Pay</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0-27</td>
<td>1-27</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Promotions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0-27</td>
<td>0-27</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Co-workers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0-54</td>
<td>3-54</td>
<td>43.52</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pleasant
Useful
Tiresome
Healthful
Challenging
On your feet
Frustrating
Simple
Endless
Gives sense of accomplishment

The possible range was zero to 54 and the actual range on this scale was from four to 54 with a mean of 37.98 and a standard deviation of 9.26. Fifty per cent of the subjects scored 38 or below and 75% scored 44 or below.

The items in the satisfaction with supervision scale were:

Asks my advice
Hard to please
Impolite
Praises good work
Tactful
Influential
Up-to-date
Doesn't supervise enough
Quick tempered
Tells me where I stand
Annoying
Stubborn
Knows job well
Bad
Intelligent
Leaves me on my own
Lazy
Around when needed

The possible range on this scale was from zero to 54, while the actual range observed was three to 54. The mean score was 42.48, and the standard deviation was 11.95. Fifty per cent of the subjects scored at least 45, and 75% scored at least 51.

The nine items which comprised the satisfaction with pay scale were as follows:

Income adequate for normal expenses
Satisfactory profit sharing
Barely live on income
Bad
Income provides luxuries
Insecure
Less than I deserve
Highly paid
Underpaid

The possible range on this scale was zero to 27, while the range of scores scored by the subjects was from one to 27. The mean score was 12.84 and the standard deviation was 6.35. The 50% score was 12 and the 75% score was 18.

The fourth scale in the JDI is satisfaction with promotions. The nine items in this scale were:

Good opportunity for advancement
Opportunity somewhat limited
Promotion on ability
Dead end job
Good chance for promotion
Unfair promotion policy
Infrequent promotions
Regular promotions
Fairly good chance for promotion

Both the possible and actual range on this scale were zero to 27. It was interesting to note that more subjects either failed to respond to this scale or scored zero on this variable than on any other. The mean score, excluding the zero scores, was 10.06. The standard deviation was 7.39. The 50% score was nine and the 75% score was 18.

The final scale in the job satisfaction variable was satisfaction with co-workers. The 18 items in this scale were:

Stimulating
Boring
Slow
Ambitious
Stupid
Responsible
Fast
Intelligent
Easy to make enemies
Talk too much
The possible range in this 18 item scale was from zero to 54. The actual range was three to 54. The mean was 43.52 and the standard deviation was 10.05. Fifty per cent of the subjects scored 45 and below, and 75% scored 51 and below.

Satisfaction with co-workers had the absolute highest score, thus indicating a high degree of satisfaction with co-workers. Satisfaction with supervision (who might also be viewed as co-workers) was second highest and fairly close in value (mean of 42 vs. mean of 43 for co-workers); but the latter had a higher standard deviation, indicating greater variability in the responses to satisfaction with supervision.
DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSES TO THE
PROFESSIONALISM VARIABLES

In contrast to the earlier discussion of professional behavior (i.e., do you belong to the professional organization? read the journals?, etc.), this variable is attitudinal. The questions were such as "how do you feel about...?," some aspect of the profession. Snizek's refinement of Hall's professionalism scale contains five sub-scales: (1) belief in self-regulation; (2) belief in public services; (3) belief in autonomy; (4) belief in professional organization as a major referent; and (5) sense of calling to the field. Again, the attention of the reader is directed to the Appendix for the questionnaire and to Chapter 6 for the sources of data by variable and to Table 16 in this chapter wherein the responses to this variable are summarized.

The first sub-scale, belief in self-regulation, with which the respondents were asked to agree or disagree on a five-point Likert-scale, contains the following items:

1. My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence (6).
2. A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing (13).
3. We really have no way of judging each other's competence (16).
4. There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work (20).
5. My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work (23).

(The number in parenthesis following each statement refers to the item number on the professionalism questionnaire.) The possible range of scores
### TABLE 16

**DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSES TO PROFESSIONALISM VARIABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Range Possible</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>50% Score</th>
<th>75% Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belief in self-regulation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>8-25</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in public service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>5-22</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>7-25</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional organization as referent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>7-24</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of calling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>15.44</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is five to 25, while the actual range was eight to 25. The mean was 17.43 and the standard deviation was 3.35. Fifty per cent of the respondents scored at least 17 and 75% scored at least 20.

Belief in public service was the second sub-scale. It contains the following five items:

1. Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine (2).

2. I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society (5).

3. The importance of my profession is sometimes over-stressed (8).

4. Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine (12).

5. If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one (22).

The actual scores on this sub-scale ranged from five to 22. The mean score was 15.16 and the standard deviation was 3.27. Fifty per cent of the rehabilitation counselors in the study scored at least 15, and 75% scored at least 17.

The five questions which comprised the belief in autonomy scale were:

1. I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work (3).

2. I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment (10).

3. My own decision are subject to review (19).

4. I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation (21).

5. Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people (25).

The actual scores scored on this sub-scale ranged from seven to 25. The mean score was 17.16 and the standard deviation was 3.14. The score at which 50% of the subjects scored that number or below was 17 and the score at which 75% scored that number or below was 19.
The fourth sub-scale was belief in the professional organization as the major referent. The five items in this scale to which the subjects could respond on a five-part Likert scale were:

1. I systematically read the professional journals (1).
2. I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level (4).
3. I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported (11).
4. The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member (15).
5. Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often (17).

The actual range of scores was from seven to 24. The mean was 16.20, with a somewhat high standard deviation of 3.57. The 50% score was 16 and the 75% score was 19.

The fifth and final sub-scale of Snizek's professionalism scale was sense of calling. The five items which make up this scale included:

1. People in this profession have a real calling for their work (7).
2. The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying (9).
3. It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field (14).
4. Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced (18).
5. There are very few people who don't really believe in their work (24).

The actual range of scores varied from a low of five to a high of 25. The subjects' mean score on this sub-scale was 15.44 with a standard deviation of 3.43. The score at which 50% of the subjects scored at least that score or below was 15. The score at which 75% scored that score or below was 18.
This study contains five kinds of variables: (1) objective climate variables, (2) subjective climate variables, (3) job satisfaction variables, (4) professionalism variables, and (5) demographic variables. The attention of the reader is directed to Figures 1 and 2 (in this chapter), which are the model and the list of the data sources, and to the actual questionnaire which appears in the Appendix.

There are three types of relationships hypothesized from the model: (1) the interactions of objective and subjective measures of organizational climate; (2) the relationship of subjective measures of climate to both job satisfaction and professionalism; and (3) the relationship of demographic variables to both job satisfaction and professionalism. The questions that this study has sought to answer are: (1) are there relationships between the objective and subjective climate in rehab workshops?; (2) are there relationships between subjective climate and job satisfaction, professional attitudes and professional behaviors of rehab counselors?; (3) are there relationships between demographic characteristics of rehab counselors and their job satisfactions and professional attitudes and behaviors?

Objective and Subjective Climate Relationships

The first section of the data analysis examined the first set of
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IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE
ON JOB SATISFACTION AND PROFESSIONALISM
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- Belief in public service
- Belief in self-regulation
- Sense of calling to field
- Autonomy

BEHAVIOR
- Memberships
- Meeting attendance
- Review of Literature
- Continuing education
FIGURE 2

SOURCES OF DATA

OBJECTIVE STRUCTURAL VARIABLES

1. Size--number of clients and number of staff (#11)
2. Kinds of clients--kinds of disabilities (#12)
3. Type of funding--public, private, parents, mixed (#13)
4. Number of clients/counselor (#14)
5. Locus of decisions on client care--counselor, director, doctor, parents, or client (#15)

SUBJECTIVE PERCEPTUAL VARIABLES

1. Leadership--confidence and trust in subordinates, free flow of discussion, soliciting of subordinates' ideas (#1, 2, 3 Likert)
2. Motivation--use of fear, threats, punishment, rewards or involvement; location of responsibility; teamwork (#4, 5, 6 Likert)
3. Communication--flow of information, acceptance of downward communication, accuracy of upward communication, superiors' knowledge of subordinates' problems (#7, 8, 9, 10 Likert)
4. Decision--level, involvement of subordinates, extent of contribution to motivation (#11, 12, 13 Likert)
5. Goals--establishment, resistance (#15, 16 Likert)
6. Control--location and concentration of control function, resistance of formal organization by informal one, use of control data (#16, 17, 18 Likert)

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

1. Age--(#1)
2. Race--(#2)
3. Sex--(#3)
4. Level of education (#4)
5. Appropriateness of education (#4)
6. Marital status (#5)
7. Significant others--personal influence of anyone on decision to enter rehab counseling (#6)
8. Years in field (#7)
9. Career commitment (#8, 9)
10. Role conflict--individuals or situations causing stress (#10)

JOB SATISFACTION

1. Satisfaction with work--Smith
2. Satisfaction with pay--Smith
3. Satisfaction with co-workers--Smith
4. Satisfaction with advancement--Smith
5. Satisfaction with supervision--Smith

PROFESSIONALISM--ATTITUDES

1. Professional organization as major referent--(#1, 4, 11, 15, 17 Snizek)
2. Belief in public service--(#2, 5, 8, 12, 22 Snizek)
4. Sense of calling to field--(#7, 9, 14, 18, 24 Snizek)
5. Autonomy--(#3, 10, 19, 21, 25 Snizek)

PROFESSIONALISM--BEHAVIOR

1. Memberships--memberships in professional organizations (#17)
2. Meeting attendance--(#18)
3. Review of the literature--(#19)
4. Continuing education--(#20)

Numbers in parentheses refer to the question number on the questionnaire.
hypotheses—the relationship between objective and subjective measures of climate. In general, what is of concern is whether there is a relationship between such objective climate variables as number of clients, number of staff, size of client caseload (clients per counselor), whether the final decision for client care was outside of the scope of the rehab counselor and public vs. non-public funding and of the workshops and subjective organizational climate. Likert's (1967) subjective measures of climate was used. It includes the sub-scales trust in leadership, motivation based on reward and involvement, pervasive communication, participation in decision-making, mutuality in goals and controls being used for self-improvement. (The components of the subjective measures of climate are fully described elsewhere in the section of this dissertation entitled "Description of Responses to Subjective Organizational Climate Variables."

It was hypothesized that rehab counselors in larger facilities, in terms of number of clients and number of staff, would be in the highly professionalized kind of organization which Likert calls "System 4"—Participative" (vs. System 1—Exploitative Authoritative, System 2—Benevolent Authoritative, Systems 3—Consultative). Hence, these rehab counselors would be expected to have high scores with respect to trust in leadership, motivation based on rewards, pervasive communication, participation in decision-making, mutuality in goals and experience controls for self-improvement. However, as can be observed in Table 17, the relationships are virtually all in the opposite direction to the one hypothesized. Only the number of clients is consistently and statistically significant at a .05 level or beyond to all of the six subjective climate variables. Motivation based on rewards showed a relationship to number of clients,
TABLE 17
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIZE OF REHAB WORKSHOP
AND SUBJECTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Climate--Components of Subscales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership--How much confidence and trust is shown in subordinates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How free do they feel to talk to superiors about job?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are subordinate's ideas sought and used constructively?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation--Is predominant use made of (1) fear, (2) threats, (3) punishment, (4) rewards, (5) involvement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is responsibility felt for achieving organization's goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much cooperative teamwork exists?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication--What is the usual direction of information flow?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is downward communication accepted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How accurate is upward communication?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions--At what level are decisions made?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are subordinates involved in decisions related to their work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does decision making process contribute to motivation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals--How are organizational goals established?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much covert resistance to goals is present?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control--How concentrated are review and control functions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there an informal organization resisting the formal one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are cost, productivity and other control data used for?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF CLIENTS</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Leadership</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>.0005*</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation Based on Reward and Involvement</td>
<td>-.2649</td>
<td>.0017*</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervasiveness of Communications</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.0005*</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Decisions</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.0003*</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality of Goals</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.024*</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.033*</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF STAFF</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Leadership</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation Based on Reward and Involvement</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervasiveness of Communications</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Decisions</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality of Goals</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also of concern is the relationship between the size of client case-load (clients per counselor) and subjective climate variables. These were hypothesized to be negatively related, inasmuch as rehab counselors with large caseloads would perceive the climate in their organizations to be System 2--Benevolent Authoritative or less. Climates would be perceived as being low in trust in leadership, low in motivation based on reward, low in pervasive communication, low in participation in decisions, low in mutuality of goals, and low in controls for self-improvement. This might in part be due to lack of time for participation, but also due to an accurate perception of the kinds of administrative practices existing in the organization and resulting in large caseloads. Five of these relationships were statistically significant at the .05 level or beyond, with the exception of the use of controls for self-improvement which was not statistically related (see Tables 18 and 19). However, the absolute size of the correlation coefficients, especially the relationship of trust in leadership and mutuality of goals does not explain more than 5% of the variance ($r^2$). Values of $r$ or of gamma of less than .3 are considered to be low, .3 to .5 are considered to be moderate and above .5 are considered to be high.

Whether the counselor had the final decision regarding client care was also hypothesized to have a positive relationship to perception of organizational climate. The more the decision was outside of the rehab counselor, the less participative he or she would perceive the climate. The counselor would have low scores on the trust in leadership, motivation based on rewards, pervasive communication, participation in decisions, mutuality in goals and controls used for self-improvement. Twenty-nine of the counselors indicated that they had the final decision with respect to client care; an additional 69 counselors participated in the decision
### TABLE 18

**SIZE OF CLIENT CASELOAD AND PERVERSIVENESS OF COMMUNICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERVERSIVENESS OF COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>1 - 42</th>
<th>43 +</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 5.07, p = .023$
TABLE 19
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIZE OF CLIENT CASELOAD
AND SUBJECTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Leadership</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation Based on Reward and Involvement</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.008*</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervasiveness of Communications</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.0007*</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Decisions</td>
<td>-.2827</td>
<td>.0007*</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality of Goals</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.046*</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Climate--Components of Subscales
Leadership--How much confidence and trust is shown in subordinates?
How free do they feel to talk to superiors about job?
How often are subordinate's ideas sought and used constructively?
Motivation--Is predominant use made of (1) fear, (2) threats, (3) punishment, (4) rewards, (5) involvement?
Where is responsibility felt for achieving organization's goals?
How much cooperation teamwork exists?
Communication--What is the usual direction of information flow?
How is downward communication accepted?
How accurate is upward communication?
Decisions--At what level are decisions made?
Are subordinates involved in decisions related to their work?
What does decision making process contribute to motivation?
Goals--How are organizational goals established?
How much covert resistance to goals is present?
Control--How concentrated are review and control functions?
Is there an informal organization resisting the formal one?
What are cost, productivity and other control data used for?
but it was not their decision entirely; and 39 counselors did not participate at all in the final decision related to client care. However, none of the subjective climate variables were related at a .05 level to the locus of decisions for client care (see Table 20).

A hypothesized relationship about the heterogeneity of client group and the rehab counselors' perceptions of climate was untestable. This was due to the fact that almost all the facilities in the sample were heterogeneous with respect to their disabilities; i.e., most facilities had a mix of clients within the facility.

Public funding of the workshops was also hypothesized to be related to perception of low levels of participation—low scores on the subjective climate variables. The basic rationale for this hypothesis was that policies for these workshops were determined outside the administration of the facility. Hence, not only were the counselors not expected to perceive themselves as participating, but the administrators in the facilities were themselves, not participating. Thirty-one of the workshops in the sample were entirely publicly funded and 100 workshops in the sample had a mix of funding sources—public, parents, grants, and private contributions.

Although none of the hypothesized relationships was significant at the conventional maximum level of significance of .05, two of the relationships approached this level and are worthy of note. There were apparently, but not surprisingly, some negative relationships between both pervasiveness of communication and mutuality of goals in those workshops which were publicly funded (see Table 21).

The findings in this section only partially support previous research on the relationship between bureaucratization and perceptions of climate. Although Stimson and LaBelle (1971), George and Bishop (1971), Payne and
### Table 20

**Relationship Between Locus of Decision for Client Care and Subjective Organizational Climate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Locus Outside of Counselor</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation Based on Rewards and Involvement</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervasiveness of Communications</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Decisions</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality of Goals</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 127 or 128)

**Organizational Climate—Components of Subscales**
- **Leadership**—How much confidence and trust is shown in subordinates?
- How free do they feel to talk to superiors about job?
- How often are subordinate's ideas sought and used constructively?
- **Motivation**—Is predominant use made of (1) fear, (2) threats, (3) punishment, (4) rewards, (5) involvement?
- Where is responsibility felt for achieving organization's goals?
- How much cooperative teamwork exists?
- **Communication**—What is the usual direction of information flow?
- How is downward communication accepted?
- How accurate is upward communication?
- **Decisions**—At what level are decisions made?
- Are subordinates involved in decisions related to their work?
- What does decision making process contribute to motivation?
- **Goals**—How are organizational goals established?
- How much covert resistance to goals is present?
- **Control**—How concentrated are review and control functions?
- Is there an informal organization resisting the formal one?
- What are cost, productivity and other control data used for?
TABLE 21
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PUBLIC SOURCE OF FUNDING AND
SUBJECTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Leadership</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation Based on Rewards and Involvement</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pervasiveness of Communications</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Decisions</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality of Goals</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls for Self-Improvement</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( N = 131 or 132 )

Organizational Climate--Components of Subscales
Leadership--How much confidence and trust is shown in subordinates?
How free do they feel to talk to superiors about job?
How often are subordinate's ideas sought and used constructively?
Motivation--Is predominant use made of (1) fear, (2) threats, (3) punishment, (4) rewards, (5) involvement?
Where is responsibility felt for achieving organization's goals?
How much cooperative teamwork exists?
Communication--What is the usual direction of information flow?
How is downward communication accepted?
How accurate is upward communication?
Decisions--At what level are decisions made?
Are subordinates involved in decisions related to their work?
What does decision making process contribute to motivation?
Goals--How are organizational goals established?
How much covert resistance to goals is present?
Control--How concentrated are review and control functions?
Is there an informal organization resisting the formal one?
What are cost, productivity and other control data used for?
Phesey (1971) and Marrow, Bowers and Seashore (1967) all found perceived degree of bureaucratization influenced employees' perception of climate, the present study found this relationship to exist only for number of clients and size of client caseload. Although it was recognized that size was not the only measure of bureaucratization, others were not tested in this study.

The present research also fails to confirm the recent work of Gavin (1975), which found a high positive correlation between the two distinct measures of organizational climate.

Subjective Climate and Job Satisfaction and Professionalism

The second section of data analysis discusses the relationships between subjective organizational climate and both job satisfaction and professionalism (both attitudes and behavior). Included in the job satisfaction scale were the subscales of satisfaction with work, pay, co-workers, advancement and supervision. These are the JDI subscales as developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969). (This scale is more fully discussed in the sections of this dissertation entitled "Description of Responses to Job Satisfaction Variables," and in the section "Job Satisfaction Instruments," especially the part about the JDI.)

Included in the professional attitudes are the professional organization as the major referent, belief in public service, belief in self-regulation and autonomy. This instrument is Snizek's (1972) modification of Hall's professionalism measure and is more fully discussed in the sections of this dissertation entitled "Description of Responses to the Professionalism Variables" and "Professionalization Instruments."

The components of the professional behavior variable are memberships in professional organizations, attendance at professional meetings,
review of professional literature and continual participation in professional education.

A distinction between the two dependent variables, job satisfaction, and professionalism, needs to be highlighted. Job satisfaction is an attitudinal variable and, as operationally defined in this dissertation, relates to satisfaction with phenomena that are internal to the employing organization. The professionalism variable contains two components, one attitudinal and one behavioral. These attitudes and behaviors are related to phenomena entirely outside the employing organization.

Morrissey and Gillespie (1975), among others, note that the bureaucratic and the professional organizations differ. Factors related to job satisfaction (bureaucratic organization) could not necessarily be expected to be related to professional attitudes and behavior (professional organization).

It was hypothesized that there were positive relationships between all the subjective climate variables and all the job satisfaction variables. Rehab counselors experiencing a Systems 4 Participative Climate (Likert, 1967) would also have high levels of job satisfaction. These relationships were in fact observed in the sample. Consistently high correlations were obtained for all the interrelationships between subjective organizational climate and all the measures of job satisfaction. In fact, many were at gammas of .40 and above and were significant at beyond a .0001 level (see Table 22).

The highest interrelationships were between the subjective measures of climate and satisfaction with work and with supervision (gammas of .45 to .54). This can be explained in part by considering why there is a lesser (although still a statistically significant) relationship with
### TABLE 22

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUBJECTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AND JOB SATISFACTION (PEARSON CORRELATIONS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Co-Workers</th>
<th>Advancement</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust in Leadership</strong></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation Based on Rewards and Involvement</strong></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pervasiveness of Communications</strong></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation in Decisions</strong></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mutuality of Goals</strong></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls for Self-Improvement</strong></td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ p > .01 \text{ for all intercorrelations} \]

**Job Satisfaction—Components of Subscales**
- Work: Fascinating, routine, satisfying, boring, good, creative, respected, hot, pleasant, useful, tiresome, healthful, challenging, on your feet, frustrating, simple, endless, gives sense of accomplishment.
- Supervision: Asks my advice, hard to please, immodest, praises good work, tactful, influential, up-to-date, doesn't supervise enough, quick-tempered, tells me where I stand, annoying, stubborn, knows job well, bad, intelligent, leaves me on my own, lazy, around when needed.
- Pay: Income adequate for normal expenses, satisfactory profit sharing, safely live on income, bad, income provides luxuries, insecure, less than I deserve, highly paid, underpaid.
- Promotions: Good opportunity for advancement, opportunity somewhat limited, promotion on ability, dead end job, good chance for promotion, unfair promotion policy, infrequent promotion, regular promotions, fairly good chance for promotion.
- Co-Workers: Stimulating, slow, ambitious, stupid, responsible, fast, intelligent, easy to make enemies, talk too much, smart, lazy, unpleasant, no privacy, active, narrow interests, loyal, hard to meet.

**Organizational Climate—Components of Subscales**
- Leadership: How much confidence and trust is shown in subordinates?
- How free do they feel to talk to superiors about job?
- How often are subordinate's ideas sought and used constructively?
- Motivation: Is predominant use made of (1) fear, (2) threats, (3) punishment, (4) rewards, (5) involvement?
- Where is responsibility felt for achieving organization's goals?
- How much cooperative teamwork exists?
- Communication: What is the usual direction of information flow?
- How is downward communication accepted?
- How accurate is upward communication?
- Decisions: At what level are decisions made?
- Are subordinates involved in decisions related to their work?
- What does decision making process contribute to motivation?
- Goals: How are organizational goals established?
- How much covert resistance to goals is present?
- Control: How concentrated are review and control functions?
- Is there an informal organization resisting the formal one?
- What are cost, productivity and other control data used for?
the other three job satisfaction variables. Subjective organizational climate variables are not as related to satisfaction with pay in that rehab counselors probably do not enter the field with expectations of high pay (gammas of .17 to .25). Additionally, given the nature of compensation systems in social service agencies, especially private agencies, they do not expect (nor do they probably receive) systematic increments. Hence, satisfaction with pay is less salient to them.

The lower, although significant, relationship between the climate variables and satisfaction with co-workers (gammas of .18 to .35), can probably be explained by the limited amount of interactions with co-workers. Satisfaction with opportunities for advancement was also thought to be less salient in that, in general, if one advances in a rehab workshop, one no longer is involved directly with the rehabilitation of clients (gamma of .24 to .37).

These findings confirm many early findings on the relationship between climate and job satisfaction. The present findings somewhat confirm Dunn, Allen, and Miller's (1973) finding of high levels of satisfaction with intrinsic factors of the job experience by rehab counselors, especially satisfaction with work. Smit's and Aiken's (1969) finding about rehab counselors' satisfaction with supervision being related to perception of openness (participativeness) in climate was decidedly confirmed. They, however, did not consider the interrelationships between climate and satisfaction.

Many studies, not on the present occupational group, but relating organization climate to job satisfaction were also confirmed. These include the studies by Friedlander and Margulies (1969), Kaczka and Kirk (1968), Schneider (1973), Cawsey (1973), Pritchard and Karasick (1973), Litwin and Stringer (1968), Schneider and Snyder (1975) and Shapiro,
Schwartz, and Moscato (1976). What the present study adds is that the way in which a "professional" individual experiences climate and its impact on the job satisfaction is the same as for non-professional and/or managerial individuals. Perceptions of climate are positively related to job satisfaction for both kinds of individuals.

It might also be conjunctured that Seashore and Taber's (1975) point that the antecedent conditions leading to job satisfaction are not usually well-known, is perhaps in part known for this sample group. Given the two findings of (1) a negative relationship between number of clients in the facility, size of client caseload, and the subjective climate variables, and (2) the positive relationship between job satisfaction and the subjective climate variables, an antecedent condition to job satisfaction in the present study could be the low number of clients and low caseload in the facility.

Another contribution made by the present study is perhaps a negative methodological one. The consistently high correlations between the climate and satisfaction variables perhaps add to the critics of the construct of organizational climate who consider the two variables to be overlapping and redundant (Guion, 1973; Jahannesson, 1971, 1973). This researcher does not attribute this to two of the usual reasons given: (1) culling of climate items from satisfaction scales or (2) similar methods of measurement. Rather, it is the problem of one's job satisfaction (attitudinal) having an impact on one's perception of climate (descriptive in intent, but attitudinal in assessment by the individual).

Also of concern in this dissertation were the relationships between subjective climate and professionalism, both professional attitudes and professional behavior. It was hypothesized that there was a positive relationship between perception of a Systems 4 participative climate and
both holding professional attitudes and engaging in professional behavior.

As can be observed in Tables 23-32, the hypotheses about professional attitudes are for the most part confirmed. Perceptions of climate are related to professional attitudes. The two exceptions are the relationships between belief in self-regulation and both participation in decision-making and mutuality of goals. Apparently, the attitude belief in self-regulation (i.e., by the profession) is held, regardless of whether the rehab counselor perceives high or low participation in decision-making in employing organizations (Table 26), and whether the rehab counselor perceives high or low mutuality of goals with respect to the employing organization (Table 28).

Perhaps the most unanticipated findings of this dissertation were the lack of significant relationships between the subjective climate variables and professional behaviors. There were virtually no statistically significant relationships between subjective organizational climate and professional behaviors. This confirms a whole body of sociological literature on all kinds of subjects, indicating that attitudes do not always result in behavior.

The two relationships that were significant warrant additional discussion. There was a positive relationship between review of professional literature and the attitude about organization climate in which controls are used for self-improvement (rather than for rewards and punishment). Administrators can foster the professional behavior review of professional literature, if controls are used for self-improvement (Table 31).

Engaging in continual professional education was also significantly and positively related to a perception of organizational climate in which motivation is based on group reward and involvement, in contrast to moti-
### TABLE 23

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRUST IN LEADERSHIP AND PROFESSIONALISM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization as Referent</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.0171*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief In Public Service</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.0007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief In Self-Regulation</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense Of Calling To Field</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.0004*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professionalism--Components of Subscales**
- **Self-Regulation**—My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.
- A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing. We really have no way of judging each other's competence.
- There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work. My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work.
- **Belief In Public Service**—Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine. I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society. The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed. Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine. If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one.
- **Autonomy**—I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.
- I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment. My own decisions are subject to review. I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation. Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people.

**Professional Behavior**—I systematically read the professional journals. I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level. I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported. The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member. Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.

**Sense of Calling**—People in this profession have a real calling for their work. The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying. It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field. Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced. There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.

**Leadership**—How much confidence and trust is shown in subordinates? How free do they feel to talk to superiors about job? How often are subordinate's ideas sought and used constructively?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization as Referent</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling to Field</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAVIOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professionalism--Components of Subscales**

- **Self-Regulation**--My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence. A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing.
- We really have no way of judging each other's competence.
- There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work.
- My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work.
- **Belief in Public Service**--Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine.
- I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.
- The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed.
- Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine.
- If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one.
- **Autonomy**--I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.
- I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment.
- My own decisions are subject to review.
- I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.
- Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people.
- **Professional Behavior**--I systematically read the professional journals.
- I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level.
- I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported.
- The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member.
- Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.
- **Sense of Calling**--People in this profession have a real calling for their work.
- The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying.
- It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field.
- Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced.
- There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.

**Motivation**--is predominant use made of (1) fear, (2) threats, (3) punishment, (4) rewards, (5) involvement?
TABLE 25
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERVERSIVENESS OF
COMMUNICATIONS AND PROFESSIONALISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization as Referent</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.0063*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.0133*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling to Field</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.0018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.0015*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professionalism--Components of Subscales
Self-Regulation--My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.
A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing.
We really have no way of judging each other's competence.
There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work.
My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work.
Belief in Public Service--Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine.
I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.
The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed.
Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine.
If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one.
Autonomy--I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.
I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment.
My own decisions are subject to review.
I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.
Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people.
Professional Behavior--I systematically read the professional journals.
I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level.
I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported.
The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member.
Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.
Sense of Calling--People in this profession have a real calling for their work.
The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying.
It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field.
Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced.
There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.
Communiation--What is the usual direction of information flow?
How is downward communication accepted?
How accurate is upward communication?
TABLE 26
PARTICIPATION IN DECISIONS AND BELIEF IN SELF-REGULATION AMONG REHAB COUNSELORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPATION IN DECISIONS</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .30; p = .589 \]
TABLE 27

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARTICIPATION IN DECISIONS AND PROFESSIONALISM

ATTITUDES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ρ</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization as Referent</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling to Field</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BEHAVIOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professionalism--Components of Subscales

Belief in Public Service--Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine. The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed. Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine. If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one.

Belief in Self-Regulation--My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence. We really have no way of judging each other's competence. There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work. My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work.

Sense of Calling to Field--People in this profession have a real calling; for their work. The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying. It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field. Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced. There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.

Autonomy--I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work. I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment. My own decisions are subject to review. I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation. Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people. Professional Behavior--I systematically read the professional journals. I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level. I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported. The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member. Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.

Decisions--At what level are decisions made? Are subordinates involved in decisions related to their work? What does decision making process contribute to motivation?
TABLE 28
MUTUALITY OF GOALS AND BELIEF IN SELF-REGULATION OF REHAB COUNSELORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MUTUALITY OF GOALS</th>
<th>BELIEF IN SELF-REGULATION</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 0.30; p = 0.588 \]
### TABLE 29

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MUTUALITY OF GOALS AND PROFESSIONALISM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>(N=116-133)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as Referent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.025*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling to Field</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in Professional</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professionalism--Components of Subscales**
- **Self-Regulation**—My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence. A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing. We really have no way of judging each other's competence.
- **Belief in Public Service**—Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine. I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society. The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed.
- **Sense of Calling**—People in this profession have a real calling for their work. The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying. It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field. Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced.
- **Autonomy**—I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work. I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment. My own decisions are subject to review. I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.
- **Professional Behavior**—I systematically read the professional journals. I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level. I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported. The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member. Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.
- **Goals**—How are organizational goals established? How much covert resistance to goals is present?
## Table 30

Relationship Between Use of Controls for Self-Improvement and Professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization as Referent</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling to Field</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professionalism--Components of Subscales

**Self-Regulation**—My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence. A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing. We really have no way of judging each other's competence. There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work. My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work.

**Belief in Public Service**—Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine. I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society. The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed. Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine. If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one.

**Autonomy**—I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work. I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment. My own decisions are subject to review. I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation. Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people.

**Professional Behavior**—I systematically read the professional journals. I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level. I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported. The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member. Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.

**Sense of Calling**—People in this profession have a real calling for their work. The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying. It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field. Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced. There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.

**Control**—How concentrated are review and control functions? Is there an informal organization resisting the formal one? What are cost, productivity and other control data used for?
### TABLE 31

CONTROLS USED FOR SELF-IMPROVEMENT AND READ PROFESSIONAL LITERATURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTROLS FOR SELF-IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 5.54; \ p = .017 \]
vation based on fear or threats. Administrators who want to foster continual professional education should structure reward systems based on group reward and involvement. There is apparently peer influence (of peers within the employing organization) in encouraging the rehab counselors to engage in continual professional education (Table 32).

This researcher speculates that the reason why there are not other relationships between perception of organizational climate variables and professional behavior is that organizational resources are not readily available to support the counselors engaging in these professional behaviors. Hence, perceptions of organizational climate are unrelated to these behaviors. Although, as previously discussed, there was a high proportion of counselors indicating that they engaged in certain professional behaviors (53.4% attended professional meetings and 75.9% read professional literature).

It is difficult to relate the findings in this part of the data analysis to previous research inasmuch as the author's survey of the literature yielded very little research on this subject--the impact of the employing organization's climate on professional behavior, which occurs outside of the employing organization. The contribution made by the findings in this section of the study is that perceptions of climate do impact on professional attitudes, although not necessarily professional behavior.
### TABLE 32

**MOTIVATION BASED ON REWARD AND INVOLVEMENT AND ENGAGEMENT IN CONTINUAL PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIVATION BASED ON REWARD AND INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.98; \ p = .043 \]
Demographic Variables and Job Satisfaction and Professionalism

This third section of the data analysis deals with the relationships between various demographic variables and job satisfaction and professionalism.

It was hypothesized that age would be negatively related to all aspects of job satisfaction—work, pay, co-workers, advancement, and supervision. However, as can be observed in Table 33, satisfaction with work and pay is positively related to age, but all the other relationships are not significant. Perhaps, rehab counselors who are dissatisfied with the work and pay leave the field. Hence, the older ones who remain are more satisfied. This, taken in conjunction with the "reality shock" that is perhaps experienced by the younger counselors as they go from school to the job might explain the significance of the two relationships. These findings should be taken somewhat cautiously, however, in view of the relatively young average age of the counselors (34) and relatively few years of experience—48% of the sample had had three or fewer years of experience in the field.

No differences in any of the aspects of job satisfaction due to the sex of the counselor was hypothesized. However, as can be observed in Table 34, female counselors were significantly less satisfied with their supervisors than were male counselors. Perhaps rehab counselors are subject to the same kinds of discriminatory practices as are female employees in general, although this researcher does not really have the data to support the assumption that the supervisors of the female rehab counselors are, in fact, male.

The education of the rehab counselors, both the level and appropriateness, was analyzed next (Tables 35 and 36). It was hypothesized


**TABLE 33**

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE OF REHAB COUNSELORS **

AND JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with</th>
<th>( \tau )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 114)

Job Satisfaction—Components of Subscales

Work—Fascinating, routine, satisfying, boring, good, creative, respected, hot, pleasant, useful, tiresome, healthful, challenging, on your feet, frustrating, simple, endless, gives sense of accomplishment.

Supervision—Asks my advice, hard to please, impolite, praises good work, tactful, influential, up-to-date, doesn't supervise enough, quick-tempered, tells me where I stand, annoying, stubborn, knows job well, bad, intelligent, leaves me on my own, lazy, around when needed.

Pay—Income adequate for normal expenses, satisfactory profit sharing, barely live on income, bad, income provides luxuries, insecure, less than I deserve, highly paid, underpaid.

Promotions—Good opportunity for advancement, opportunity somewhat limited, promotion on ability, dead end job, good chance for promotion, unfair promotion policy, infrequent promotion, regular promotions, fairly good chance for promotion.

Co-Workers—Stimulating, boring, slow, ambitious, stupid, responsible, fast, intelligent, easy to make enemies, talk too much, smart, lazy, unpleasant, no privacy, active, narrow interests, loyal, hard to meet.
Table 34

Relationship Between Sex of Rehab Counselor

and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction With</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.045*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The two values were computed to be identical.

(N = 113)

Job Satisfaction--Components of Subscales

- Work: Fascinating, routine, satisfying, boring, good, creative, respected, hot, pleasant, useful, tiresome, healthful, challenging, on your feet, frustrating, simple, endless, gives sense of accomplishment.
- Supervision: Asks my advice, hard to please, impolite, praises good work, tactful, influential, up-to-date, doesn't supervise enough, quick-tempered, tells me where I stand, annoying, stubborn, knows job well, bad, intelligent, leaves me on my own, lazy, around when needed.
- Pay: Income adequate for normal expenses, satisfactory profit sharing, barely live on income, bad, income provides luxuries, insecure, less than I deserve, highly paid, underpaid.
- Promotions: Good opportunity for advancement, opportunity somewhat limited, promotion on ability, dead end job, good chance for promotion, unfair promotion policy, infrequent promotion, regular promotions, fairly good chance for promotion.
- Co-Workers: Stimulating boring slow, ambitious, stupid, responsible, fast, intelligent, easy to make enemies, talk too much, smart, lazy, unpleasant, no privacy, active, narrow interests, loyal, hard to meet.
# Table 35

**Relationship Between Educational Level and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.043*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-.266</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 122 to 132)

**Job Satisfaction—Components of Subscales**

- **Work**: Fascinating, routine, satisfying, boring, good, creative, respected, hot, pleasant, useful, tiresome, healthful, challenging, on your feet, frustrating, simple, endless, gives sense of accomplishment.
- **Supervision**: Asks my advice, hard to please, impolite, praises good work, tactful, influential, up-to-date, doesn't supervise enough, quick-tempered, tells me where I stand, annoying, stubborn, knows job well, bad, intelligent, leaves me on my own, lazy, around when needed.
- **Pay**: Income adequate for normal expenses, satisfactory profit sharing, barely live on income, bad, income provides luxuries, insecure, less than I deserve, highly paid, underpaid.
- **Promotions**: Good opportunity for advancement, opportunity somewhat limited, promotion on ability, dead end job, good chance for promotion, unfair promotion policy, infrequent promotion, regular promotions, fairly good chance for promotion.
- **Co-Workers**: Stimulating boring slow, ambitious, stupid, responsible, fast, intelligent, easy to make enemies, talk too much, smart, lazy, unpleasant, no privacy, active, narrow interests, loyal, hard to meet.
TABLE 36
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN Appropriateness of EDUCATION
AND JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>-0.399</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-0.202</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 122 or 123)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>-0.339</td>
<td>0.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-0.179</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>0.239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 122 to 130)

Job Satisfaction--Components of Scales
Work-Fascinating, creative, satisfying, boring, good, creative, respected, hot, pleasant, useful, tiresome, healthful, challenging, on your feet, frustrating, simple, endless, gives sense of accomplishment.
Supervision-Asks my advice, hard to please, impolite, praises good work, tactful, influential, up-to-date, doesn't supervise enough, quick-tempered, tells me where I stand, annoying, stubborn, knows job well, bad, intelligent, leaves me on my own, lazy, around when needed.
Pay-Income adequate for normal expenses, satisfactory profit sharing, barely live on income, bad, income provides luxuries, insecure, less than I deserve, highly paid, underpaid.
Promotions-Good opportunity for advancement, opportunity somewhat limited, promotion on ability, dead end job, good chance for promotion, unfair promotion policy, infrequent promotion, regular promotions, fairly good chance for promotion.
Co-Workers-Stimulating boring slow, ambitious, stupid, responsible, fast, intelligent, easy to make enemies, talk too much, smart, lazy, unpleasant, no privacy, active, narrow interests, loyal, hard to meet.
that those counselors who had higher levels of education and more appropriate education would be more satisfied with all aspects of their jobs. There was unexpectedly a negative relationship between educational level and satisfaction with work, but a positive relationship between appropriate education at the graduate level and satisfaction with work. Apparently, the rehab counselors who have formal training in counseling (rehab or other), experience greater satisfaction with work than the rehab counselors with graduate degrees in less appropriate subjects, such as psychology or sociology (Table 37).

Another interesting finding was that rehab counselors who have appropriate undergraduate degrees are significantly less satisfied with opportunities for advancement. This is perhaps what motivates them to go on for advanced degrees. Sixty-two per cent of the subjects had graduate study or graduate degrees in counseling, which is considered by this researcher to be quite a high percentage (Table 38).

Marital status of the rehab counselors was hypothesized to have no relationship to job satisfaction. This was confirmed by the data analysis as shown in Table 39. All the relationships are not significant.

Whether the rehab counselor had a significant other and if the significant other was in need of rehabilitation were both hypothesized to be positively related to all aspects of job satisfaction. The presence of the significant other being influential in career choice was found in 50 of the cases (38%). In 11 of these cases (22%), this significant other influential in career choice was in need of rehabilitation. Both were considered by the researcher to be quite high proportions.

However, the data analysis indicated that satisfaction with work was positively related to both and that the presence of a significant other
TABLE 37
LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF REHAB COUNSELORS
AND SATISFACTION WITH WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH WORK</th>
<th>BA or less</th>
<th>Graduate Work or Degree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.98; p = .043 \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH WORK</th>
<th>APPROPRIATE EDUCATION</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Appropriate</td>
<td>More Appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 3.80; p = .048$
TABLE 39

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MARITAL STATUS AND JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction With</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>-0.269</td>
<td>.1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 120-132)

Job Satisfaction--Components of Subscales

Work-Fascinating, routine, satisfying, boring, good, creative, respected, hot, pleasant, useful, tiring, healthful, challenging, on your feet, frustrating, simple, endless, gives sense of accomplishment.

Supervision-Asks my advice, hard to please, impolite, praises good work, tactful, influential, up-to-date, doesn't supervise enough, quick-tempered, tells me where I stand, annoying, stubborn, knows job well, bad, intelligent, leaves me on my own, lazy, around when needed.

Pay-Income adequate for normal expenses, satisfactory profit sharing, barely live on income, bad, income provides luxuries, insecure, less than I deserve, highly paid, underpaid.

Promotions-Good opportunity for advancement, opportunity somewhat limited, promotion on ability, dead end job, good chance for promotion, unfair promotion policy, infrequent promotion, regular promotions, fairly good chance for promotion.

Co-Workers-Stimulating boring slow, ambitious, stupid, responsible, fast, intelligent, easy to make enemies, talk too much, smart, lazy, unpleasant, no privacy, active, narrow interests, loyal, hard to meet.
was positively related only to satisfaction with supervision (Tables 40 and 41). The presence of a significant other in need of rehabilitation is related to satisfaction with the intrinsic (work) but not necessarily the extrinsic aspects (other) of the job. The nature of the work is probably what the significant other focused on during the "influencing process" (Table 42).

This researcher finds it difficult to explain the satisfaction with supervision relationship, except by speculating that those individuals who value the influencing of a significant other (or at least act on the influence to the extent of a career choice) also value (or are less critical of the role of the supervisor.

Years in the field of rehab counseling and years with present employer were both hypothesized to be positively related to all aspects of job satisfaction. As can be observed in Tables 43 and 44, years in the field of rehab counseling is significantly related to satisfaction with pay and supervision, and years with present employer is positively related to satisfaction with pay.

The significant relationships are more-or-less readily explainable. Those individuals who are not satisfied with pay, either leave the present employer or leave the field. Hence, the ones who remain tend to have higher satisfaction with pay. And, as one gains years of experience in the field, one appreciates problems and perspectives of the supervisor better. Hence, satisfaction with supervision increases as one gains experience in the field.

The lack of a relationship between years as a counselor and years with present employer and satisfaction with work is particularly perplexing in view of the significant, positive relationship between age and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.0015*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 114)

Job Satisfaction--Components of Subscales

Work--Fascinating, routine, satisfying, boring, good, creative, respected, hot, pleasant, useful, tiresome, healthful, challenging, on your feet, frustrating, simple, endless, gives sense of accomplishment.

Supervision--Asks my advice, hard to please, impolite, praises good work, tactful, influential, up-to-date, doesn't supervise enough, quick-tempered, tells me where I stand, annoying, stubborn, knows job well, intelligent, leaves me on my own, lazy, around when needed.

Pay--Income adequate for normal expenses, satisfactory profit sharing, barely live on income, bad, income provides luxuries, insecure, less than I deserve, highly paid, underpaid.

Promotions--Good opportunity for advancement, opportunity somewhat limited, promotion on ability, dead end job, good chance for promotion, unfair promotion policy, infrequent promotion, regular promotions, fairly good chance for promotion

Co-Workers--Stimulating boring, slow, ambitious, stupid, responsible, fast, intelligent, easy to make enemies, talk too much, smart, lazy, unpleasant, no privacy, active, narrow interests, loyal, hard to meet.
### TABLE 41

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIGNIFICANT OTHER'S NEED OF REHABILITATION AND JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.247</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 43)

Job Satisfaction--Components of Subscales:
- Work: Fascinating, routine, satisfying, boring, good, creative, respected, not, pleasant, useful, tiresome, healthful, challenging, on your feet, frustrating, simple, endless, gives sense of accomplishment.
- Supervision: Asks my advice, hard to please, impolite, praises good work, tactful, influential, up-to-date, doesn't supervise enough, quick-tempered, tells me where I stand, annoying, stubborn, knows job well, bad, intelligent, leaves me on my own, lazy, around when needed.
- Pay: Income adequate for normal expenses, satisfactory profit sharing, barely live on income, bad, income provides luxuries, insecure, less than I deserve, highly paid, underpaid.
- Promotions: Good opportunity for advancement, opportunity somewhat limited, promotion on ability, dead end job, good chance for promotion, unfair promotion policy, infrequent promotions, regular promotions, fairly good chance for promotion.
- Co-Workers: Stimulating boring slow, ambitious, stupid, responsible, fast, intelligent, easy to make enemies, talk too much, smart, lazy, unpleasant, no privacy, active, narrow interests, loyal, hard to meet.
### TABLE 42
SIGNIFICANT OTHER IN CAREER CHOICE AND SATISFACTION WITH WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH WORK</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Non-Relative</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 13.01; p = .002 \]
### TABLE 43

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN YEARS AS A REHAB COUNSELOR AND JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.027*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 93)

Job Satisfaction—Components of Subscales

- **Work**: Fascinating, routine, satisfying, boring, good, creative, respected, hot, pleasant, useful, tiresome, healthful, challenging, on your feet, frustrating, simple, endless, gives sense of accomplishment.
- **Supervision**: Asks my advice, hard to please, impolite, praises good work, tactful, influential, up-to-date, doesn't supervise enough, quick-tempered, tells me where I stand, annoying, stubborn, knows job well, bad, intelligent, leaves me on my own, lazy, around when needed.
- **Pay**: Income adequate for normal expenses, satisfactory profit sharing, barely live on income, bad, income provides luxuries, insecure, less than I deserve, highly paid, underpaid.
- **Promotions**: Good opportunity for advancement, opportunity somewhat limited, promotion on ability, dead end job, good chance for promotion, unfair promotion policy, infrequent promotion, regular promotions, fairly good chance for promotion.
- **Co-Workers**: Stimulating, boring, slow, ambitious, stupid, responsible, fast, intelligent, easy to make enemies, talk too much, smart, lazy, unpleasant, no privacy, active, narrow interests, loyal, hard to meet.
### TABLE 44

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN YEARS EMPLOYED BY PRESENT EMPLOYER AND JOB SATISFACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH</th>
<th>$\tau$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 95)

**Job Satisfaction--Components of Subscales**

- **Work**: fascinating, routine, satisfying, boring, good, creative, respected, hot, pleasant, useful, tiresome, healthful, challenging, on your feet, frustrating, simple, endless, gives sense of accomplishment.
- **Supervision**: Asks my advice, hard to please, impolite, praises good work, tactful, influential, up-to-date, doesn't supervise enough, quick-tempered, tells me where I stand, annoying, stubborn, knows job well, bad, intelligent, leaves me on my own, lazy, around when needed.
- **Pay**: Income adequate for normal expenses, satisfactory profit sharing, barely live on income, bad, income provides luxuries, insecure, less than I deserve, highly paid, underpaid.
- **Promotions**: Good opportunity for advancement, opportunity somewhat limited, promotion on ability, dead end job, good chance for promotion, unfair promotion policy, infrequent promotion, regular promotions, fairly good chance for promotion.
- **Co-Workers**: Stimulating boring slow, ambitious, stupid, responsible, fast, intelligent, easy to make enemies, talk too much, smart, lazy, unpleasant, no privacy, active, narrow interests, loyal, hard to meet.
satisfaction with work, as previously discussed. It is conjectured that these two relationships are distributed in a curvilinear manner, with high satisfaction with work reported by those individuals with both low and high number of years in the field and number of years with present employer. Those in the middle are reporting low satisfaction with work; hence, averaging these results in no correlation between the two variables and satisfaction with work. An examination of the frequency distributions for age (Table 2), years employed by present employer (Table 6), and years as a rehab counselor (Table 7), indicates that the age distribution is increasing faster than the other two distributions. The computed correlation between age and years as a counselor is .434 and between age and years with present employer is .561. Hence, since the variables are not perfectly correlated with age, it is not surprising to find that they are not correlated with the variable satisfaction with work, even though age is. (This discrepancy can be explained by individuals who enter the field after being engaged in other undetermined occupations.) Satisfaction with co-workers and satisfaction with advancement were not thought to be salient to the rehab counselors in the study, as previously discussed.

Career commitment--for five years, ten-years, and rest-of-life--was hypothesized to be positively related to all the aspects of job satisfaction. Career commitment in the short run was positively related to satisfaction with work and with advancement, but in the long run was related to different factors, to satisfaction with pay and with co-workers (Table 45). The satisfactions which relate to career commitment in the short run are distinctly different from factors relating to career commitment in the long run. Why this is true is not clear to this researcher (Table 46).

The experiencing of situations of stress and its relationship to job satisfaction was hypothesized to be negative. As can be observed in
### TABLE 45

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CAREER COMMITMENT AND JOB SATISFACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-yr</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-yr</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-yr</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-yr</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-Workers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-yr</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-yr</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.109*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advancement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-yr</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.027*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-yr</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-yr</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-yr</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N: 5 years = 81; 10 years = 43; rest of life = 61)

**Job Satisfaction—Components of Subscales**

- **Work**—Fascinating, routine, satisfying, boring, good, creative, respected, hot, pleasant, useful, tiresome, healthful, challenging, on your feet, frustrating, simple, endless, gives sense of accomplishment.
- **Supervision**—Asks my advice, hard to please, impolite, praises good work, tactful, influential, up-to-date, doesn't supervise enough, quick-tempered, tells me where I stand, annoying, stubborn, knows job well, bad, intelligent, leaves me on my own, lazy, around when needed.
- **Pay**—Income adequate for normal expenses, satisfactory profit sharing, barely live on income, bad, income provides luxuries, insecure, less than I deserve, highly paid, underpaid.
- **Promotions**—Good opportunity for advancement, opportunity somewhat limited, promotion on ability, dead end job, good chance for promotion, unfair promotion policy, infrequent promotion, regular promotions, fairly good chance for promotion.
- **Co-Workers**—Stimulating boring slow, ambitious, stupid, responsible, fast, intelligent, easy to make enemies, talk too much, smart, lazy, unpleasant, no privacy, active, narrow interests, loyal, hard to meet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH PAY</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\chi^2 = 3.75; p = .05\]
Table 47, it is in fact negatively related to satisfaction with pay and with supervision.

With respect to satisfaction with pay, perhaps because the individuals experience stress, they felt they should be compensated more, not unlike the increased compensation given to individuals engaged in battle. Additionally, it may be the supervisor who is the cause of the stress (as reported by R. Miles, 1977), although this researcher does not have data to establish causality. It was not too surprising that the experience of stress was not related to job satisfaction with work, since some very recent research (Burke, 1976) indicates that some kinds of stress can be positively related to performance. Maybe it can also be positively related to satisfaction with work in some cases. Combining these cases with those cases where it was negatively related causes the differences to be averaged—hence, yielding no relationship between experiencing stress and satisfaction with work.

The findings in this section of the data analysis confirm the work of Seashore and Taber (1975) who reported that demographic variables ought to be included in the analysis of job satisfaction. In fact, many (although by no means a majority) of the demographic variables which were hypothesized to be significantly related to job satisfaction were so, although they were not always related in the hypothesized direction.

The findings also confirm to some extent Burke's (1976) general finding that occupational stress was, for the most part, negatively related to job satisfaction. The contribution that the present study makes is that the impact of the experiencing of stress was negatively related to some aspects of job satisfaction (pay and supervision), but unrelated to others.

The present study also confirms the findings of R. Miles about
### TABLE 47
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EXPERIENCE OF WORK-RELATED STRESS AND JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION WITH</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.047*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>-.314</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>-.307</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>-.559</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 110)

**Job Satisfaction--Components of Subscales**
- **Work**--Lavishing, routine, satisfying, boring, good, creative, respected, hot, pleasant, useful, tiresome, healthful, challenging, on your feet, frustrating, simple, endless, gives sense of accomplishment.
- **Supervision**--Asks my advice, hard to please, impolite, praises good work, tactful, influential, up-to-date, doesn't supervise enough, quick-tempered, tells me where I stand, annoying, stubborn, knows job well, bad, intelligent, leaves me on my own, lazy, around when needed.
- **Pay**--Income adequate for normal expenses, satisfactory profit sharing, barely live on income, bad, income provides luxuries, insecure, less than I deserve, highly paid, underpaid.
- **Promotions**--Good opportunity for advancement, opportunity somewhat limited, promotion on ability, dead end job, good chance for promotion, unfair promotion policy, infrequent promotion, regular promotions, fairly good chance for promotion
- **Co-Workers**--Stimulating boring slow, ambitious, stupid, responsible, fast, intelligent, easy to make enemies, talk too much, smart, lazy, unpleasant, no privacy, active, narrow interests, loyal, hard to meet.
the stresses experienced by individuals with great distances between themselves and their role senders, if one assumes that the rehab counselors' supervisors are the primary role senders and that there is a great deal of psychological distance between the rehab counselors and their supervisors. O'Connelly, Cummings, and Huber's (1976) findings about role stress being related to low information specificity is also confirmed if one assumes that the supervisor is the major source of information in the workshops.

The present study somewhat confirms and somewhat does not confirm research done by Muthard and Salomone (1969) on the same occupational group. They found that background factors are not predictive of job satisfaction. Eighteen demographic (background) variables were either positively or negatively related to some aspect of job satisfaction. This is 20.6% of the total number that were hypothesized to be related.

Rockenbeck and Moses' (1973) findings on the same occupational group are confirmed. They found that age is negatively related to job turnover, while the present study found age positively related to satisfaction with work and pay. They found no differences in job turnover due to sex. The present study found only one difference in job satisfaction (satisfaction with supervision) due to sex. The contribution that the present study makes is that it overcomes some of the methodological shortcomings of both the Muthard and Salomone (1969) study and the Rockenbeck and Moses (1973) study, as previously discussed.

Also of concern in this section were the relationships between the demographic variables and professionalism—both professional attitudes and professional behaviors. The professional attitudes from Snizek's revision to Hall's measure of professional attitudes included professional organization as referent, belief in public service self-regulation, sense of
calling to the field, and autonomy. The professional behaviors included were: has memberships in professional organizations, attends professional meetings, reviews professional literature, and participates in continual professional education.

One overall finding warrants discussion at the onset. There was no sharp distinction between professional attitudes and professional behaviors for the demographic variables as there was for the subjective climate variables. This is important because one doesn't have to distinguish between professional attitudes and behavior. On the other hand, proportionately fewer of the demographic variables were related to professionalism, either attitudes or behavior. Thirty-four per cent of the demographic variables were significantly related, whereas 63% of the subjective climate variables were related.

Age was hypothesized to be positively related to professional attitudes and behaviors. And for the most part, the data supported this (Table 48). However, older rehab counselors do not have greater belief in public service, self-regulation, or autonomy than do the younger counselors. The significant positive relationships were age and professional organization as referent, and age and sense of calling. Additionally, all the professional behavior variables were positively related to age. (See Tables 49 and 50.) Perhaps older workers have the maturity to perceive the need for a referent outside the employing organization. Additionally, they probably have more personal resources to engage in professional behaviors than do younger counselors who are presumably more recently out of school.

An examination of the professional attitudes scores did not provide any insights either (Table 16). The possible range of the scores was 5-25. Most of the actual scores fell into that range. However,
TABLE 48

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE OF REHAB COUNSELORS AND PROFESSIONALISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization As Referent</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling to Field</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.0017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 133)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.0014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.0064*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.027*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=117)
TABLE 49

AGE OF REHAB COUNSELOR AND ATTENDANCE AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTENDANCE AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-50</th>
<th>57-65</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 10.24; \ p = .0064$
### TABLE 50

**AGE OF REHAB COUNSELOR AND ENGAGEMENT IN CONTINUAL PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGAGEMENT IN CONTINUAL PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23 60.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15 39.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 2.41; p = .816 \]
The important factor to note in Figure 3 is the relatively low mean scores and the relatively high standard deviations, indicating high variability between scores. There is not, however, any pattern in this variability. The literature does not provide this researcher with the scores of any other occupational groups to be used as a basis for comparison.

The sex of the counselor was hypothesized to have no relationship to either professional attitudes or professional behavior. As Table 51 indicates, sex in fact is not related to any attitudinal or behavioral variables.

Educational level and appropriateness of education were hypothesized to be positively related to both professional attitudes and professional behavior. However, as can be observed in Tables 52 and 53, virtually none of the relationships are significantly related, with two exceptions. More highly educated and more appropriately educated rehab counselors have less of a sense of calling to the field than less educated and less appropriately educated counselors. Perhaps when one has higher and more appropriate education, being a rehab counselor is viewed more as a formal career choice and less as a mission or calling (Table 54).

The other exception is the positive and significant relationship between level of education and autonomy. Perhaps rehab counselors who are more highly educated value autonomy more, since with increasing education they have increasing confidence in their own abilities.

Although it was hypothesized that marital status would not be related to any of the professional attitudes or behavior variables, being married was related to a sense of calling to the field and belonging to professional organizations. It was not possible for this researcher to explain either of these two relationships (Table 55).
### Table 51

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEX OF REHAB COUNSELORS AND PROFESSIONALISM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATITUDES</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as Referent</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling in Field</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 130 or 131)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in Professional</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=115)

---

**Professionalism--Components of Subscales**

**Self-Regulation**—My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.

A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing.

We really have no way of judging each other's competence.

There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work.

My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work.

Belief in Public Service—Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine.

I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.

The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed.

Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine.

If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one.

Autonomy—I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.

I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment.

My own decisions are subject to review.

I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.

Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people.

Professional Behavior—I systematically read the professional journals.

I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level.

I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported.

The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member.

Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.

Sense of Calling—People in this profession have a real calling for their work.

The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying.

It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field.

Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced.

There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.
### Table 52

**Relationship Between Educational Level and Professionalism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization as Referent</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling to Field</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>-.396</td>
<td>.0435*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.027*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 133)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=122-127)

**Professionalism--Components of Subscales**

- **Self-Regulation**--My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.
- **Public Service**--Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine.
- **Belief in Public Service**--I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.
- **Autonomy**--I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.
- **Behavior**--I systematically read the professional journals.
- **Sense of Calling**--People in this profession have a real calling for their work.

*Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.*

These dedication of people in this field is most gratifying.

It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field.

Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced.

There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.
TABLE 53
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN APPROPRIATENESS OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONALISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE Undergrad</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE Grad</th>
<th>GAMMA Undergrad</th>
<th>GAMMA Grad</th>
<th>p Undergrad</th>
<th>p Grad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Referent</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>-.359</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 133)

Professionalism--Components of Subscales

Self-Regulation--My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.

A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing.

We really have no way of judging each other's competence.

There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work.

My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work.

Belief in Public Service--Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine.

I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.

The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed.

Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine.

If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one.

Autonomy--I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.

I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment.

My own decisions are subject to review.

I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.

Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people.

Professional Behavior--I systematically read the professional journals.

I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level.

I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported.

The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member.

Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.

Sense of Calling--People in this profession have a real calling for their work.

The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying.

It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field.

Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced.

There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.
Table 53--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE Under-grad</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE Graduate</th>
<th>GAMMA Under-grad</th>
<th>GAMMA Graduate</th>
<th>p Under-grad</th>
<th>p Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships In Professional Organizations</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 117)
TABLE 54
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND BELIEF IN AUTONOMY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BELIEF IN AUTONOMY</th>
<th>EDUCATION LEVEL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA or less</td>
<td>Graduate Work or Degree</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 4.76; p = .0276$
### Table 55

**Relationship Between Marital Status and Professionalism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization as Referent</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling to Field</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.0533*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 133)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.035*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=117)

**Professionalism--Components of Subscales**

**Self-Regulation**--My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.

A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing.
We really have no way of judging each other's competence.
There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work.
My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work.

**Belief in Public Service**--Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine.
I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.
The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed.
Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine.
If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one.

**Autonomy**--I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.
I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment.
My own decisions are subject to review.
I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.
Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people.

**Professional Behavior**--I systematically read the professional journals.
I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level.
I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported.
The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member.

Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.

**Sense of Calling**--People in this profession have a real calling for their work.
The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying.
It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field.
Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced.
There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.
The next analyses were the relationships between having a significant other influential in career choice, whether that significant other was personally in need of rehabilitation and the holding of certain professional attitudes and behaviors. Although it was hypothesized that having a significant other would be positively related to professional attitudes and behavior, the data do not support this (Table 56). This finding was especially surprising in view of the significant relationship between having a significant other and both satisfaction with work and supervision, as previously discussed. Apparently, the influence of a significant other only impacts on job satisfaction, but not on the forming of professional attitudes or engaging in professional behaviors. Also, there was a significant but negative relationship between having a significant other in need of rehabilitation and belief in self-regulation. (Table 57) Belief in self-regulation is not valued if one has a more personal involvement in rehabilitation, that is, more personal than one's career area, if this is possible. Or perhaps, these individuals have scrutinized the work of other rehab counselors, who performed at less than expected levels and were not sanctioned by self-regulation (Table 58).

Years as a rehab counselor and years with present employer were also negatively related to belief in self-regulation (Tables 59 and 60), although this was not in the hypothesized direction (years as a rehab counselor and years with present employer were both hypothesized to be positively related to professional attitudes and behavior). The same explanation could be offered here as was offered above. The more one is in the field and sees rehab counselors performing less than competently and not being sanctioned by colleagues, the less one believes in self-regulation.
TABLE 56

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIGNIFICANT OTHER IN CAREER CHOICE AND PROFESSIONALISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization as Referent</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.0182*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling to Field</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 133)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.1744</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=117)

Professionalism--Components of Subscales

Self-Regulation--My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.
A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing.
We really have no way of judging each other's competence.
There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work.
My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work.
Belief in Public Service--Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine.
I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.
The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed.
Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine.
If ever an occupation is indispensible, it is this one.
Autonomy--I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.
I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment.
My own decisions are subject to review.
I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.
Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people.
Professional Behavior--I systematically read the professional journals.
I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level.
I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported.
The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member.
Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.
Sense of Calling--People in this profession have a real calling for their work.
The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying.
It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field.
Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced.
There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization as Referent</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.039*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling to Field</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 57**

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SIGNIFICANT OTHER'S NEED OF REHABILITATION AND PROFESSIONALISM

**ATTITUDES**

- **Professional Organization as Referent**
- **Belief in Public Service**
- **Belief in Self-Regulation**
- **Sense of Calling to Field**
- **Autonomy**

**BEHAVIOR**

- **Memberships in Professional Organizations**
- **Attends Professional Meetings**
- **Reviews Professional Literature**
- **Continual Professional Education**

**Professionalism--Components of Subscales**

- **Self-Regulation**--My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.
- **A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing.**
- **We really have no way of judging each other's competence.**
- **There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work.**
- **My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work.**
- **Belief in Public Service**--Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine.
- **I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.**
- **The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed.**
- **Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine.**
- **If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one.**
- **Autonomy**--I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.
- **I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment.**
- **My own decisions are subject to review.**
- **I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.**
- **Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people.**
- **Professional Behavior**--I systematically read the professional journals. I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level. I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported. The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member. Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often. **Sense of Calling**--People in this profession have a real calling for their work. The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying. It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field. Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced. **There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.**
TABLE 58

SIGNIFICANT OTHER IN NEED OF REHABILITATION AND BELIEF IN SELF-REGULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BELIEF IN SELF-REGULATION</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 4.14; p = .039$
TABLE 59

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN YEARS AS A REHAB COUNSELOR AND PROFESSIONALISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization as Referent</td>
<td>.1329</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>.0047*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling to Field</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.0705</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 101)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>-.434</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professionalism--Components of Subscales
Self-Evaluation--My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other’s competence. A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing. We really have no way of judging each other’s competence. There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work. My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work. Belief in Public Service--Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine. I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society. The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed. Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine. If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one. Autonomy--I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work. I don’t have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment. My own decisions are subject to review. I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation. Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people. Professional Behavior--I systematically read the professional journals. I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level. I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported. The professional organization doesn’t really do too much for the average member. Although I would like to, I really don’t read the journals too often. Sense of Calling--People in this profession have a real calling for their work. The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying. It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field. Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced. There are very few people who don’t really believe in their work.
### TABLE 60

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN YEARS EMPLOYED BY PRESENT EMPLOYER AND PROFESSIONALISM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization as Referent</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.037*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling to Field</td>
<td>0.0055</td>
<td>0.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($N = 93$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.036*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($N = 95$)

**Professionalism--Components of Subscales**

- **Self-Regulation**—My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.
- A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing.
- We really have no way of judging each other's competence.
- There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work.
- My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work.
- **Belief in Public Service**—Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine.
- I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.
- The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed.
- Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine.
- If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one.
- **Autonomy**—I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.
- I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment.
- My own decisions are subject to review.
- I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.
- Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people.
- **Professional Behavior**—I systematically read the professional journals.
- I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level.
- I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported.
- The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member.
- Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.
- **Sense of Calling**—People in this profession have a real calling for their work.
- The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying.
- It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field.
- Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced.
- There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.
Additionally, years as a counselor was negatively related to membership in professional organizations and years with present employer was positively related to attending professional meetings. The negative relationship between years as a counselor and memberships in professional organizations could be in part explained by stating that, as the counselors have more years of experience, they have less to gain from belonging to professional organizations. Hence, they cease renewing their memberships.

The explanation of the positive relationship between years with present employer and attending professional meetings is perhaps farfetched. But as one gains in terms of number of years of experience with an employer, there are no longer possibilities for salary increases, since the salary range for the position has been exceeded (due to longevity and maybe merit). Hence, compensation increments could be in the form of employer-paid attendance of professional meetings. This is the practice in several social service agencies that are personally known to the researcher.

Perhaps the most predicted findings relate to career commitment (Table 61). Five-year, ten-year, and rest-of-life commitments are positively related to professional organization as referent, and belief in public service (See Table 62). Five-and ten-year commitments are related to sense of calling to the field, although rest-of-life commitment is not. Additionally, a ten-year commitment is related to reviewing professional literature. A rest-of-life commitment is related to three of the four professional behaviors: memberships in professional organizations, attends professional meetings and reviews professional literature. These were as hypothesized. The major finding from this section is that it is only a rest-of-life commitment that results in
TABLE 61
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CAREER COMMITMENT AND PROFESSIONALISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDES</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-yr</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.043*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-yr</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-yr</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-yr</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-yr</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-yr</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-yr</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-yr</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.047*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-yr</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-yr</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professionalism--Components of Subscale
Self-Regulation--My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.
A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing.
We really have no way of judging each other's competence.
There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work.
My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work.
Belief in Public Service--Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine.
I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.
The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed.
Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine.
If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one.
Autonomy--I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.
I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment.
My own decisions are subject to review.
I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.
Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people.
Professional Behavior--I systematically read the professional journals.
I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level.
I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported.
The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member.
Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.
Sense of Calling--People in this profession have a real calling for their work.
The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying.
It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field.
Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced.
There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.
Table 61--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>CHI SQUARE</th>
<th>GAMMA</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional 5-yr</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional 10-yr</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional 5-yr</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional 10-yr</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.027*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional 5-yr</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional 10-yr</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.0209*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.0011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional 5-yr</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.1667</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional 10-yr</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N: 5 years = 98; 10 years = 52; rest of life = 67)
**TABLE 62**

**REST OF LIFE CAREER COMMITMENT AND BELIEF IN PUBLIC SERVICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BELIEF IN PUBLIC SERVICE</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 3.40; p = .061$

\[ x^2 = 3.40; p = .061 \]
professional behavior. The question remains as to why individuals with rest-of-life commitments to the field do not engage in continual professional education, although this may be that the opportunities to do so are not readily accessible, as was previously discussed. It was also surprising that counselors with a rest-of-life commitment do not have a sense of calling to the field. Perhaps a rational career choice for life should be thought of as distinct from the idea of a calling or mission. Not too surprising, however, was the finding that individuals with lesser career commitment do not engage in professional behavior, since they probably don't feel a need to keep abreast of a field that they are not going to be a part of for very long.

The experiencing of situations of stress was hypothesized to be unrelated to either professional attitudes or behavior. The rationale for this was that the stresses are oriented to or originate from the employing organization, but professional attitudes and behaviors are oriented outside of the employing organization. However, the data analysis resulted in situation of stress being negatively related to belief in self-regulation, that is, the more stress the rehab counselor experienced, the less likely he or she was to believe in self-regulation. Because of stress, these individuals would rather have other than self-regulation (Table 63).

It is difficult to relate the findings in this section to previous research findings on the relationship of demographic variables to professional attitudes and behavior, because, as previously discussed, there are not any findings reported. Most of the literature on professionalism deals with the process by which an occupational group becomes a profession. Granted only 25% of the demographic variables that were hypothe-


### Table 63

**Relationship Between Experiencing Work-Related Stress and Professionalism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Organization</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.047*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Calling to Field</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>N = 128</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>Gamma</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memberships in Professional</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>N = 120</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professionalism**—Components of Subscales

- **Self-Regulation**—My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence.
- A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing.
- We really have no way of judging each other's competence.
- There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work.
- My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work.
- **Belief in Public Service**—Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine.
- I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society.
- The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed.
- Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine.
- If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one.

**Autonomy**—I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work.

- I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment.
- My own decisions are subject to review.
- I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.
- Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people.
- **Professional Behavior**—I systematically read the professional journals.
- I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level.
- I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported.
- The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member.
- Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.

**Sense of Calling**—People in this profession have a real calling for their work.

- The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying.
- It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field.
- Most people would stay in the profession even if their income were reduced.
- There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.
sized to be related to professional attitudes and behaviors were significantly related. But the finding of no relationship is also a finding. Previous studies which found no relationship should have been published, but this researcher was unable to locate any.
SUMMARY OF DATA ANALYSIS

This section will summarize the discussion of the data analysis. The attention of the reader is first directed to Table 64 which summarizes the relationships between the objective and subjective measures of climate.

It is not possible to conclude that objective and subjective climate are related—with one possible exception. Those aspects of objective climate dealing with the clients—number of clients and size of client caseload are significantly, but negatively, related to all aspects of subjective climate that were tested. However, with regard to one other client-related variable—decision for client care outside of the counselor—it is not possible to draw such a conclusion.

In Table 65 the relationships between subjective climate and job satisfaction are summarized. The conclusion that can be drawn is rather apparent. There is decidedly a positive relationship between subjective measures of climate and job satisfaction. This is also true with respect to professional attitudes (See Table 66). But this kind of relationship does not exist with respect to the professional behavior variables. Apparently, the sets of attitudes related to subjective climate and both job satisfaction and professionalism are highly interrelated, but this does not necessarily translate into professional behavior.

There is also not really any discernible relationship between the hypothesized demographic variables and job satisfaction. It should be noted however, that more of the demographic variables are significantly related to satisfaction with work (six—five of them positive) than to
### TABLE 64

**SUMMARY OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE MEASURES OF CLIMATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Measures</th>
<th>Trust in Leadership</th>
<th>Motivation Based on Reward and Involvement</th>
<th>Pervasive Communication</th>
<th>Participation in Decisions</th>
<th>Mutuality in Goals</th>
<th>Controls For Self-Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Clients</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Staff</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Client Case Load</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision For Client Care Outside of Counselor</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Funds</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S- = Significant negative relationship at least at .05 level.*

*NS = Not significant at .05 level.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjective Measures</th>
<th>Trust in Leadership</th>
<th>Motivation Based on Reward and Involvement</th>
<th>Pervasive Communication</th>
<th>Participation in Decisions</th>
<th>Mutuality in Goals</th>
<th>Controls For Self-Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S+ = Significant positive relationship at least at .05 level
Table 66--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trust in Leadership</th>
<th>Motivation Based on Reward and Involvement</th>
<th>Pervasive Communication</th>
<th>Participation in Decisions</th>
<th>Mutuality in Goals</th>
<th>Controls For Self-Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S+ = Significant positive relationship at least at .05. NS = Not significant at .05. NS = Not significant at .05.
any of the other satisfaction variables. Surprisingly there was a negative relationship between educational level and satisfaction with work. Five of the demographic variables were also significantly related to satisfaction with pay. These are worthy of note: Age, years as a rehab counselor, years with present employer, and a rest of life career commitment are all positively related to satisfaction with pay (See Table 67).

In Table 68, the relationships between the demographic variables and professionalism are summarized. Three aspects of this table are worthy of note. First, age of the rehab counselor is positively related to more of the professionalism variables than any other demographic variable. And it is especially related to the professional behavior variables. Older rehab counselors are more likely to engage in professional behavior. Secondly, years as a rehab counselor and years with present employer are both negatively related to belief in self-regulation; so is whether one's significant other was in need of rehabilitation negatively related to belief in self-regulation. Thirdly, career commitments of all kinds were positively related to two professional attitudes--the professional organization as a referent and belief in public service.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Co-Workers</th>
<th>Advancement</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Female)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Other</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Rehab--Significant Other</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Counselor</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years with Present Employer</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>Co-Workers</td>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of life</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation of Stress</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S+ or S- = Significant positive or negative relationship at least at .05.
NS = Not significant at .05.
### Table 68

**Summary of Relationships Between Demographic Variables and Professionalism**

**Demographic Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>S+</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>S+</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>S+</th>
<th>S+</th>
<th>S+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Female)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Education</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Other</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Rehab--</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>S-</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Other</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Calling to Field</td>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>Belief in Self-Regulation</td>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>Professional Organization</td>
<td>As Referent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual Professional Education</td>
<td>Reviews Professional Literature</td>
<td>Attends Professional Meetings</td>
<td>Memberships in Professional Organizations</td>
<td>Sense of Calling to Field</td>
<td>Belief in Public Service</td>
<td>Professional Organization</td>
<td>As Referent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Situations of Stress**

- Rest of Life
- 10 years
- 5 years
- Career Commitment
- Employer
- Years with Present Years Counselor

**TABLE 68-Continued**
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS, CONTRIBUTIONS, LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

REVIEW OF RELATIONSHIP OF PRESENT FINDINGS TO PREVIOUS FINDINGS

When the results of the analyses in this study are compared to previous research findings, not many of the previous findings are supported. Those that are for the most part confirmed are related to previous studies on this occupational group--rehab counselors. Those groups of findings that are in part confirmed and in part not confirmed are those related to job satisfaction, professionalism, and organizational climate. This might be attributable to some measurement problems or to some theoretical inconsistencies which were not rectified.

With regard to professionalism, the occupational group in the study does suggest it is on its way to developing into a profession according to the concept of Wilensky (1964) and Caplow (1966). Although not empirically tested, this researcher did observe the following attributes considered by Wilensky and later by Caplow to be stages in the development of an occupational group into a profession:

1. Creation of a full-time occupation
2. Establishment of a training school
3. Formation of a professional association
4. Formation of a code of ethics.

In addition, the problems identified by Gartner (1975) and Meinert (1976) as salient in thwarting the development of both education and social work in becoming a profession to the extent that law is a profession also appear to exist:
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1. No mandate to define work
2. Low autonomy for practitioners
3. Low salaries to faculty in professional schools
4. More emphasis on theory than practice
5. No private practice of faculty

To further complicate the determination of whether rehab counseling is a profession, the present study found distinctions between professional attitudes and professional behavior. Attitudes were far more likely than behavior to be significantly related to the other variables in the study.

Also, Sussman and Haug's (1969) finding of high identification with the professional organizations was substantiated. In the present study, 58% of the counselors reported belonging to a professional organization and 53% attending meetings of the professional organizations. But only 27% were making a life-time career commitment to rehab counseling, which is a much lower percentage than for other professionals (85% of firm lawyers and 43% of white collar workers, in general) identified by Blauner (1964) and Wilensky (1965). Also not confirmed were Sussman and Haug's (1965) finding of relationships between length of time in field and both perception of rehab counseling as a profession and feelings of autonomy. Perhaps the observation of Moses and Patterson (1971) that rehab counseling is not a "profession" but an "area of work" is confirmed.

This study also did confirm many of the earlier findings about the positive relationship between subjective organizational climate and job satisfaction. The more positively the rehab counselors perceived their organizational climates, the more satisfied they were with their jobs. This confirms the findings of Friedlander and Margulies, 1969; Kaczka and Kirk, 1968; Schneider, 1973; Cawsey, 1973; Pritchard and Karasick, 1973; and Litwin and Stringer, 1968. In fact, these relationships are so strongly, consistently, and positively related that doubt can be cast on
the independence of these two variables, as was previously found by Schneider and Snyder (1975) and Gavin (1975).

Also confirmed in this study was Shapiro, Schwartz, and Moscato's (1976) conclusion about preference for an open climate, if preference can be determined by the observation of higher job satisfaction and professionalism of counselors in those facilities characterized by open climates (high scores on subjective climate variables). That is, those counselors who had high subjective climate scores had significantly higher job satisfaction and professional attitudes.

Not confirmed by this study was Osborn and Hunt's (1975) conclusion of no direct relationship between unit size and satisfaction. It should be noted that this was not tested directly in the present study. However, unit size in terms of number of clients in the entire facility and also number of clients in the counselor's caseload was significantly and negatively related to perceptions of climate. Number of staff showed no relationship, however. One may infer from the significant relationship between number of clients, size of caseload, and subjective climate that there also is a relationship between number of clients and size of client caseload and job satisfaction. One can legitimately do this since subjective climate is significantly and positively related to job satisfaction. This, then, can also confirm the negative relationship between total organizational size and job satisfaction, as found by Porter and Lawler, 1965; Kerr, Kopelmeier and Sullivan, 1951; and Indik and Seashore, 1961; and also the relationship between sub-unit size and job satisfaction found by Benge, 1944 and Talacchi, 1960.

Not substantiated was the relationship between the locus of decision-making and positive perceptions of climate. Litwin and Stringer (1968); Sorcher and Danzig, (1969); and Davis (1968) all found a rela-
relationship between participation in decision-making and positive perceptions of climate. But this was not shown to be significant in the present study.

Neither does the present study confirm Burke's (1967) finding of a positive relationship between the experiencing of role stress and intrinsic aspects of job satisfaction. This study did, however, confirm another of Burke's conclusions of a negative relationship between the experiencing of role stress and extrinsic aspects of job satisfaction--satisfaction with pay and satisfaction with supervision. In other words, those counselors in the present study who experienced role stress were also significantly less likely to be satisfied with pay and supervision, but role stress did not affect satisfaction with work.

This study also partially confirms the 1973 work of Dunn, Allen and Miller, who found intrinsic satisfaction with work as salient. Seventy per cent of the total possible score is the average satisfaction with work score in this study. But the present study also observed high satisfaction with extrinsic aspects--80% of the total possible score is the average satisfaction with supervision score and 81% is the average satisfaction with co-workers score. This is unlike the previous findings.

One aspect of satisfaction that is consistently reported in the literature is the importance of satisfaction with supervision. The present study confirms the work of Fay and Moses (1972) and Smits and Aiken (1969) among others, who report the importance of satisfaction with supervision. Satisfaction with supervision was found to be positively related to subjective climate, to having a significant other in the choice of rehab counseling as a career and to years as a rehab counselor.

This study found age to be related to job satisfaction (work and pay), which is similar to Rockenbeck and Moses' (1973) findings of age
being negatively related to job turnover. Similarly, this study found no relationship between sex and job satisfaction. Neither did Rockenbeck and Moses find a relationship between sex and job turnover.

Age was found to be related to certain professionalism variables specifically professional behavior, but no relationship between either sex and professionalism or professionalism and subjective climate was found, unlike Kilpatrick, Cummings, and Jennings (1964) who found differences in job satisfaction due to sex and public funding.
WHAT WAS LEARNED FROM THIS STUDY ABOUT
REHAB COUNSELORS AS A PROFESSIONAL GROUP

The typical rehab counselor is a highly and appropriately educated individual. In this study, more than half had a master's degree, and of those, almost two-thirds were in counseling.

The average age of 34 was in some respects old and in some respects young. Since the field of rehab counseling has really only had its distinctive character since the mid-1960s at the earliest, 34 years old is quite old. It would be expected that those individuals who entered the field at or near its onset would have risen to administrative positions by the age of 34. On the other hand, over 50% of the individuals in the sample had been in the field for less than three years, indicating a high proportion of "newcomers", individuals who are embarking on second careers. However, there is a moderate amount of career commitment--53% planned at least a five-year commitment, whereas 27% planned a rest-of-life commitment to rehab counseling. There also appears to be an influential person in the career choice of these rehab counselors who was personally in need of rehabilitation.

The counselor is most likely to be Caucasian, either male or female, and employed by a facility that has a mix of public and private funds.

The counselor is likely at any one time to have 30 or fewer clients, who have a variety of handicaps. He or she will have to consult with others in the final decision regarding the care of the client. The counselor is likely to experience stressful situations in his or her
The counselor heavily identifies with the professional organizations, by belonging, attending meetings, and reading professional literature.

The counselor tends to perceive the climate in his or her organization to lie between a Systems II--benevolent authoritative--and a Systems III--consultative type. This was true for all six of the organizational climate dimensions examined.

Extremely important in this perception of climate were two variables--number of clients and size of client caseload. Nothing else consistently had such an (negative) impact on climate as these two variables did (see Figure 42).

Also important were the consistently positive relationships between climate and job satisfaction (see Figure 43). There was, however, a distinction between holding professional attitudes, which were for the most part directly related to perceptions of organization climate and engaging in professional behaviors, which were unrelated to perception of climate. (A possible explanation is that there is already such a high level of engagement in professional behavior that the range is restricted; hence no relationship was found. See Figure 44.)

Age was consistently related to engaging in professionalism as "behavior". This may be in part due to the chronologically older "newcomers", the second careerists, etc.

Career commitment was consistently related to the attitudes that the professional organization is the referent and to the attitude of belief in public service. Career commitment was, surprisingly, unrelated to almost all the professional behaviors.

The most interesting findings were the lack of a belief in self-
regulation, especially with more years of experience in the field, more years with one's present employer, and having a significant other influential in career choice who was also personally in need of rehabilitation.

This study was originally begun with the perspective that, while it was to be a survey of a particular occupation, generalization of the findings could be done, not only to rehab counselors as an emerging professional group, but also to other emerging professional groups as well. These would include, for example, physical therapists, occupational therapists, dietitians, medical technologists, and guidance counselors.

However, from the standpoint of technically correct research methodology, generalizations should be made only to rehab counselors. Generalizations with regard to the dependent variables can be made only if the other emerging professional group were matched to the sample group (rehab counselors) on relevant independent variables. For example, some or all of the following characteristics would have to be matched: age, educational level, appropriateness of education, "second careerists", significant other in career choice, career commitment, number of staff, number of clients, size of client caseload, and between a Systems II and a Systems III perception of climate in the employing organization. Whether or not such matching would be possible is beyond the scope of this researcher.
CONTRIBUTIONS

A major contribution made by the present study is its being a systematic study of an emerging occupational group--rehabilitation counselors. To the knowledge of this researcher, it is still the only study done on a random sample of these counselors. It was originally anticipated that this group could be called an emerging profession. But although the occupation has, for the most part, gone through the steps indicated by Wilensky (1964) and Caplow (1966) as necessary for the transition into a profession, other mitigating factors prevent the labeling of it as a profession: the problems in the status of the professional schools and faculty, the lack of a life-time career commitment, the lack of a feeling of various professional attitudes--as was previously discussed.

Another contribution that this study makes is that it does not confirm many of the previous findings. Most researchers would be distressed by the failure of a study to confirm previous findings, but this is not the case of this researcher. Even though the research methodology in this study has some faults (discussed elsewhere), it is methodologically better than many of the studies reported in the literature. The researcher can modestly (or perhaps immodestly) suggest that: (1) the earlier findings are currently incorrect, and (2) the theoretical body of knowledge on subjective climate, job satisfaction, and professionalism are not readily generalizable--at least not to groups of semi-professionals.

There are two other closely related points that need to be made
here. First, the demographic variables that have been regarded by sociologists to be the best predictors of variations in attitudes and behavior were found not to be significant in this study. Recognizing that one study neither makes or breaks an existing body of theoretical knowledge this study is, nevertheless, one (of an expanding number) which cast doubt over the general use of demographic variables to predict differences in attitudes and behavior. Secondly, because of the consistently strong, positive correlations obtained between subjective climate and job satisfaction, the present study is an addition to those that question the independence of subjective climate and job satisfaction. The last contribution that this researcher considers this study to make is that it provides data to support the suggested need for improvements in all of the dependent variables--subjective climate, professionalism, and job satisfaction. Relatively low scores were observed on all three measures--subjective climate, professionalism, and job satisfaction, especially the first two. The average subjective climate score, relative to the total possible subjective score, ranges from 50% to 60%. This does not project an image of favorableness in perceptions of climate. The professionalism (attitudes) scores are somewhat better. They range from 60% to 70% of the total possible scores. The job satisfaction scores are even more favorable but also exhibit greater variation. With regard to satisfaction with work, supervision, and co-workers, the actual scores relative to the total possible score range from 70% to 80%. However, satisfaction with pay and with promotions is substantially less. The average score on satisfaction with pay is 45% of the total possible, and the average score on satisfaction with promotions relative to the total possible score is 38%.
This research study can thus substantiate that steps have to be undertaken to improve perceptions of climate, professional attitudes, and satisfaction with pay and promotions, especially as they impact on career commitment. (It is also theoretically possible that these three also impact on job performance, but obtaining a measure of job performance was beyond the scope of this study.) Otherwise, trained and experienced counselors, whose educations were in part financed through government subsidies, will be leaving the field.

Since there is relatively high identification with the professional organizations, it is perhaps appropriate to suggest that the desirable improvements in climate and in certain areas of job satisfaction be undertaken by them, even though they are obviously only implementable within the rehab facilities themselves. It is also feasible to make this same suggestion to the Rehabilitation Administration Division of DePaul University's Administrative Studies Center, which has been heavily involved in an off-campus, on-site master's degree program in rehabilitation administration.
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This section of the paper will discuss the shortcomings and limitations of the study.

In the viewpoint of this researcher, the greatest shortcomings lie in the area of what was not studied but should have been. Although it was originally (and probably correctly) thought that the addition of many more instruments or questions would substantially reduce the response rate, more information would have been desirable. Obtaining this additional information could have been done by increasing the sample size and sending half the group half the questions and the other half the other half of the questions. For example, even thought demographic variables were not predictive, it would have been desirable to have additional questions on demographic variables such as income (especially in view of the finding of low satisfaction with pay); number of other counselors and non-counseling professional staff; age of the facility; budget of the facility; and community characteristics of both the place of residence of the counselor and of the facility. Changes in the facility thought to be desirable by the counselor would also have been a good question which was omitted.

It would also have been desirable to have another measure of job satisfaction which would focus more on the client-counselor relationship. Perhaps the instrument used by Miller and Muthard (1965) would have been a good additional measure.

Another shortcoming of the study is that only professional behavior was studied. It would have been desirable to obtain a measure of
the level of day-to-day behavior, although this was thought to be if not virtually impossible then at least resulting in a built-up bias in the kinds of responses that would be obtained. Additionally, it was not ascertainable, if the researcher provided the performance measure, whether it would be suitable to most of the counselors; and, if facility provided the performance measure, whether there would be enough comparability to permit analysis.

The last shortcoming as observed by this researcher relates to the subjective organizational climate measures. The first two of these are less serious in that they are retrievable from the data base. First, there should have been a composite measure of climate corresponding to Likert's Systems I, II, III, and IV. Even though it is not likely that any relationships that weren't significant when analyzed separately would be significant when analyzed as a composite, it would have been more technically accurate to analyze in terms of these designations--Systems I through IV. Although a field study might rectify some of these shortcomings, it is doubtful that this would be feasible, given the small number of rehab counselors in any one facility. At any rate, the randomness of the sample would certainly be lost by a field study.

Perhaps the greatest shortcoming is the failure of the researcher to obtain a deprivation of climate measure in terms of differences in perceptions between the ideal and actual climates. Although this was originally considered, it was specifically rejected in that it was thought that both a professionalism measure and a deprivation-in-climate measure could not be obtained without reducing the response. While this is probably correct, half of a larger sample could have had one and half could have had the other administered.

There are also some methodological shortcomings. It would have
been desirable to use more rigorous multi-variate data analysis. However, this was regarded by this researcher (and her statistics consultant) to be questionable. Given the number of variables that were nominal in nature, any regression analysis would have been distorted by the existence of numerous dummy variables.
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1. What is your age: ______

2. What is your race:
   ___ Caucasian
   ___ Negro
   ___ Oriental
   ___ Other, please specify__________

   Is your race the same or different from that of the majority of your clients:
   ___ Same      ___ Different

3. What is your sex:
   ___ Male      ___ Female

4. What is your level of education
   ___ Some high school
   ___ High school graduate
   ___ Some college
   ___ College graduate
   ___ Some graduate school
   ___ Graduate school degree

   If you went to college, what did you major in
   as an undergraduate____________________
   as a graduate student___________________

5. What is your marital status
   ___ Single
   ___ Married
   ___ Separated
   ___ Divorced

6. Is there any person who particularly influenced your decision to enter the field of rehabilitation counseling:
   ___ Yes      ___ No

   If yes, who was this person (what was his relationship to you)
   ____________________________

   Was this person ever personally in need of rehabilitation?
   ___ Yes      ___ No

7. How long have you been employed by your present employer?
   ___ years

8. How long have you been a rehab counselor?
   ___ Years
9. Do you plan to be in the field of rehabilitation counseling:

Five years from now
Yes  No
Ten years from now
Yes  No
The rest of your working life
Yes  No

10. Are there any individuals or situations which cause you to experience stress or conflict in your work:

Yes  No

If yes, please describe below:

11. How large is your facility in terms of:
   a. number of clients
   b. number of staff members

12. What kinds of clients do you have in your facility:
   - Mentally retarded
   - Mentally disturbed
   - Geriatric
   - Blind
   - Deaf
   - Alcoholic and drug abusers
   - Physically handicapped
   - Other, please specify

13. What is the source of the funds for your facility:
   - Public
   - Parents/relatives of clients
   - Private
   - Mixed

14. How many clients are you personally responsible for during any one given period of time?

15. Who has the final decision with regard to the rehabilitation aspect of client care:
   - You
   - Workshop director
   - Doctor or other medical personnel
   - Parents or relatives of client
   - Client himself
16. If you could change any aspect or aspects of your job or organization, what would you change. Please discuss below or on the reverse side of this sheet.

17. Do you belong to any professional organizations for rehabilitation counseling?

   ___Yes   ___No

   If yes, please list them:

18. Have you attended any meetings of these professional organizations within the last year?

   ___Yes   ___No

19. Do you regularly read journals and/or other literature dealing with rehabilitation counseling?

   ___Yes   ___No

20. Have you taken any courses within the last year to keep up with new developments in the field of rehabilitation counseling?

   ___Yes   ___No
INSTRUCTIONS: On the line below each organizational variable (item), please place an "x" at the point which, in your experience, describes your organization at the present time (N = now). Treat each item as a continuous variable from the extreme at one end to that at the other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Variables</th>
<th>Virtually none</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Substantial amount</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much confidence and trust is shown in subordinates?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How free do they feel to talk to superiors about job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are subordinates' ideas sought and used constructively?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is predominant use made of fear, threats, punishment, rewards, involvement?</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, occasionally</td>
<td>4, some</td>
<td>4, some 3 and 5</td>
<td>5, 6, based on group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is responsibility felt for achieving organization's goals?</td>
<td>Mostly at top</td>
<td>Top and middle</td>
<td>Fairly general</td>
<td>At all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW much cooperation teamwork exists?</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>Relatively little</td>
<td>Normally amount</td>
<td>Great deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the usual direction of information flow?</td>
<td>Downward</td>
<td>Mostly downward</td>
<td>Down and up</td>
<td>Down, up, and sideways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is downward communication accepted?</td>
<td>With suspicion</td>
<td>Possibly with suspicion</td>
<td>With caution</td>
<td>With a receptive mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How accurate is upward communication?</td>
<td>Usually inaccurate</td>
<td>Often inaccurate</td>
<td>Often accurate</td>
<td>Almost always accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well do superiors know problems faced by subordinates?</td>
<td>Not very well</td>
<td>Rather well</td>
<td>Quite well</td>
<td>Very well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At what level are decisions made?</td>
<td>Mostly at top</td>
<td>Policy at top, some delegation</td>
<td>Broad policy at top, more delegation</td>
<td>Throughout but well integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are subordinates involved in decisions related to their work?</td>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>Occasionally consulted</td>
<td>Generally consulted</td>
<td>Fully involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does decision-making process contribute to motivation?</td>
<td>Not very much</td>
<td>Relatively little</td>
<td>Some contribution</td>
<td>Substantial contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are organizational goals established?</td>
<td>Orders issued</td>
<td>Orders, some comments invited</td>
<td>After discussion, by orders</td>
<td>By group action (except in crisis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much covert resistance to goals is present?</td>
<td>Strong resistance</td>
<td>Moderate resistance</td>
<td>Some resistance of times</td>
<td>Little or none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How concentrated are review and control functions?</td>
<td>Very highly at top</td>
<td>Quite highly at top</td>
<td>Moderate delegation to lower levels</td>
<td>Widely shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there an informal organization restating the formal one?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Non--some goals as formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are costs, productivity, and other control data used for?</td>
<td>Policing, punishment</td>
<td>Reward and punishment</td>
<td>Reward, some self-guidance</td>
<td>Self-guidance, problem-solving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item no.
Place a Y beside an item if the item describes your present job, N if the item does not describe your job, and ? if you can not decide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>PAY</th>
<th>PROMOTIONS</th>
<th>CO-WORKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fascinating</td>
<td>Income adequate for normal expenses</td>
<td>Good opportunity for advancement</td>
<td>Stimulating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Satisfactory profit sharing</td>
<td>Opportunity somewhat limited</td>
<td>Boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying</td>
<td>Barely live on income</td>
<td>Promotion on ability</td>
<td>Slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Dead end job</td>
<td>Ambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Income provides luxuries</td>
<td>Good chance for promotion</td>
<td>Stupid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>Insecure</td>
<td>Unfair promotion policy</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respected</td>
<td>Less than I deserve</td>
<td>Infrequent promotions</td>
<td>Fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot</td>
<td>Highly paid</td>
<td>Regular promotions</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>Underpaid</td>
<td>Fairly good chance for promotion</td>
<td>Easy to make enemies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Talk too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiresome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On your feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narrow interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loyal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives sense of accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hard to meet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SUPERVISION | |
| Asks my advice | | |
| Hard to please | | |
| Impolite | | |
| Praises good work | | |
| Tactful | | |
| Influential | | |
| Up-to-date | | |
| Doesn't supervise enough | | |
| Quick tempered | | |
| Tells me where I stand | | |
| Annoying | | |
| Stubborn | | |
| Knows job well | | |
| Bad | | |
| Intelligent | | |
| Leaves me on my own | | |
| Lazy | | |
| Around when needed | | |
The following questions are an attempt to measure certain aspects of what is commonly called "professionalism." The referent in the questions is your own profession. Each item should be answered in light of the way you yourself both feel and behave as a member of your particular profession.

There are five possible responses to each item. If the item corresponds VERY WELL (VW) to your own attitudes and/or behavior, circle that response. If it corresponds WELL (W), POORLY (P) or VERY POORLY (VP), mark the appropriate response. The middle category (?) is designed to indicate an essentially neutral opinion about the item. Please answer ALL items in one fashion or another, making sure that you have NO MORE THAN ONE RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM.

1. I systematically read the professional journals. VW W ? P VP

2. Other professions are actually more vital to society than mine. VW W ? P VP

3. I make my own decisions in regard to what is to be done in my work. VW W ? P VP

4. I regularly attend professional meetings at the local level. VW W ? P VP

5. I think that my profession, more than any other, is essential for society. VW W ? P VP

6. My fellow professionals have a pretty good idea about each other's competence. VW W ? P VP

7. People in this profession have a real calling for their work. VW W ? P VP

8. The importance of my profession is sometimes overstressed. VW W ? P VP

9. The dedication of people in this field is most gratifying. VW W ? P VP

10. I don't have much opportunity to exercise my own judgment. VW W ? P VP

11. I believe that the professional organization(s) should be supported. VW W ? P VP

12. Some other occupations are actually more important to society than mine. VW W ? P VP

13. A problem in this profession is that no one really knows what his colleagues are doing. VW W ? P VP
14. It is encouraging to see the high level of idealism which is maintained by people in this field.

15. The professional organization doesn't really do too much for the average member.

16. We really have no way of judging each other's competence.

17. Although I would like to, I really don't read the journals too often.

18. Most people would stay in the profession even if their incomes were reduced.

19. My own decisions are subject to review.

20. There is not much opportunity to judge how another person does his work.

21. I am my own boss in almost every work-related situation.

22. If ever an occupation is indispensable, it is this one.

23. My colleagues pretty well know how well we all do in our work.

24. There are very few people who don't really believe in their work.

25. Most of my decisions are reviewed by other people.
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