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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Studies on attitudes toward disabled and deviant groups have shown that certain types of attitudes can be associated with attitudes of rejection and negative evaluation (Friedson, 1966). In the field of alcoholism treatment, the attitudes of the treatment staff can have a direct bearing on treatment approaches and outcome. Negative attitudes, if perceived by the alcoholic, may result in a desire to leave treatment prematurely (Chafetz, Blane, Abram, Golner, Lacy, McCourt, Clark, and Meyers, 1962; Pattison, 1966).

Research on job satisfaction suggests that attitudes toward work can affect the worker in at least two ways. Hackman and Lawler (1971) have found that job satisfaction can influence performance. In the area of worker turnover, Brayfield and Crockett (1955) concluded that job satisfaction had a strong influence on worker turnover. Additional support for this finding was reported by Porter and Steers (1973).

With the reduction of funds available for alcoholism programs, it becomes more important to increase the effectiveness of existing programs by reducing impediments to positive outcomes. Study of factors affecting treatment
staff attitudes is one way of achieving this objective.

A number of researchers in various fields have focused on the influence of environmental variables on attitudes. For instance, Bettelheim (1943) found that inmates of concentration camps came to believe that their captor's rules were desirable values and norms. Breer and Locke (1965) suggest that task experiences lead to the development of certain beliefs, values and preferences that are specific to the task itself, but are also generalized to other areas of life over time. In a study on the role of psychiatrists in the military, Daniels (1969) found that the organization superceded any authority for decision-making that may be vested in their non-military colleagues. The norms and the sanctions for deviations from the norms are determined by the military and not the professional. Holland (1973) studied the effect of organizational structure on resident management practices of institutional staff and found that decentralization of authority was more influential than staff to resident ratios on the development of resident treatment programs. In a study of staff working in a residential rehabilitation program and a sobering-up station, Berger-Gross and Lisman (1979) tested the hypothesis that work settings would result in differences in attitudes between the two groups. They found that the rehabilitation staff had a more humanistic attitude toward the alcoholic and a view that the etiology of alcoholism was psychological in nature.
Others, however, have argued that the study of attitudes should take into account the interaction of personality and environmental variables. Inkeles (1959) and Inkeles and Levinson (1963) have posited that to predict the functioning of a particular institution, a researcher needs to know both the system and the personality characteristics in the population at large and among incumbents of specific roles. They have argued that there is a reciprocity between the individual's personality and the extent to which the environment is mediated by the personality. To them, it is important to study both the individual and the social situation.

In addition, Yinger (1963) noted in a review on the implications of a field view of personality that the social psychologist should study individual behavior in the social context. Researchers need to consider not only personal traits, but the social system as well. In the area of mental illness, a field view requires that it be defined only in the process of interaction.

In a series of studies that examined the interaction of persons and settings, Moos (1968), Moos (1969), and Moos and Daniels (1967) utilized a semantic differential to assess staff and patients' feelings in various ward sub-settings. They found that the person and setting interaction accounted for most of the variance. Furthermore, setting differences for staff were somewhat more important
in accounting for total variance than were individual differences. This suggests that predictions may be possible on how staff will react if the particular setting they are in is known. More recently, Moos (1974, 1975) and Moos and Brownstein (1977) have argued for combining the individual's personality, attitudes and background variables with the study of the environment as a means of increasing the accuracy of behavior predictions.

**Purposes**

The purpose of this study is to examine staff attitudes toward the alcoholic and staff job satisfaction in relation to need-press congruence in two types of alcoholism residential treatment programs. The attitudes will be studied from the person-environment interaction perspective discussed in the preceding section. The focus will be on the staff personality needs and perceptions of the work environments in the two types of treatment programs.

There are several specific objectives of the study. First, staff from the two types of programs will be compared to determine if there are significant differences in their closeness needs as well as on eleven other personality factors. Secondly, they will be compared on differences in the degree of perceived supportiveness in their work environments. Third, they will be studied to determine if there are differences in the degree of congruence of their scores on the measures for closeness need and perceived supportiveness in the work environment. That is, will the variability
of scores on the two measures be closely associated or widely dispersed?

The next two hypotheses will examine the relationship of congruence and attitudes toward the alcoholic and job satisfaction. The staff will be grouped according to level of congruence and scores on the six scales of the Attitude Toward Alcoholics Instrument and will be compared by those levels. In addition, they will be compared on a measure of job satisfaction along these same groupings.

These hypotheses have been formulated in the general context of the person-environment interaction theory. Essentially, it proposes that human behavior should be studied in terms of the relationship of the individual and the environment. The prediction of behavior is improved when the researcher has knowledge of both the individual's personality, the environmental influences, and how the two interact. Researchers have hypothesized that the study of attitudes should take into consideration the interaction of the individual and the environment.

Need-press congruence is a more specific aspect of the person-environment interaction hypothesis that is of concern in this study. Murray (1938) has posited that an individual's needs and his or her environmental press interact to influence behavior. As will be discussed in Chapter II, a number of studies have been conducted along Murray's theoretical notions around job satisfaction. This hypothesis,
however, has not been applied to the study of attitudes toward the alcoholic. Nevertheless, the basic tenets of the person-environment interaction suggest that need-press congruence would have applicability to the study of influences on these attitudes.

Types of Programs

The staff, or respondents to the questionnaires, will be drawn from two types of residential alcoholism treatment programs: residential rehabilitation and detoxication programs. These programs offer a residential and protective environment while the individual alcoholic progresses through the treatment regimen of the specific programs.

There are some similarities in the types of services offered by the two programs. For instance, both offer some counseling to the alcoholic. There is some education focusing on the effects of alcohol on the individual both physically and psychologically. In addition, there is an attempt to link the alcoholic to a self-help group such as Alcoholics Anonymous.

However, there are many more important differences between the two types of programs. A significant difference is the length of stay for the clients. For the detoxication programs, the programmed length of stay is generally five days, whereas, for the rehabilitation programs, the programmed length of stay is thirty days or more. This offers several advantages to the residential rehabilitation
program. As the staff work with the clients over time, they are able to see some changes (either verbal or behavioral) in them. This in itself can be reinforcing to the staff. They are able to see positive changes as a result of their work. Even if the clients have completed their detoxication within the program and stay for the longer term treatment, the staff get to see the clients at their best as well as their worst. In contrast, the detoxication staff must try to persuade the clients to go on for continued service. They do not have the opportunity to see them at their best.

As support for the significance of this difference, Reynolds and Coleman (1972) found that when staff believed they were playing an instrumental role in patients treatment, their attitudes and morale tended to be higher. They compared staff using treatment techniques based on principles of behavior therapy with another utilizing traditional treatment techniques. The results showed that the staff using the behavior therapy techniques had significantly more positive views of the ward atmosphere. In addition, their morale was higher. Another finding in their study was that opinions on the likelihood of responding to treatment and potential for adjustment outside of the hospital also improved in the experimental group.

Another facet of the significance of the longer lengths of stay for the rehabilitation program staff is the effect
of higher discharge rates or client turnover on staff. In a study involving inpatient psychiatric programs, Ellsworth, Maroney, Klett, Gorden, and Gunn (1971) found that nursing staff had negative views of units characterized by high release rates. In addition, these programs failed to promote patient autonomy. The professional staff tended to not involve either staff or the patients in responsible roles.

Another advantage of the longer lengths of stay is the opportunity afforded for the acculturation of the clients into the programs' milieu by other clients as well as the staff. In a study that examined the acculturation of milieu therapy, Almond, Keniston, and Bolton (1972) studied the effect of the ward milieu on changes in the pattern of values of patients hospitalized for emotional problems. The study attempted to relate how staff and patients working together over an extended period of time have an opportunity to develop shared values, attitudes and beliefs. The results of the study indicate that inpatient values are a product of staff values only insofar as they are integrated into the ward social system through positively sanctioned patient roles that must put these values into practice. The specific pressures toward this role were found to be the role of the ward director and reinforcement given by staff leadership to other staff for exhibiting the desired value system. The ongoing acculturation of the patients in the desired value system, effective and appropriate delegation
of responsibility, and the lessening of symptomatic behavior through social and pharmacologic control were the result of long lengths of stay. Since the clients in the detoxication programs do not stay very long, staff do not have a chance to impart very many values to the clients other than routine expectations of daily living. Furthermore, the clients do not have an opportunity to participate in an acculturation process. Instead, it is the staff who must communicate to the clients all of the norms for the program.

Another significant difference between the two types of programs is the difference in their goals. Dimsdale (1975), in a study that examined the goals of patients and staff on a psychiatric inpatient unit, noted that goals provide an organization with direction. They enable the individual to put limits on a random environment. Furthermore, they become the basis for a worker's identification and motivation. The primary objectives of the detoxication programs are to provide a humane and safe environment in which alcoholics can sober up. Secondly, they try to convince them of the value of continued treatment. The goals of the residential rehabilitation programs are somewhat different. These programs have completed their work. The primary objective of the long-term programs is to help the alcoholic establish a behavior pattern of sobriety. The protective and supportive environments provide the assistance to accomplish this objective. In addition, there is an opportunity to work with
the families of alcoholics. The long term client stay also provides an opportunity to staff in these programs to work with the alcoholic over longer periods of time and develop closer relationships that are not available in the detoxication programs.

**Definition of Terms**

To provide clarity in the purposes of the study, definitions are provided for the key concepts.

**Need-press Congruence**

This is the degree of fit between personality needs and the press or demands of the environment. Stern (1970) has defined personality need as the activities an individual prefers to do. Press refers to the phenomenological view of the world an individual possesses. It also refers to those views that are shared with others.

Congruence, then, refers to the degree of symmetry between a personality need and the perceived climate or press of the environment. A lack of congruence would reflect a dissonant relationship between the need and press. This would lead to a desire on the part of the individual to bring one or the other into balance with the other. The other option open to the individual is to withdraw from the situation.

**Closeness Need**

This is defined by Stern (1970) as recognition of one's needs for warmth and emotional supportiveness.
Supportiveness

Stern (1970) defined this as respect for the integrity of the teacher as a person with recognition that dependency needs are to be supported. It is not necessary for independence needs to be accepted. Scales measuring this could reflect a climate of certainty, acceptance, and non-prejudice.

Job Satisfaction

Dawis (1976) in a paper reviewing the Minnesota Theory of Work Adjustment defined job satisfaction as the correspondence between an individual's needs and the work environment's reinforcers. Individuals bring into their work environment certain needs and abilities and the environment, in turn, has certain requirements. Correspondence, then, is the degree to which the two sets of requirements are mutually responsive.

Attitudes

Rokeach (1969) has defined an attitude as "a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner." Allport (1939) also defined an attitude as one's position for or against something that is rooted in motivation. They have a driving force which impels someone to act in a particular way. These definitions point out how attitudes are evaluative in nature and predispose an individual to a certain action.
Alcoholism

Defined by the American Psychiatric Association, alcoholism is a pattern of pathological alcohol use. It results in an impairment of social and/or occupational functioning. Also, the individual develops a physical tolerance that results in withdrawal symptoms when use is discontinued.

Non-hospital Detoxication Center

Established by the State of Illinois Alcohol Intoxication Act of 1976, these programs offer a humane and supervised environment for the withdrawal of alcohol. No hospitalization is offered, but referral can be made for any medical complications resulting from the withdrawal. Lengths of stay are generally up to 5 days.

Nimmers (1970) noted that there are 5 basic goals of the detoxication program:

1. removal of the criminal label for public intoxication and stigmatizing effect that was thought to impede rehabilitative efforts;

2. removal of a large burden from the criminal justice system;

3. provide more humane treatment than drunk tanks;

4. provide prompt medical care; and

5. referral to ongoing treatment.

Annis (1979) also stressed the importance of the last goal. The average length of stay in these programs in Illinois is 2.9 days.
Residential Rehabilitation

These programs generally begin when the client has completed the withdrawal from alcohol. The length of the program generally runs 14 - 28 days. The average length of stay in such programs in Illinois is 27.7 days. These programs aim at helping the alcoholic establish a pattern of sobriety. Because of the treatment techniques used, they also aim at changing unsatisfying behavior patterns to more satisfying ones. The treatment modalities used are individual and group therapy as well as family therapy if the alcoholic's social network has not disintegrated. In addition, there is an educational component that stresses the effects of alcohol. In some instances, a non-hospital detoxification service may be offered by the residential rehabilitation program.

Staffs

The staffs who participated in the study were those providing direct-care services to the clients of the programs. This included both professional and para-professional levels. Each program is allowed to develop its own job descriptions and to utilize job titles in keeping with their own programmatic requirements. The most commonly used job title is a characteristic of both types of programs. This can be seen in Table 9 on page 73. In addition, the detoxication programs utilize two other types of general titles: treatment assistant and addiction specialist. Finally, the
detoxication programs utilize a shift supervisor position that is not shown for the other program. This may reflect the need for greater structure on all shifts because the detoxication programs do not control who and when clients are admitted. The rehabilitation programs, however, do control who is admitted and when they are admitted. Administrative and clerical staff were excluded from the study.

The types of major activities that the staffs engage in are different for each type of program. The residential rehabilitation programs provide individual and group counseling, family counseling, lectures on the effects of alcoholism, and recreational activities. Because the length of stay for the clients is longer, there is an opportunity for the staff to develop long term relationships.

The detoxication staff have an opportunity to do some counseling, both individually and in groups, with the clients. What counseling is done, however, is over a short term for those who stay more than a day or two. The activity that is emphasized is motivating the clients to continue treatment when detoxication is completed. Thus, referral and liaison with other agencies is an important activity. Because of this emphasis, detoxication programs are viewed as an entry point into the alcoholism treatment system. Finally, many clients do not continue in an organized treatment program when detoxication has been completed.
Significance of the Study

Several researchers have documented the importance of therapists' attitudes toward their clients. In a study of patients' views of their therapists, Strupp, Fox, and Lesser (1969) found that a patients' degree of improvement was related to their views of the therapist. Greatest improvement among the clients was revealed when the therapist was seen as attentive, warm, and willing to engage in small talk. In contrast, there was a tendency to get angry when the therapist was viewed as neutral.

Pattison (1966) noted that the therapist must show a fundamental respect for alcoholics when treating them. Furthermore, a negative response by disulfiram treatment can be predicted when given by a deprecating physician. Also, Selzer (1951) has written on the negative impact of overt or covert hostility from a therapist. To the alcoholic, a hostile therapist is another obstacle that must be overcome.

This evidence suggests that it is important to know not only the attitudes of staff working with the alcoholic, but also those factors influencing them. In this way, better treatment modalities can be developed that will play a part in better treatment outcome.

A second consideration is the additional support that could be provided to some studies that have suggested that ecological and psycho-social variables have important roles in the study of treatment environments. For instance,
MOOS (1972) studied treatment environments at a wide variety of VA hospital wards and found that the variables of ward size and staffing are likely to influence the type of environment that is created on a psychiatric ward.

Finally, should support for the purposes be found, additional evidence would be provided for the value of studying the interaction of personality and organizational climate.

Overview

The remainder of the dissertation will be organized in the following manner: Chapter Two will provide a review of the literature pertinent to the study. Specifically, the focus will be on theories related to the person-environment interaction hypothesis. Particular attention will be given to need-press congruence and its relationship to attitudes toward the alcoholic and job satisfaction. Chapter Three will provide a description of the method and instruments used to test the major hypotheses. In addition, the hypotheses will be listed in greater detail than provided in the Introduction. The analysis of the data, results and discussion will be presented in Chapter Four. Chapter Five will summarize the study and provide conclusions, implications and recommendations for future study. Samples of instruments and correspondence used in the study will be provided in the Appendices.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, literature on need-press congruence, job satisfaction and attitudes toward alcoholics will be reviewed. Each section will first consider some of the theoretical ideas, followed by empirical studies. Particular attention will be given those studies focusing on the interaction of person and environment. This review will be approached from a multidisciplinary standpoint.

Need-Press Congruence

In writing on the person-environment interaction, various researchers have used a number of terms to describe their particular approach. Among these terms are need-press congruence, goodness of fit, and the interaction hypothesis. All suggest basically the same thesis: That the person and the environment must be studied together because both interact with each other to influence behavior.

The first part of this review will deal with theoretical statements of this approach to studying human behavior. Literature from the fields of psychology, sociology, education, anthropology and organizational development will be discussed. The second part will focus on empirical studies utilizing these constructs and what support they provide for studying the interaction of person and environment.
One of the earliest advocates of the need-press model was Henry Murray. He propounded a theory of motivation that utilized the notion of needs as a major component. According to Murray (1938) this concept was seen as an abstraction, but it is related to underlying physiological processes in the brain. It produces and maintains activity in the part of the person until a level of satisfaction is reached that reduces the need. Needs are inferred from the organism, rather than actually being observed or measured. The basis of such inferences are:

1.) the effect or end result of the behavior;

2.) the particular pattern or mode of behavior involved;

3.) selective attention and response to a particular class of stimulus objects;

4.) the expression of a particular emotion or affect; and

5.) expression of satisfaction when a particular effect is achieved or disappointment when it is not (Murray, 1938).

On the basis of his work with a small number of subjects, Murray formulated a lengthy list of needs. These needs were also classified into five overall categories depending upon a number of different factors.

Needs do not operate in isolation. Rather, there is a degree of interrelatedness. On the one hand, there is a hierarchy of needs with some taking precedence over others
according to Murray's theoretical formulation. In addition, some needs can serve as the basis for building up the organism. This is different than serving as a motivating component for tension reduction. Using Murray's terminology, this is an anabolic function for a need.

The other part of Murray's theory is the concept of press. Very broadly, it is defined as the significant determinants of behavior within the environment. A need is an intrinsic determinant of behavior and press is an extrinsic determinant of behavior.

Also, press is any attribute in the environment which may facilitate or impede the individual's effort to satisfy his or her need drives. Knowledge of both needs and press increases the predictability of behavior.

In Murray's scheme, there are two types of press that are important. The first, beta press, is the perception of the objects in the environment. The second, alpha press, is the objective description of the properties in the environment.

It is not enough to study the individual or the environment in Murray's theoretical framework. The researchers should consider both the subject and the object if they are to make predictions about behavior. This can be done on two levels. One level would be the study of a molar or behavioral unit, wherein the situation and the operating need are both studied as a single unit. This is known as
The second level, known as a unity-thema, involves the study of a single pattern of related needs and press that give meaning and coherence to the individual's early childhood. Like Freud, Murray believed in the importance of an individual's early developmental history for explaining current behavior.

Another theorist who has stressed the importance of the interaction of person and environment was Kurt Lewin. In his book *Principles of Topological Psychology* (1936), he noted that both the characteristics of the individual and environment should be studied. Every psychological event depends upon the state of the person and the environment, although their relative importance is different in each case.

In the field of group behavior, Lewin (1948) took the position that the individual and the psychological environment cannot be treated as separate entities. Rather, they are dynamically one field. This principle of interaction is important in how Lewin defined group membership. He did not regard outward and physical characteristics as providing the basis for membership. Instead, interaction is the basis for group membership. That is, how a person interacts with others in the group is the more critical determinant of membership.

Furthermore, groups are defined on the basis of their
dynamics rather than outward or concrete characteristics. Lewin devoted a great deal of his efforts in studying atmosphere created in groups and their impact on its members.

As a way of representing the interdependence of person and environment, Lewin (1951) developed the mathematical formula $B = f(P,E)$. This can be read as: Behavior is a function of Person and Environment.

Sells (1963) is another psychologist who has argued for the importance of the interaction of the individual and environment. His position is that the principles of determinism, multiple determinism, and interaction have important implications for psychology.

In his article, he cites the importance of the principles of interaction in the fields of biology and anthropology as well as psychology. Research in each of these fields has shown how people have adapted to their environment in order to survive and flourish. Modern research techniques should enable scientists to utilize more complicated models to measure the multiple encounters between the organism and environment. Ultimately, he argues, there will need to be a satisfactory conceptualization of the environment to reach this objective. This entails the development of a taxonomy of the environment.

From a social psychological standpoint, Yinger (1963) has argued for the need to consider variables that stem from inner tendencies as well as those stemming from the
social situation in psychological research. This is necessary because no researcher is able to examine a single trait in all of the situations where it may express itself. If all things were constant and stable, then examination of a single trait would be of some use.

In his view, neither personality variables nor environmental variables have a direct effect on behavior by themselves. Rather, each influences the other.

A review of some of the empirical evidence supporting the interaction hypothesis has been provided by Pervin (1968). His review examined research in the areas of performance, satisfaction, and academic performance and satisfaction. In the area of performance, he concluded that:

"Interactions among modes of response, situations, and persons were more important in producing variations in behavior than any of the individual sources of variance alone."
(Pervin, 1968, p. 57)

Similarly, in the area of occupational satisfaction, he concluded that satisfaction with one's occupation could be studied from the interaction standpoint. College administrators could reach their objectives in different ways by taking into consideration the environmental and personality characteristics of the college and its student body. Pervin's review concluded that the fit between an individual's personality characteristics and the social climate have a bearing on performance.

Jahoda (1961) has also posited that the goodness of fit
between a culture and an individual's values and beliefs affects an individual's performance. Furthermore, her main thesis is that each situation is unique for the researcher. This means that values and beliefs of a particular culture are not necessarily comparable across cultures.

To illustrate her point, she cites colleges as an example of cultures that have the appearance of being comparable. In reality, the values and beliefs comprising the cultures are unique and different. Therefore, the researcher can transcend this uniqueness by studying the goodness of fit between person and environment.

By studying the goodness of fit, the researcher is then able to make generalizations across situations where similar groups exhibit the same degree of fit. Thus, the object of study is the relationship of person and environment, rather than one or the other.

Research on the interaction hypothesis has not been limited to these fields. Theoretical formulations and empirical research have been conducted in a variety of other areas. One such field has been in the study of organizations. The focus in these studies has been on the effect of organizations on human behavior.

In one of his earliest works, Argyris (1957) has suggested that formal organizations make demands on relatively healthy individuals. These demands can be inconsistent with their needs. This, in turn, leads to frustration.
Documentation of this effect can be found in one of his early works (Argyris, 1964). Jobs that have been fractionalized in accordance with the principles of scientific management tend to increase the dependence and submissiveness of workers. Argyris assumes that people aspire to competence and psychological success. They are frustrated in achieving these goals by work that is fractionalized and highly specialized. Thus, the degree of their frustration is determined by the degree they aspire to competence and psychological success.

The resulting feelings of frustration could lead to increased levels of absenteeism, goldbricking, worker turnover, trade unions, etc. In turn, first line managers, such as foremen, could protect these activities. This could be done by citing problems with raw materials and poor production goals and standards. Eventually, higher level managers can be caught up in the same process.

The eventual result is that poor worker performance becomes institutionalized. An unhealthy situation develops where repetitive work activities lead to frustration and poor work performance. This, in turn, leads to feelings of psychological failure and conflict. Ultimately, the organization will not be able to meet its goals and maintain itself.

To counter this tendency, Argyris proposes that an increase in congruency between an individual's needs for
psychological success and demands of the organizational environment will ameliorate the deleterious effects of a pyramidal organization. A major assumption in his framework is that the individual and the organization are interconnected.

He goes on to argue that organizations have many sources of energy. One such source is psychological energy, an energy which is a primary focus of his theory. This energy requires three things:

1. individuals must value themselves and want to increase their sense of competency;

2. the organization must provide an opportunity for people to define their own goals, the paths to these goals, relate them to the organization's goals and evaluate their effectiveness; and

3. recognition that society can influence the people and organization in which they are embedded.

In essence, Argyris draws many parallels between positive mental health of individuals and the organization. The integration of the organization and people is greater when the organization is modified to meet the three conditions of psychological energy and when they aspire to positive mental health.

This emphasis on positive mental health receives more attention in his book Management and Organizational Development (1971). There, his focus is on human resources and how a quality of life within an organization can be created
and maintained. The quality of life Argyris is proposing would enable people to make effective decisions based on useful and relevant information. Also, it would result in higher degrees of energy and commitment to their decisions.

The focus on people is important to Argyris because they create and maintain organizations. Also, it is people who must design, accept and implement changes needed to preserve an organization's healthy state. This view emphasizes the importance of the interrelatedness of person and environment: While people have a significant impact on the organization, the organization is also the means by which they are able to satisfy their personal needs.

Other theorists and researchers have also been concerned with optimizing the human resources in an organization. In the field of educational administration, Andrew Halpin has conducted research into how organizations can be modified so as to satisfy the needs of the people working in it to the mutual benefit of both.

In his book Theory and Research in Administration (1966), Halpin has focused on the organizational climate in the school. Like Murray, he is a need-press theorist and also emphasizes the importance of studying the individual and the environment.

The organizational climate, in his view, interacts with the needs of principals and faculty to influence behavior.
To measure organizational climate, he developed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire for use in schools. By combining its use with the Edwards Personnel Preference Schedule, Halpin suggested that an adequate formulation of the needs-press configuration of an organization could be made.

The final area to be considered is that of vocational choice and satisfaction. There have been some theorists who have hypothesized that vocational choice can fit the person-environment interaction hypothesis. Their thesis is that people choose occupations because they provide a means of meeting their needs. Satisfaction, in turn, is directly related to the congruence of needs and environment.

One such theorist is John Holland. In his book *The Psychology of Vocational Choice* (1966), he suggests the notion that job satisfaction, vocational stability, and behavior are dependent on the congruence of personality and environment.

He proposes that there are six personality types. These types are:

1. realistic
2. intellectual
3. social
4. conventional
5. enterprising
6. artistic
Each of these personality types is associated with a corresponding type of environment. People choose training in a particular vocation because the environment is appealing to their needs and interests (Holland, 1959). As people mature, their preferences for environments are stabilized and formed into a hierarchy. Where the hierarchy is unstable and ambiguous, then vocational choice will also be tenuous and vacillating.

Where the person and the environment are congruent, Holland states that there are a number of benefits. Vocational choice is more stable. Achievement, both in vocational and academic endeavors, is generally higher. Finally, there is greater personal stability and satisfaction in an individual's life.

Personal stability and satisfaction are the result of matching the person's coping abilities with the environmental tasks and problems. Thus, from Holland's viewpoint, human behavior is dependent upon both the personality and environment and how they interact. When only one or the other is considered, the result is an incomplete picture.

Ann Roe is another researcher in the field of vocational choice who agrees with the importance of studying the person and the environment. She has written that individuals

"...are products of their experience as well as of their genes, and the setting in many ways. They cannot be understood out of context. Nor can the context be understood without some understanding of
Like Murray, she believes that an individual's occupational choice is tied to the psychological climate in which he was raised. These early experiences shape certain needs, interests and values which ultimately have a bearing on this choice (Roe, 1956).

She also has formulated her theory of personality on the basis of Maslow's hierarchy of needs. To her, needs form the basis of occupational choice as people strive to satisfy them through their work. Work plays an important part in the satisfaction of people's needs during their lives.

Each of these researchers has emphasized the importance of studying the person and the environment. The result of studying only one or the other is an incomplete picture and explanation of human behavior. Knowledge of both variables and their influences on each other increases the researcher's power to predict human behavior.

In an empirical test of Murray's theory, Stern (1970) developed two instruments to measure personality needs and the climate or press of an organization. The book, *People in Context* (1970) by George Stern, has been described by Sells (1971) as a definitive book that describes comprehensive instruments to measure the individual differences of people interacting with their environments. Its aim was
to test Murray's theories on need-press congruence. As a compilation of research material, it represents over ten years work on these theoretical ideas.

Stern began the development of the instruments while teaching at the University of Chicago. The Activities Index measures personality need on the basis of people's likes and dislikes. An underlying assumption is that an individual's preference for an activity is a reflection of his underlying needs. Scores are provided on thirty scales. At the next level of analysis, they can be grouped into twelve factors and the factors can be grouped into three areas.

To measure organizational climate, Stern developed several instruments for use in particular types of settings, such as high schools, colleges, business, etc. Like the Activities Index, the climate indexes have corresponding and equivalent scales. Rather than asking about preferred activities, the climate indexes ask for perceptions of the organizational climate.

Much of the original research with these instruments was done on college campuses. Stern believed that each college campus develops its own culture and climate and that students do better in those environments where it is matched to their particular needs. His data revealed that students exhibit characteristics appropriate to the colleges they attend.

As an example of the type of analysis Stern was engaged
in, he found five cultures drawn from scores on the Activities Index and College Climate Index by students in a number of different colleges. These are:

1. **Expressive**: Schools in this category were non-work oriented, non-conforming, esthetic interests. The scores also suggested a strong emphasis on self-actualizing goals.

2. **Intellectual**: Schools in this category were characterized by strong intellectual pursuits.

3. **Protective**: The culture in these schools was a highly organized and supportive environment with students who were dependent and submissive.

4. **Vocational**: The main characteristics in this culture were a climate that emphasized conventionality and an authoritarian structure. The students tended to be egocentric, wishful, exhibitionistic, and manipulative.

5. **Collegiate**: Primary characteristics of these schools were the availability of extensive recreational facilities and an uncertain purposefulness.

Pace (1966) had found that colleges could also be classified in a similar manner. He utilized an instrument similar to the College Climate Index to measure perceptions of organizational climate. The results of his research showed that liberal arts and junior colleges were characterized by friendly student-teacher relationships and good teaching. The high prestige liberal arts colleges provided opportunities for their students to confront social ideas.

Stern did not limit himself to the study of college campuses. One of his objectives was to measure the
environments of other types of organizations such as the peace Corps, businesses, and schools from the faculty standpoint. This led to the development of the Organizational Climate Index. Like the College Climate Index, it measures a member's perceptions of the organizational climate and has thirty scales that correspond to those on the Activities Index.

The major contribution of People in Context is the extensive research conducted with the Activities Index and the climate indexes. In this way, some empirical evidence is provided to demonstrate the efficacy of Murray's theoretical scheme in describing and explaining human behavior.

More recently, Meadows (1980a, 1980b) has attempted to test Murray's notions in organizations. Utilizing some of the items from Murray's questionnaire schedule, he compared the needs and perceptions of staff working in the research and development divisions of a large telecommunications company.

He concluded that redesigning the task itself will not necessarily increase worker satisfaction. Rather, consideration must also be given to the group structure. This group structure is made up of the worker's perception of the sharing of roles, tasks, and responsibilities as well as the supportiveness of communications and participation in the decision making process. Additional evidence was provided to suggest that the interaction of traits and
structure was significant enough to warrant further investigation.

There are several conclusions that can be drawn from these studies. First, the interaction hypothesis has a great deal of theoretical support. Furthermore, this support comes from a wide variety of fields. These fields include psychology, sociology, anthropology and education. This notion has drawn the attention of a number of theorists and researchers in each field who consider it important enough to devote their talents and energies to its study.

Second, how people and their environment interact appears to influence their performance and the satisfaction they derive from their behavior. It would appear that it could affect their adjustment as well.

Third, there are several methods of studying the person-environment interaction. One way of doing this is to utilize the need-press model. However, no matter which method is chosen, comparisons among groups is possible when the same method is used.

Fourth, there is some means of measuring an individual's needs and perceptions of the environment.

Need-Press Congruence and Job Satisfaction

A great deal of research has been conducted in the area of job satisfaction and the factors that influence it. According to Brayfield and Crockett (1955), research into this area had been conducted as early as the 1920s, but it
had not been a very active area. During World War II, however, this changed and research activity in this area became very extensive. This level of activity has continued unabated since their review.

In this section, theoretical and empirical studies focusing on job satisfaction will be examined. Particular attention will be given to those studies that have examined job satisfaction and need-press congruence.

Brayfield and Crockett (1955) completed an early review of the literature on job satisfaction up to that time. They noted that these early researchers stated that there was a causal relationship between job satisfaction and performance. That is, workers were more highly motivated if they were satisfied with their work. However, one of the conclusions they reached was that the empirical data did not support that relationship.

They attribute the failure of the empirical evidence to support that conclusion to some of the methodological problems. Furthermore, they question the wisdom of focusing solely on performance as a dependent measure in these studies. Instead, it was suggested that other things such as the quality of job performance and harmonious labor relations may be desirable outcomes.

An additional consideration that they bring up is that of studying the individual differences of workers. These differences must also be studied in the context of the
social systems in which the worker operates. They concluded that:

"...the most significant conclusions to be drawn from this survey...is that the industrial situation is a complex one. We have suggested that an analysis of the situation involves analysis not only of the individual's relation to the social system of the factory, the work group, and the union, but the community at large as well. It is important to know what motives exist among industrial workers, how they are reflected in the behavior of the workers and how the motives develop and are modified within the framework of patterned social relationships in the plant and in the larger community."

(Brayfield and Crockett, 1955, p. 422)

One of the shortcomings of the Brayfield and Crockett conclusions is that they do not specify the individual differences in the workers that should be studied. They limit their discussion to worker motives, a somewhat ambiguous term.

Vroom (1964) and Locke (1969) took the Brayfield and Crockett conclusion a little further. Vroom (1964) reviewed the literature on job satisfaction up to that time. He concluded that the research focused on situational and environmental variables that affected job satisfaction. Little attention was given to personality variables. To Vroom, this was a serious shortcoming.

He argued for the importance of personality and situational variables in affecting job satisfaction. The study of the interaction of these two variables will lead to a better understanding of job satisfaction.
Similarly, Edwin Locke (1969) has posited that the interaction of personality and environmental variables must be studied in order to make any predictions about job satisfaction. In his view, satisfaction and dissatisfaction are a function of the perceived relationship between what is desired in a job and what it is perceived as offering.

A more extensive formulation of the relationship between person and environment as it relates to job satisfaction can be found in the Minnesota Theory of Work Adjustment. In an early paper on the theory, Betz, Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1968) noted that "satisfaction is a function of the correspondence between the reinforcer system system of the work environment and the individual's set of needs..."

Essentially, this theory hypothesizes that the most frequent responses in a work situation become associated with a person's abilities. In turn, the most frequently occurring environmental reinforcers become associated with needs. Dawis (1976) noted that job satisfaction can be predicted by the correspondence between these needs and reinforcers.

Dawis goes on to note that the correspondence relationship between need and reinforcers is moderated by satisfactoriness. That is, job satisfaction prediction is improved when something is known about how well a worker is performing.
A partial test of this theory of job satisfaction was provided by Betz (1969). Her study found that job satisfaction was a function of the correspondence between needs and reinforcers for two out of three groups of retail clerks. The relationship was also supported when the three groups were combined.

Finally, Tagiuri (1968) has hypothesized that the way one carries out a task depends on the kind of person one is and the environment in which one acts. Although he was writing on the concept of organizational climate, he brings up some relevant points that are pertinent when reviewing the literature on the relationship of person and environment to job satisfaction. Among the problems he cites are:

1. distinguishing between objective and subjective environments;
2. separating the person and the situation, i.e., a social norm that has been internalized;
3. identifying the salient aspects of the environment; and
4. identifying the structures and dynamics of the environment.

The next question to consider is that of the empirical evidence to support the importance of the person-environment relationship to job satisfaction.

In an early series of studies of need fulfillment and job satisfaction, Porter (1962a, 1962b, and 1963) investigated changes in importance of needs from lower to higher levels of management in companies of varying sizes. He was also interested in investigating the degree managers
perceived their needs as being met by level and size of company. Maslow's conceptions of needs and hierarchy were used in developing the dependent measure.

One of the results of his investigation showed that level of management position had an effect on degree of perceived need satisfaction. That is, of the five levels of management investigated, higher levels reported greater degrees of need satisfaction than lower levels.

A second finding in his research was in the relationship of importance of need satisfaction to level of management. Using the same managers and companies, Porter asked them to rate the importance of satisfying security, social, esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization needs. Again, level of management influenced the degree of importance assigned to some needs. Higher level managers saw satisfaction of autonomy and self-actualization needs as more important than lower level managers. There was no difference, however, in assigned importance on the other three needs between higher and lower levels of management.

When the variable of company size is also considered, Porter found that lower level managers in small companies were more satisfied than lower level managers in large companies. For higher level managers in large companies, however, there was greater reported satisfaction than higher level managers in small companies. Thus, there was an interactive effect between size and level of management on the
satisfaction of personality needs.

In another study that examined the influence of level of position on job success, Mitchell and Porter (1967) asked military officers the importance of inner-directed traits on job success. They found that higher level officers placed greater emphasis on inner-directed traits than lower level officers. These results were similar to results obtained from civilian managers. One significant difference between the military and civilian managers was that lower level officers tended to place greater emphasis on other-directed traits than lower level civilian managers.

These studies have examined the relationship of personality needs and job satisfaction within organizations. Other researchers have examined the relationship of personality needs and job characteristics to need fulfillment and job satisfaction.

Hackman and Lawler (1971) have examined needs and job characteristics. In their study, they used as independent variables higher order need and job core dimensions. Higher order needs were defined as obtaining feelings of accomplishment and personal growth. Job core dimensions were variety, autonomy, task identity, and feedback.

Using employees from a large telephone company, they found that employees who expressed a desire for higher order needs also had higher motivation and job satisfaction levels when the jobs had high levels of the four core dimensions.
They concluded that the interdependencies of personality and job characteristics must be considered in job design.

In a study that also examined individual differences and job characteristics, Seybolt (1976) compared three work characteristics and job satisfaction to educational level. He predicted that individuals with higher levels of education would be more satisfied in jobs characterized by high levels of variety. Results from the study supported this hypothesis. Also, he found that education and task complexity were significantly related to satisfaction. Overall, the conclusion was that educational level was a complex variable and required further study.

Each of the studies in the two preceding areas has focused on concrete and specific aspects of the job. Research, however, has also been conducted on broader and more complex aspects of the job environment such as organizational climate or group structure. The focus in these studies is more in communications, role relationships and how employees perceive the environment around them.

In one such study, Kean (1973) used Murray's theoretical notions to test the relationship of need-press congruence to job satisfaction. She found that school counselors who showed a high submissiveness need had higher job satisfaction scores than low submissiveness need counselors when the work environment was described as close. Similarly, low expressiveness need counselors had significantly higher
satisfaction scores than high expressiveness need counselors in a close environment.

Driscoll (1978) examined the relationship of trust and participation in decision making to prediction of satisfaction. He found that the greater the congruence between desired participation and perceived participation the greater the satisfaction with the job. Congruence, however, was not a better predictor than perceived participation as he had hypothesized.

Driscoll did not examine the nature of the participatory process among the subjects of the study. If he had, the results would have more meaning because the type of climate in which the participatory process occurred would have had an influence on the dependent variable. Support for this notion comes from several sources. In a review of the literature on goal setting, Locke, Shaw, Saan, and Latham (1981) suggested that participation in the goal setting process may involve supportiveness. That is, the participants may have created a climate where interactions and contributions are encouraged. Litwin and Stringer (1968) have stated that environments which are supportive reduce fear of failure and increase motivation. Other research by Blau (1981) has shown that social support is negatively related to dissatisfaction with work.

In a study examining the relationship of personality needs and organic structures, Meadows (1980b) found support
for the value of looking at both variables in predicting job satisfaction. He utilized Murray's notions of needs and defined the organic structures as shared roles, tasks, and responsibilities, the supportiveness of communications, and participation in decision-making.

In summary, researchers have examined the interaction of person and environment as it relates to job satisfaction from several standpoints. Early studies focused on personality needs and level within the organization. Later studies examined personality needs and characteristics of the job. More recently, personality needs have been studied in relationship to more complex descriptions of the work environment such as climate.

It is evident that the interaction of person and environment influences attitudes toward work. The next area to consider is research on attitudes toward the alcoholic.  

**Attitudes Toward Alcoholics**

Research in social psychology has not focused on need-press congruence and attitudes. Nevertheless, some theorists and researchers have studied the interaction of person and environment on attitudes. An early study by Newcomb (1943) into the nature of attitude change toward public issues in college students provides evidence of the influence of climates on attitudes and personality changes. Students who exhibited conservative attitudes at the start of college had changed them to correspond with those of the
other students within a few years.

In a review of the research on attitude change, Sargent and Williamson (1966) concluded that it was impossible to separate personality, the social system, and attitudes. They listed nine major variables that have received extensive attention in attitude change research. These were both personality and environmental variables.

Endler (1973) has also argued for the study of the person and environment interaction in personality research. Based on evidence gathered during his research on attitudes, he found that the person and environment interaction accounted for more of the variance than either alone. As a consequence, he disagrees with researchers who see only one or the other as more important.

The examination of the research on staff attitudes toward the alcoholic reveals that there are few studies that have examined the person-environment interaction and its relationship to attitudes. Many of the studies have examined one or the other variable exclusively.

In an early study, Mendelson, Wexler, Kubansky, Harrison, Leiderman, and Solomon (1964) studied the role of personal values and contact as they relate to recommendations for treatment. More specifically, they were interested in studying the relationship between authoritarian attitudes and a custodial vs. humanistic viewpoint of treatment. It was thought that the expression of an authoritarian
attitude would result in a preference for the custodial viewpoint of treatment. More specifically, the authoritarian physician would recommend the highly structured setting of a hospital more frequently.

Results of the study showed that physicians scoring higher on the authoritarian scale, then the greater their likelihood of making a referral to a custodial setting. They concluded that personal values and socio-cultural factors may play an influential role in determining attitudes toward alcoholism.

Cartwright (1980) attempted to test the role of self-esteem and perceived support in the work environment in influencing therapist attitudes toward the alcoholic. One of his findings was that those in the higher levels of self-esteem showed more positive attitudes when perceived support in the work environment was considered. The relationship did not hold up, however, for those with low self-esteem. Thus, the influence of personality on attitudes seems to have a limited relationship when coupled with perceived support in the work environment.

These two studies provide mixed evidence on the influence of personality on attitudes toward the alcoholic. The Mendelson, et. al., study found a significant relationship between authoritarian personality and recommendations for treatment. The Cartwright study found that a personality variable (self-esteem) in conjunction with perceived support
in the work environment proved to be significantly related to attitudes at one level, but not at another. This suggests a need for further study examining other personality traits along with environmental characteristics.

Several studies have been carried out examining the influence of environmental factors on attitudes toward the alcoholic.

One variable that has received a great deal of attention is the work setting. Orcutt, Cairl, and Miller (1980) compared the views of students, the general public, policemen, and staff in social setting detoxication centers. They hypothesized that the staff in the social setting detoxication centers would have a more medical or illness conception of alcoholism than either of the three other groups. This relationship was supported. Moreover, the police viewed the alcoholic as more of a threat and placed more blame on the alcoholic for their problems than the other groups.

Berger-Gross and Lisman (1979) compared attitudes of staff working in a sobering up station and a rehabilitation program. The results indicated that the latter group had a humanistic attitude toward the alcoholic and thought the cause of alcoholism was psychological. A major limitation of the study was that only two facilities were used. Another limitation was that only a total of twenty-one subjects participated in the study. Finally, the only variable
controlled for was setting. No study was made of the interaction of personality and environmental variables. These limitations weaken the generalizations that can be made.

In another study that compared settings, Mogar, Helm, Suedeker, Suedeker, and Wilson (1969) did not find attitudinal differences between two groups of professional staff. One group worked in a residential while the other worked in an outpatient program. Like Berger-Gross and Lisman, the study used a small number of subjects and was limited to staff from two facilities. If both of these studies had used more staff from more facilities, a stronger statement would be made on the influence of setting alone on attitudes. As they stand now, the results may reflect the influence of variables unique to the particular facilities.

A third environmental variable that has been examined is the influence of status. Sowa and Cutter compared the attitudes of high, middle and low status staff working in a combined alcoholism and drug treatment program. They found that the significant differences were only found between the high and low status staffs. The finding of a negative attitude toward the alcoholic among high status staff was attributed to feelings of social distance from the alcoholic. Because the high status staff was comprised of physicians, psychologists, and social workers, it was suggested that educational and social distance factors may have been operating to influence attitudes.
The Mogar, et. al., study also examined the influence of status. A comparison was made of professional versus non-professional staff attitudes toward the alcoholics. The instrument used asked for attitudes on four scales. The results found differences between the two groups on only two of the scales.

Both of these studies suffered from some methodological flaws. The Mogar study had a small number of subjects in each condition. In addition, the subjects were drawn from a limited number of facilities. The obtained results could reflect situations unique to the one facility. The major flaw with the Sowa and Cutter study is the instrument used. This study used the Adjective Checklist which has been described by Rorer (1972) as a very inadequate instrument for the measurement of attitudes.

In conclusion, it appears that personality as a variable has mixed effect on attitudes toward the alcoholic. Research has not, however, been very extensive and studies utilizing other aspects of the personality are needed before any conclusions can be definitively made.

Similarly, environmental factors by themselves do not appear to have a significant influence either. Again, more definitive research is needed before conclusions can be made.

The work by Cartwright, however, suggests that personality in conjunction with other variables such as perceived
support may provide more useful information. Like the research on job satisfaction, investigations into the nature of staff attitudes toward the alcoholic will require investigation of both personality and environmental variables.

**Summary and Conclusions**

In summary, a number of theorists have argued that human behavior must be studied from the standpoint of the interaction of the person and environment. Although both aspects of this interaction have been studied individually, more information and better predictions of human behavior can be made when their interaction is considered.

Literature has been reviewed from a wide variety of areas. These fields include personality research, vocational choice, anthropology, sociology, and group dynamics. Such a wide variety of areas attests to the importance that many researchers and theorists attribute to studying the interaction of person and environment.

In addition, research has revealed that need-press congruence would have applicability in studying attitudes of direct treatment staff toward their work and toward alcoholics. Studies were reviewed that indicated needs and environment interact together to influence worker satisfaction. These studies have examined needs based on the theoretical notions of Maslow and Murray. The aspects of the environment studied have included level of position
within the organization, job characteristics, and perceptions of the environment.

More recently, supportiveness in the environment has received attention as a variable influencing worker satisfaction. It has been studied in conjunction with personality needs and results suggest that these variables have a substantial effect on worker satisfaction.

In the area of attitudes toward the alcoholic, most researchers have focused on person or environmental variables, rather than on the interaction of both. The research has shown that both variables influence attitudes toward the alcoholic. A more recent study has examined a personality variable and support in the environment on therapeutic attitudes. Results were inconclusive. Nevertheless, Endler (1973) has argued that the interaction of person and environment should be studied for a more thorough understanding of human behavior.

On the basis of this literature, it would be useful to study differences in need-press congruence between the direct treatment staff of alcohol detoxication and rehabilitation programs. Furthermore, it would be useful to examine the differences in relation to job satisfaction and attitudes toward the alcoholic. The study of the environmental variable should include some descriptions of the climate in which the staff work as well as more overt and obvious characteristics. This is supported by the most recent studies in the area of need-press congruence and
worker satisfaction where more complex aspects of the environment have been studied. Finally, no research has been conducted in the area of need-press congruence of the treatment staff in these two types of alcoholism treatment programs.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Facilities

Each of the facilities that participated in this study met three requirements. First, all receive funding from the Illinois Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. As a condition of receiving such funding, a program must agree to serve the poor and indigent as the primary target population (IDMHDD, 1980). People with financial resources may be served, but each agency is expected to reach out to the poor as a special population.

Second, each facility is operated as a not-for-profit agency. Again, an agency that does not have to maintain a specified level of profitability is more likely to serve the poor as well as the difficult to treat.

Third, each facility is licensed by the Illinois Department of Public Health to provide either detoxication or residential rehabilitation services or both. A license requires that an agency meet a specific set of standards in a minimal manner. This assures that there is a consistent level of standardization among the programs.

These three factors provide some measure of consistency among the programs. The primary target populations they serve can be assumed to be similar. In addition, each is
meeting the same set of standards for program operation.

Listed below is a brief description of each facility. All are within the Chicago Metropolitan Area.

**Facility A**

Located in an urban area outside of Chicago, the facility provides both detoxication and residential rehabilitation services. The staff function in both program areas and the clients participate in services for both programs as well. There is no separation of the clients and the staff other than for budgeting purposes. The clients are drawn from the immediate urban vicinity as well as from suburban and rural areas. It is operated as part of a county health department.

**Facility B**

This facility is located in the city of Chicago and is operated as part of a city health department. The program provides residential rehabilitation services with minimal detoxication services. There is no separation of the clients and the staff other than budgetary purposes. Only residents from the city are served.

**Facility C**

Located in Chicago, this facility provides residential rehabilitation service and is affiliated with a religious organization. Other social and medical services to the poor are provided, but only staff in the residential rehabilitation were included.
Facility D

Located in an urban center outside of Chicago, this facility operates a residential rehabilitation program as well as a halfway house. Each program is located in a separate physical plant. The clients are drawn from the immediate urban area as well as from the surrounding rural and Chicago suburban area. Some of the staff work part-time in the halfway house program.

Facility E

Located in an urban center outside of Chicago, this facility provides detoxication services only. It is operated by a larger agency that provides services to the mentally ill. Only the staff in the detoxication program participated in the study. The clients are drawn from its immediate urban service area as well as from suburban Chicago communities.

Facility F

This facility is located within the city of Chicago and provides detoxication services exclusively. It is operated by a religious affiliated organization that provides a variety of other social services throughout the state. The clients for the program are drawn from the immediate urban environment.

Facility G

This facility provides detoxication services as well as a boarding service. The boarding service does not provide
any form of organized treatment for the alcoholic nor is it licensed to do so. Clients and staff for both programs are separated. Also, it is located within the city of Chicago and is affiliated with a religious organization.

Facility H

Located within Chicago, this facility provides social setting detoxication services only. It is operated as part of a larger community organization, but the staff and the facility are separated from the larger organization.

All of the facilities providing the two types of residential services of interest in this study did not participate. Two facilities preferred not to participate. A third facility provided a detoxication service that was different from the others.

Sample

The focus of this study is the direct treatment staff who are responsible for the ongoing care and treatment of alcoholics during detoxication and rehabilitation. This includes the twenty-four hours coverage staff, paramedics, counselors, social workers, therapists, nurses, and psychologists.

The administrators and the program directors were excluded from the study because research by Wiggins (1972) indicates that administrative staff, such as school principals, reflect the organizational climate of the larger organization, rather than that of the school. This research
found that the principals perceived the climate of the schools differently than the teachers. The author concluded that it is the larger system (the school district) which influences the principal as well as the school. It is expected that program directors would respond in the same manner.

In the same way, the program coordinators can be seen as being influenced by the larger system (the agency). They interact with other program coordinators (if it is a large agency) as well as at the policy making levels of the organization.

The secretaries and clerical staff were also excluded from the study because they do not have direct contact with the clients. Furthermore, they would not be exposed to training programs and other staff experiences.

The number of staff and beds for each are shown in Table 1 as indicators of facility size. Both full and part-time staff are shown.

**Instruments**

Instruments used in the study were selected on the basis of their appropriateness and evidence of reliability and validity.

**Activities Index** (short form)

Developed by Stern (1970), the Activities Index is a measure of personality based on Murray's theory of personality. In the development of the items, Stern used as his
rationale the notion that an individual's preference for an activity is a reflection of his need.

The instrument provides scores on thirty scales and is comprised of ninety-one items. The long form of the Activities Index has three hundred items, ten for each scale. Items for the instrument were developed by having a group of psychologists generate possible items. Eventually, this list was reduced to a smaller number by a second group of psychologists.

Reporting in the Seventh Mental Measurement's Yearbook (1972), Skager noted that the reliability scores of the thirty scales "vary from .45 to .88 with a mean of .71." He also stated that the Activities Index has been a thoroughly researched instrument. Finally, where a researcher is interested in examining and analyzing personality variables on a group basis, Skager indicated that it was a better choice of instrument.

Based on research conducted by Stern, the thirty scales can be combined into twelve factors. One of these factors, the closeness factor, is of particular interest in this study. It is described by Stern as depicting an individual who is emotionally close. The scales comprising this factor are:

1. Supplication
2. Sexuality
3. Nurturance
4. Deference

A copy of the Activities Index is in Appendix A.
Organizational Climate Index - Supportiveness Factor

Also developed by Stern (1970), the Organizational Climate Index (OCI) in its long form provides scores on thirty scales. These scales correspond to the thirty scales on the Activities Index and are intended to provide descriptions of press according to Kelly (1971).

Skager (1972) reports that the reliability coefficients for the thirty scales range from .34 to .81 with an average of .66.

Like the Activities Index, the scales of the Organizational Climate Index can be grouped into factors. One of the factors used in this study is the Supportiveness factor. It was found by Stern (1970) in a group of teachers drawn from six school districts. It is defined as "the aspects of the organizational environment that respect the integrity of the teacher as a person, but with the implication of dependency needs to be supported rather than of independency needs to be accepted." It is comprised of the following scales in order of magnitude:

1. assurance
2. tolerance
3. objectivity
4. affiliation
5. conjunctivity
6. supplication
7. blame avoidance
8. harm avoidance
9. nurturance

Permission from the copyright holder was received to use items comprising these scales from the Organizational
Climate Index. A copy of the license is in Appendix B and a copy of the items is in Appendix C.

Each of the scales is comprised of items describing aspects of the environment. Respondents are asked to indicate whether the item is a true or false description of it.

**Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (short form)**

According to Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967), the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was developed to measure satisfaction with reinforcers in one's job. It was designed as a parallel instrument to the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire. The long form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire provides scores on twenty scales with five questions for each scale. A score for general satisfaction is also provided. The short-form is comprised of only twenty items, one from each scale.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire is self-administered. The respondents are asked to indicate their level of satisfaction in a Likert format to descriptive statements about their work. Scores for each item can range from very dissatisfied to very satisfied.

The manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire indicates that the reliability coefficients are adequate for each of the scales. The median Hoyt reliability coefficients for twenty-seven normative groups range from a high of .91 to .78 for the long form. For the short form, the Hoyt reliability coefficients for the normative groups on each
scale are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Extrinsic</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assemblers</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken together, the reliability coefficients for both the long and short forms show that the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire has more than acceptable levels of reliability.

Validity for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire is drawn from research with the Minnesota Information Questionnaire where it is predicted that the high-need-high-reinforcement group would express the most satisfaction with their work. This hypothesis is drawn from the theory of Work Adjustment. According to the authors, the results indicated that the predictions were supported.

Additional evidence is provided that shows support for the ability of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire to distinguish among occupational groups. A copy of the instrument is in Appendix D.

**Attitudes Toward Alcoholism Instrument**

This instrument provides a measure of a person's attitudes toward alcoholics and alcoholism. Developed by Tolor and Tamerin (1975), the Attitudes Toward Alcoholism provides scores in six scales that are referable to attitudes toward alcoholics. These scales and their definitions are:

1. **Psychological Etiology:** the basis of
alcoholism is psychological;
2. Physical-Genetic: alcoholism has a physical, inherited basis;
3. Moral Weakness: the alcoholic has weak morals or character;
4. Medical-Illness Model: the alcoholic is sick and alcoholism should be treated as an illness;
5. Humanism: treatment of the alcoholic should be kind, fair, and humanistic;
6. Social Rejection: alcoholics should be avoided or rejected.

Each scale is comprised of four items in a four-point Likert format. Higher scale scores indicate approval of the concept. Scales were developed by having nine raters categorize the twenty-four items into the six scales.

Reliability coefficients for the six scales range from .53 to .77 based on a sample of thirty graduate students administered the test over a two week interval.

A test of the instrument's social desirability was also done by the authors. Based on their sample of one hundred thirty-five graduate students, the authors concluded that social desirability had only a negligible effect on most of the responses. A sample of the instrument can be found in Appendix E.

Data Questionnaire

Each staff member was asked to complete a questionnaire providing information on demographics, educational background, work history, and expectations for continuing in the field of alcoholism treatment. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix F.
Procedure

Packets of the materials were given to the program coordinators for distribution to staff working in the programs covered by the research hypotheses. They were instructed to give them to each of the staff having clinical contact with the residents of the program. Staff from all three shifts were included in the study.

Each of the packets contained a letter to the staff member explaining the basic purpose of the study and the instructions for completing the form. Respondents were not asked for any identifying information and participation was voluntary. The questionnaires were to be completed at the respondents convenience and returned by mail to the researcher. All materials were provided by the researcher.

Questionnaires were distributed over a three week period. A follow-up letter was distributed to the staff requesting that they return the questionnaires as quickly as possible if they were planning to participate in the study.

Copies of the following materials are included in the Appendices:

1. Letter to program director explaining the nature of the study Appendix G
2. Instructions to supervisors in distribution of materials Appendix H
3. Letter to staff members Appendix I
4. Follow-up letter to staff members Appendix J

No discussion of the research hypotheses were provided so as not to bias responses. An offer was made by the
researcher to return to the program at a later date to explain the results as part of an in-service training program.

Table 1
Number of Staff and Beds for Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Number of Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detoxication</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questionnaires were distributed to each staff member by the program director. A question on the data sheet asked for the percentage of time worked in the program. Only those staff working a majority of their time in the detoxication or residential rehabilitation programs were included in the study.

Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1a

There will be no significant difference between staff of residential rehabilitation programs and detoxication programs in closeness needs as measured by Stern's Activities
Hypothesis 1b
There will be no significant difference between staff of residential rehabilitation programs and detoxication programs in personality needs as measured by Stern's Activities Index.

Hypothesis 2
There will be no significant difference between staff of residential rehabilitation programs and detoxication programs in perceived support in their work environments as measured by selected items from Stern's Organizational Climate Index.

Hypothesis 3
There will be no significant difference in congruence of the need for closeness (as measured by Stern's Activities Index) and perceived supportiveness in the work environments (as measured by the selected items from Stern's Organizational Climate Index) between staff from residential rehabilitation programs and detoxication programs.

Hypothesis 4
There are no significant differences in attitudes toward the alcoholic and alcoholism (as measured by Tolar and Tamerin's Attitudes Toward the Alcoholic Instrument) between staff in residential rehabilitation programs and detoxication programs who perceive their work environment as supportive (as measured by items from Stern's Organizational
Climate Index) and express a personality need for closeness (as measured by Stern's Activities Index).

**Hypothesis 5**

There are no significant differences in job satisfaction (as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire) between staff in residential rehabilitation programs and detoxication programs who perceive their work environment as supportive (as measured by items from Stern's Organizational Climate Index) and express a personality need for closeness (as measured by Stern's Activities Index).
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents a summary of the methodological procedures used (i.e., sample, procedures, and data collection procedures) and a statistical presentation and discussion of the findings relevant to the hypotheses tested. For each statistical test, the level of significance was set at .05.

Description of the Sample

As indicated in Chapter III, there were 145 sets of questionnaires distributed to the direct treatment staff in two types of residential alcoholism treatment programs. Of this number, 79 were returned. Table 2 shows the returns by type of treatment staff and the number of usable responses.

Table 2
Distribution of Instruments and Usable Returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Usable Returns</th>
<th>Usable Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detoxication</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the unusable returns, two were returned blank and
three were from the staff working part-time in the program from the detoxication group. Of the unusable returns from the staff in the rehabilitation program, two were returned incomplete, two were returned by individuals who had an administrative position, and eight were returned from individuals who worked part-time in the program. The staffs working part-time in the programs generally worked in programs that were dissimilar to those that are the focus of this study. These included programs such as outpatient, halfway house, etc. Each program type requires a specific license and be treated as a separate entity even within the same agency. The staffs are excluded from the study because their perceptions of the work environment may be influenced by participation in the non-experimental programs.

Staff members were also asked to provide basic demographic information as a means of allowing the investigator to test the homogeneity of the two groups studied and explain any differential assessment of the given responses. The means, standard deviations, and t-tests on the variables of age, education, and lengths of employment within the agency, within the person's position, and within the alcoholism treatment field are presented in Table 3.

As indicated in the data summarized in Table 3, the two groups are heterogeneous with respect to age and length of employment within the agency, position and the alcoholism
Table 3
Means, Standard Deviations and T-Tests for Age, Education, and Employment for Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Residential Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Detoxication</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age^a</td>
<td>43.24</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education^a</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of^b Employment with Agency</td>
<td>36.73</td>
<td>29.02</td>
<td>22.27</td>
<td>19.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of^b Employment in position</td>
<td>32.13</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>10.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of^b Employment in field</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>39.31</td>
<td>29.27</td>
<td>23.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a = data expressed in years  
^b = data expressed in months  
* p < .05.
treatment field. The detoxication staff are younger in age than the residential rehabilitation staff. Also, they have not worked as long in their agencies, position, and in the alcoholism treatment field. The groups are homogeneous with respect to their level of education.

The differences in employment history suggest two possibilities. First, working in the detoxication programs may be an entry level position for individuals who want to work in alcoholism treatment. Another possibility may be that experience in a detoxication program may result in a desire to leave the alcoholism treatment field. That is, individuals may leave their position in the detoxication program and not take another position in another alcoholism treatment program.

Table 4 provides some information on which of these possibilities may be correct. Each respondent was asked about his future intentions of continued employment in alcoholism treatment. The categories of the table are defined as follows:

0 = missing data
1 = continued employment in alcoholism treatment for five years or less
2 = continued employment in alcoholism treatment for ten years or less
3 = continued employment in alcoholism treatment for the rest of my working life
4 = none of the above

Respondents who indicated they were not sure about any of these categories were counted as missing data. Responses to
the question of future intentions resulted in the distribution of frequencies in Table 4.

Table 4
Intentions for Future Employment in Alcoholism Treatment of Rehabilitation and Detoxication Program Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Detoxication</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There were 3 missing cases and are not included.

Data presented in this manner is amenable to a chi-square test (Siegel, 1956). However, before such a test may be applied, the contingency table may not have more than twenty percent of the cells with fewer than five frequencies and none of those cells may have an expected frequency of less than one. To overcome these problems, meaningful categories may be combined if the new categories combined are conceptually meaningful. In this case, categories 1 and 2 were combined to indicate an intention of continued employment for ten years or less. The new contingency table had no expected frequencies of less than one. Table 5 displays the results of combining categories 1 and 2.

The new categories and their meanings are listed below:

1 and 2 = continued employment in alcoholism treatment for ten years or less
3 = continued employment in alcoholism treatment for the rest of my working life

4 = none of the above

Table 5
Test for Significant Differences in Intentions for Future Employment in Alcoholism Treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Detoxication</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Not included are three missing cases

The results of the chi-square test indicate that there is no difference in future intentions of continued employment in the alcoholism treatment field for the two groups of staff. It was suggested that the differences in lengths of employment in the preceding table may be explained by the possibility that detoxication staff enter the field by working in a detoxication program or leave the field after working in detoxication programs. Insofar as their intentions are concerned, detoxication staff are no more likely to leave the treatment field as rehabilitation staff. Thus, the lower levels of employment tenure may reflect the fact working in a detoxication program may be an entry level position for people wanting to work with alcoholics.

As indicated earlier, there were no significant
differences in educational level. Tables 6 and 7 show the undergraduate and graduate majors of those staff that had college training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Detoxication</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
Graduate Majors of Treatment Staffs with Graduate School Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Detoxication</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 below displays the number of men and women working in the two types of programs. A chi-square analysis in the data did not find any statistically significant differences between the two types of staff.

Table 8
Male and Female Treatment Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Detoxication</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the remaining tables will display information on the job titles, license status of staff corresponding fields of licensure, and racial characteristics of the treatment staff.
Table 9  
Job Titles of Treatment Staffs by Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Detoxication</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Asst.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiction Spec.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift Supervisor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor/Therapist</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10  
Licensure Status of Treatment Staffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>License</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Detoxication</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11
Field of License for Licensed Treatment Staffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Detoxication</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Alcoholism Counselor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramedic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12
Treatment Staffs Second License to Practice with a Specialty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>License</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Detoxication</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the staff with a second license to practice a specialty, one individual in the Rehabilitation program was certified as a school administrator. Of those in the Detoxication program with a second license, two were Emergency Medical Technicians and the third was in nursing.
Overall, there does not appear to be a significant difference in the number of licensed staff working in the two types of programs.

Finally, there is no difference in the racial makeup of the two groups. A new contingency table was created by dividing the staff into white and non-white categories so as to eliminate cells with a frequency of one. A chi-square analysis was performed on this new contingency table and no significant differences were found in the racial makeup of the staffs.

Table 13
Racial Characteristics of Treatment Staffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Detoxication</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the two groups are heterogeneous on the variables of age, length of employment with agency, length of employment in current position, and length of employment in the alcoholism treatment. The detoxication staff is younger and has less work experience with their agency, position, and in the alcoholism treatment.

The two groups do not significantly differ in length of education and educational background. In addition, the
data indicates that both programs have a similar number of licensed personnel. The distribution of staff by race and sex is not significantly different.

The similarity in future intentions for both groups and the shorter work experience of the detoxication staff suggest that employment in a detoxication program is an entry level position for working in alcoholism treatment.

**Hypothesis 1A**

There will be no significant difference between staff of residential rehabilitation and detoxication programs in closeness needs as measured by Stern's Activities Index.

**Results**

To determine the significance of the mean differences between the two groups of staff, a t-test was used. The statistical results displayed in Table 14 indicate that there is no significant difference between the two groups in closeness needs at the .05 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detoxication</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores may range from 0 to 10*

**Discussion**

Richman and Stern (1975) define this factor as recognizing a need for warmth and emotional supportiveness. It
is similar to the Submissiveness factor which emphasizes needs for social conformity and other-directedness. The Submissiveness factor, however, has some elements of self-denial and self-abasiveness that are not found in the Closeness factor. Both groups show a level of closeness need that is more toward the maximum score rather than the minimum.

Since there were no significant differences between the two groups, a Pearson correlation was performed to measure the degree of association between closeness and the other eleven factors (presented on pp. 73-76) of the Activities Index. The correlations that achieved a level of significance at the .05 level for one or the other group are displayed in Table 15.

Table 15
Correlation of Closeness Factor to Other Personality Factors for Rehabilitation and Detoxication Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Detoxication</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensuousness</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.63*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assurance</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05.

In general, the correlations underscore the similarity in personality between the two groups as measured by Stern's Activities Index. Although in several instances the
measures of correlation are not as strong for the two groups, the direction of the association is the same. For both groups, the Sensuousness and Expressiveness factors have the strongest associations with Closeness. Sensuousness is defined by Richman and Stern (1975) as the need to seek gratification through the senses. They define Expressiveness as the need to be outgoing, uninhibited, spontaneous, and impulsive.

For the scales measuring Self-Assurance and Friendliness, the associations are significant for the residential rehabilitation staff and the group as a whole, but they are not significant for the detoxication staff.

In summary, the staff of both programs do not differ in Closeness need and both have a need for emotional closeness and emotional supportiveness. In addition, this need is closely associated with needs to experience through the senses and to be able to express spontaneity and impulsivity. In conclusion, the hypothesis is not rejected.

Hypothesis 1B

There will be no significant difference between staff of residential rehabilitation programs and detoxication programs in personality needs as measured by Stern's Activities Index.

Results

To determine the significance level of the differences in means between the two groups, a oneway analysis of
variance was performed on each of the twelve personality factors of Stern's Activities Index. The significance level was set at .05.

As shown in Table 16, there are no significant differences in personality between the two groups on the twelve factors of the Activities Index.
Table 16
Comparison of Means on Twelve Personality Factors
of the Activities Index for Treatment Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Factor</th>
<th>Rehabilitation (N = 30)</th>
<th>Detoxication (N = 33)</th>
<th>Total (N = 63)</th>
<th>F-Ratio (df = 61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Assertion</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audacity</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Interests</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Interests</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissiveness</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensuousness</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>0.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: None are significant at the .05 level.
Range of possible scores for each scale is 0 to 10.
Discussion

Although there are no significant differences between the groups on the personality factors, there are some differences in the rankings by means of the factors. The rankings of the twelve factors for each of the two groups are presented in Table 17.

Table 17
Rankings by Groups for Mean Scores on Stern's Activities Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Factor</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Detoxication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assertion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audacity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Interests</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Interest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orderliness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensuousness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of the similarities and differences between the two groups will be done for each factor within the context of that factor. Definitions for each factor are taken from Richman and Stern (1975).
Self-Assertion. This factor reflects a need for personal power and social recognition. People scoring high on this factor like to be highly regarded. They also enjoy getting a group to do things their way. Both groups ranked this factor the lowest of the twelve with the detoxication group scoring somewhat higher.

Audacity. This factor emphasizes skill in physical activities and interpersonal relationships. It also reflects a desire for elitism. Again, both groups gave this factor the same ranking with the detoxication group also scoring somewhat higher.

Intellectual Interests. Individuals scoring high on this factor evince a need for intellectual activities. This includes the arts and the sciences as well as the concrete and abstract. The rehabilitation group ranked this factor somewhat higher than the detoxication group but scored somewhat lower.

Motivation. According to Richman and Stern (1975), this factor represents a need for achievement just as the preceding three. It differs from them in that the conventional forms of striving are emphasized. Elements of competitiveness and perseverance are also involved. On this factor, the detoxication group ranked this as its highest while the rehabilitation group ranked this third. Again the mean score for the detoxication group was higher.

Applied Interests. High scores on this factor indicate
a need to achieve success and satisfaction through conventional means. There is an orientation toward the known and applied. Both groups ranked this factor at the same level with the detoxication group again having a somewhat higher score.

**Orderliness.** This factor represents an emphasis on personal organization and deliberation. Impulsive behavior is controlled through ritual, routine and planning. Both groups had about the same mean score, and ranked this need at the same level.

**Submissiveness.** A high score on this factor implies a need for a high level of control involving social conformity and other-directedness. There is also a tendency to avoid conflict and direct confrontation. Both groups ranked this need at the same level.

**Closeness.** This factor is closely related to the preceding factor. It differs from it in that the abasiveness and self-denying features are not present. Instead, there are emphases on activities recognizing a need for warmth and emotional supportiveness. The rehabilitation staff ranked this factor highest, while the detoxication staff ranked it third.

**Sensuousness.** Individuals who score high on this factor express a need for self-indulgence and gratification through the senses. Included in this is an appreciation of the fine arts and esthetic experiences. The detoxication
Friendliness. This factor reflects a need for friendly and playful relationships with others. The preference is for simple and uncomplicated methods of entertainment that are usually enjoyed in a group setting. The rehabilitation staff ranked this factor higher than the detoxication staff.

Expressiveness. People who scored high on this factor have a need to be outgoing, uninhibited, spontaneous, and impulsive. An emphasis is placed on freedom from self-control. Both groups ranked this factor at the same level and second from lowest.

Egoism. A high score on this factor reflects a need for preoccupation with the self. It is characterized by a high degree of narcissism. Again, both groups ranked this factor at the same level.

It is interesting to note that the two groups ranked Closeness, Motivation and Submissiveness in the three highest levels. Taken together, these factors imply a need for warmth and emotional closeness among all staff. Thus, the staff ranked the same needs in the highest three categories with only slight differences between them.

Similarly, the three lowest ranked factors of Egoism, Expressiveness, and Self-Assertion received the same rankings by both groups. These factors imply a need for self-recognition and freedom from conventional controls, a
contrast from the factors that were ranked the highest for both groups. The rankings assigned by both groups again highlight the similarity in personality.

In conclusion, there is no significant difference in scores on the twelve factors of Stern's Activities Index. Therefore, the hypothesis is not rejected.

**Hypothesis 2**

There will be no significant difference between staff of detoxication programs and rehabilitation programs in perceived support in their work environments as measured by selected items from Stern's Organizational Climate Index.

**Results**

A t-test was used to test the significance of the difference in means between the two groups on their scores on the supportiveness factor of Stern's Organizational Climate Index. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 18. There is a significant difference in perceived supportiveness between the two groups at the .05 level. The residential rehabilitation staff had a significantly higher score than the detoxication staff.
Table 18
Comparison of Supportiveness Scores for Rehabilitation and Detoxication Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59.87</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detoxication</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52.13</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>2.22*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: One case in the detoxication program had a missing score and was not included.

* p < .05.

Discussion

The results of the statistical analysis indicate that the residential rehabilitation staff perceived their work environment as more supportive. Because of the nature of the program and programming offered, it was thought that the staff would perceive their work environment as more supportive. Richman and Stern (1975) have defined this factor as how one's dependency needs are accepted. Furthermore, there is a sense of openness and fair play in the environment. Of the nine scales comprising this factor, assurance, tolerance and objectivity contribute the most to the factor (Stern, 1970).

As discussed in the first chapter, there are some major differences in programming that present the opportunity for the climate of supportiveness to develop. Based on the literature reviewed, the client length of stay may have a strong influence on staff perceptions of the staff's interaction. In this study, the rehabilitation programs have
longer client lengths of stay than the detoxication programs.

In conclusion, the hypothesis is rejected at the .05 level. The residential rehabilitation staff perceive a significantly higher level of supportiveness in their work environments than do the detoxication staff.

Hypothesis 3

There will be no significant difference in congruence of the need for closeness (as measured by Stern's Activities Index) and perceived supportiveness in the work environments (as measured by selected items from Stern's Organizational Climate Index) between staff from residential rehabilitation and detoxication programs.

Results

The hypothesis was tested using the t-test for difference scores as described by Blalock (1960). He states that where it is hypothesized that \( \mu_1 = \mu_2 \) and the subjects are drawn from two independent samples the following statistic may be used.

\[
t_d = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sigma \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}
\]

The symbol \( \sigma \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}} \) is the standard error of the mean.

Because the scores on the two scales are not equal, each individual's score was converted to a standardized score. A difference score was derived for each individual
in both programs. This figure was used in the analysis. The result of the t-test in the difference scores is presented in Table 19.

Table 19
Differences in Congruence Between Staffs from Rehabilitation and Detoxication Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Difference Score</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detoxication</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: One case in the detoxication program was missing and was not included in the analysis.

Discussion

The two groups do not differ in their level of congruence. That is, the difference between the measure for closeness and organizational climate is not significantly different for the two groups.

Additional support for this conclusion can be found in Table 20 which displays the Pearson correlations for the groups in the two variables.

Table 20
Pearson Correlations for Closeness and Perceived Supportiveness for Alcoholism Treatment Staffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Detoxication</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the correlations reach the .05 level of
significance. In this instance, there is little difference in variability on the two measures for each group. The association for the residential rehabilitation staff tend to be negative, but positive for the detoxication staff.

In conclusion, the hypothesis is not rejected. The two groups of staff do not differ in congruence of closeness need and supportiveness in the environment.

**Hypothesis 4**

There are no significant differences in attitudes toward the alcoholic (as measured by Tolor and Tamerin's Attitudes Toward the Alcoholic Instrument) between staff in residential rehabilitation and detoxication programs who perceive their work environment as supportive (as measured by items from Stern's Organizational Climate Index) and express a personality need for closeness (as measured by Stern's Activities Index).

**Results**

To test this hypothesis, the staff from the two types of programs were divided along the median scores for their respective groups into four groups. These groups were labeled as follows:

- High Closeness/High Supportiveness
- High Closeness/Low Supportiveness
- Low Closeness/High Supportiveness
- Low Closeness/Low Supportiveness

The Attitudes Toward Alcoholics provides scores on six scales. A three-way analysis of variance was performed on
each scale score for the four groupings. The results of the analysis of variance are presented in Tables 21 through 27. At the .05 level of significance, a main effect for service or program type on the Medical Illness scale was found.
Table 21
Means for Groups on Attitudes Toward Alcoholics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Detox.</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Detox.</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Detox.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehab.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Rehab.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Rehab.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=9)</td>
<td>(N=6)</td>
<td>(N=10)</td>
<td>(N=6)</td>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>(N=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness Need</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Etiology</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Rejection</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Genetic</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanism</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Illness</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of possible scores for each scale is 4 to 16 points.
Table 22
Analysis of Variance Results on Psychological Etiology Scale for Alcoholism Treatment Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Interactions</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Climate</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness by Climate</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Way Interactions</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: One case did not have an organizational climate score and is not included.
### Table 23
Analysis of Variance Results on Social Rejection Scale for Alcoholism Treatment Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Interactions</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Climate</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness by Climate</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Way Interactions</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness by Climate</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: One case did not have an organizational climate score and is not included.
### Table 24

**Analysis of Variance Results on Physical Genetic Etiology Scale for Alcoholism Treatment Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Climate</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness by Climate</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Climate</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: One case did not have an organizational climate score and is not included.*
Table 25
Analysis of Variance Results on Humanism Scale for Alcoholism Treatment Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td>16.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Climate</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness by Climate</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness by Climate</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: One case did not have an organizational climate score and was not included.
### Table 26

Analysis of Variance Results on Moral Weakness Scale for Alcoholism Treatment Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Climate</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness by Climate</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Climate</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: One case did not have an organizational climate score and is not included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>30.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>82.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Climate</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness by Climate</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: One case did not have an organizational climate score and is not included.

* p < .05.
Discussion

It was hypothesized that there would be a relationship between closeness need and perceived supportiveness in the organizational climate and scores on the six scales of the Attitudes Toward Alcoholics Instrument. In effect, there would be a two-way interaction on closeness need and climate. No such effect was found.

Instead, there was a significant difference by service or program type on the Medical Illness scale. That is, the two groups differed on the basis of their program and not on any other main effects or interactions.

According to Tolor and Tamerin, a high score on this scale indicates agreement with the view that alcoholism is sick. In this instance, the staff of the residential rehabilitation programs agree with the view that alcoholism is a medical illness as measured by the Attitudes Toward Alcoholism Instrument.

The adoption of a medical illness view of alcoholism would not be unusual. Jellinek (1960) has been one of the earliest advocates of a view that alcoholism is a disease. His rationale was that adoption of such a view would make it easier to treat the alcoholic. As a sick individual, the alcoholic would be more willing to accept treatment because he would believe that there was some hope for changing his condition. From the standpoint of society, there would be a willingness to offer treatment because the condition would
The prevailing viewpoint at the time that Jellinek wrote his book was that the alcoholic was morally weak and could not control his drinking behavior. As noted earlier, there is evidence to suggest that the adoption of a moralistic viewpoint is highly correlated with attitudes of rejection. Thus, it is difficult for the alcoholic to accept treatment if the basic attitude is one of rejection. Furthermore, a society will not devote its resources to treating the alcoholic if it rejects them.

Over the years, the disease concept of alcoholism has become more popular and widely accepted. It has been integrated into training programs for alcoholism treatment staff. It has also been adopted by Alcoholics Anonymous, the largest self-help group available to the alcoholic.

The longer work experience may help to explain the differences in attitudes between these two groups of staff. As indicated earlier in the description of the sample, the residential rehabilitation staff was significantly older than the detoxication staff. In addition, the residential rehabilitation staff had significantly higher lengths of employment in their agency, their position, and in the alcoholism treatment field. All the factors analyzed indicate that these staff have had an opportunity for more exposure to views and attitudes that emphasize the illness aspect of alcoholism. Consequently, they are more likely to adopt a
view that agrees with the medical illness concept.

In conclusion, the hypothesis is not rejected. Alcoholism treatment staff do not differ in their attitudes on the six scales of the Attitudes Toward Alcoholics Instrument by level of congruence on closeness need and perceived supportiveness in the environment. A main effect, however, was found by service or program type on the Medical Illness scale. That is, staff from the residential rehabilitation programs agree with the view that alcoholism is a medical illness.

Hypothesis 5

There are no significant differences in job satisfaction (as measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire) between staff in residential rehabilitation programs and staff in detoxication programs who perceive their work environment as supportive (as measured by items from Stern's Organizational Climate Index) and express a personality need for closeness (as measured by Stern's Activities Index).

Results

As in the previous hypothesis, each of the two groups of staff were divided into four subgroups based on the level of scoring on the two independent variables by using the median values. A three way analysis of variance was performed and the results are shown in Tables 29 through 31.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (short-form) provides three scores. These are intrinsic, extrinsic, and
general scores. The manual for the instrument states that the intrinsic and extrinsic scales measure reinforcement dimensions of a job (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist, 1967). The general score is a combination of the two subscale scores plus scores on two other items that are not included in them.

Of the three scores, significant differences were found for service or program type and organizational climate. Furthermore, a two way interaction of service and organizational climate was found on the extrinsic and general scores.
Table 28
Means for Groups on Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supportive Climate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Detox.</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Detox.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (N=9)</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (N=6)</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (N=10)</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (N=6)</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (N=8)</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (N=7)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (N=6)</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (N=10)</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of possible scores for each scale:
- Intrinsic: 12 - 60
- Extrinsic: 6 - 30
- General: 20 - 100
Table 29
Analysis of Variance Results on the Intrinsic Scale for Alcoholism Treatment Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>253.36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.68*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>173.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>39.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>474.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td>30.49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Climate</td>
<td>44.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness by Climate</td>
<td>60.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Climate</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>37.92</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.97</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: One case did not have an organizational climate score and was not included.
* p < .05.
### Table 30
Analysis of Variance Results on the Extrinsic Scale for Alcoholism Treatment Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>222.87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>107.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-Way Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td>562.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Climate</td>
<td>54.59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness by Climate</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-Way Interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness by Climate</td>
<td>149.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual</strong></td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>26.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: One case did not have an organizational climate score and was not included.

* $p < .05$. 
Table 31
Analysis of Variance on the General Scale for Alcoholism Treatment Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>107.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>562.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Climate</td>
<td>149.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness by Climate</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Way Interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service by Closeness by Climate</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: One case did not have an organizational climate score and was not included.

* $p < .05$. 
Discussion

As with the previous hypothesis, it was predicted that level of congruence will be associated with job satisfaction. The results show that this was not the case.

First, on the Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and General scales, main effects were found for service type and organizational climate. The residential rehabilitation staff found their jobs more satisfying than the detoxication staff.

Secondly, a main effect was found for organizational climate. That is, staff who perceived higher levels of supportiveness in their environments scored significantly higher on the job satisfaction measure than those who perceived low levels of supportiveness.

Third, a two-way interaction was found for service and organization. In effect, the staff of rehabilitation and detoxication programs who also perceived high levels of supportiveness in their work environments had higher job satisfaction scores than did the staff of both types of programs who perceived low levels of supportiveness in their environments.

In summary, main effects for service type and organizational climate were found at the .05 level. A two-way interaction for service and climate was found on the Extrinsic and General scales of the job satisfaction measure, but not for the Intrinsic scale. The variable accounting for most of the variation in the scores was perceived
supportiveness. With regard to the hypothesis, however, the groups did not differ by their level of scores on closeness need and perceived supportiveness. Therefore, the hypothesis is not rejected.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter will give a summary and conclusions of the present study including a discussion on the limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, and implications.

Summary

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship of need-press congruence and attitudes toward alcoholics and the job in treatment staff from two types of residential alcoholism treatment programs. The two types of programs were residential rehabilitation and detoxication programs. These programs differ in their goals and client lengths of stay. Research was reviewed that suggested these factors would influence staff perceptions of their work environment.

A review of the pertinent literature also indicated that improvement in the ability to predict human behavior would require the study of an individual's attributes and motivational system in a given group, the group environment, and the interaction of both person and environment. One specific aspect of this hypothesis that was utilized was Murray's notions of needs and press. Essentially, he hypothesized that people were motivated by needs. He
formulated a taxonomy of needs and suggested that they form a hierarchy. In addition, he argued that factors in the environment also influence human behavior. He termed this influence press. Both of these factors work singly and together to influence human behavior.

In this study, closeness needs and perceived supportiveness in the work environment were the two primary independent variables. It was hypothesized that the two groups would not differ in closeness need and perceived supportiveness in their work environments. In addition, it was hypothesized that there would be no difference in congruence between the two groups on the independent measures. Finally, it was hypothesized that there would be no difference in attitudes toward the alcoholic and the job by level of congruence on the independent measures.

To obtain the data, packets of questionnaires were distributed to staff in the two types of programs. These packets consisted of a data questionnaire, the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, the Attitudes Toward Alcoholics Instrument, the short form of the Activities Index, and items from the Organizational Climate Index measuring supportiveness. The last two questionnaires were developed by George Stern and served as the measures for the independent variables. The short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Attitudes Toward Alcoholics were used as the dependent measures.
Each packet contained a letter from the investigator to the staff member with a brief explanation of the purpose of the study and instructions on returning the materials. Materials were returned by mail when they were completed. A follow-up letter was distributed to the staff approximately two weeks after receiving the original packet. Participation was voluntary. Both professional and non-professional staff were asked to participate.

The results of the data analysis revealed that there was no difference in closeness need between the two groups of treatment staff as measured by Stern's Activities Index. Since the Activities Index provided measures of personality need on eleven other factors, the two groups were also tested on these factors. Again, there was no difference in personality need on any of the factors studied.

On the measure of perceived supportiveness, the residential rehabilitation group scored significantly higher than the detoxication staff. In effect, they perceived their work environment as offering more support and emotional warmth.

The two groups, however, did not differ in their degree of congruence on the two measures. That is, there was no significant variability in their differences on the closeness need and perceived supportiveness measures. There was no association between the two measures for either group also.

Finally, the last hypotheses were concerned with the
relationship of congruence of closeness need and perceived supportiveness on measures of attitudes toward the alcoholic and job satisfaction. This was tested by dividing the two groups along their respective medians on both of the independent measures. This resulted in eight groups and a three-way analysis of variance was performed. The two groups of staff did not differ on their scores for attitudes toward the alcoholic and job satisfaction on the basis of their level of congruence.

Conclusions

The results of the study did not support the notion that the congruence of closeness need and supportive press in the work environments of the two treatment staffs would be associated with significant differences in attitudes toward the alcoholic and job satisfaction. This finding was also true where program type was not considered. That is, for the group as a whole, the level of need-press congruence was not associated with differences in attitudes toward the alcoholic and job satisfaction.

Rather, the program type and/or the supportive variable were more likely to be associated with any differences in one type of attitude toward the alcoholic and job satisfaction than the personality variable. The groups differed in their job satisfaction on the basis of the program type and degree of perceived supportiveness in the work environment. That is, the residential rehabilitation staff had
significantly higher scores on the job satisfaction measure than the detoxication staff. In addition, when only the supportiveness variable is considered, those staff who reported higher levels of supportiveness in the work environment had significantly higher job satisfaction scores irrespective of the program type.

Furthermore, some of the research suggested that staff would differ in their attitudes toward their work on the basis of the type of program in which they work. The research by Ellsworth, et. al., (1971) found a relationship between high client turnover programs and negative staff attitudes toward the unit. Some support for the influence of client turnover on staff attitudes was found in this study. The detoxication programs are characterized by rapid turnover and the job satisfaction attitudes of these staff were significantly lower than the residential rehabilitation staff. The latter program is characterized by much lower client turnover.

On the measure of attitudes toward the alcoholic, the type of program was associated with a difference in attitude on only one of the six scales. The residential rehabilitation staff had significantly higher scores on the Medical Illness scale than the detoxication staff. In essence, they are more likely to hold the view that alcoholism is a disease and should be treated as such.

The finding that only environmental variables were
associated with differences in attitudes toward the alcoholic and job satisfaction was contrary to what the literature predicted. The review of the literature showed that the interaction of person and environment works to influence attitudes. Murray's hypothesis of need-press congruence was found to be associated with differences in job satisfaction. The hypothesis had not been investigated in regard to attitudes toward the alcoholic. The results of the study do not provide support for the notion that the congruence of closeness need and perceived supportiveness is associated with differences in attitudes toward the alcoholic and job satisfaction in the staff of residential rehabilitation and detoxication programs. With these types of program staff, only the supportiveness or program variables were associated with differences in attitudes toward the alcoholic and job satisfaction.

**Implications**

The implications of this study center on the influence of the environmental variables as opposed to the interaction of closeness need and perceived supportiveness on job satisfaction and attitudes toward alcoholics. More specifically, the findings of this study focus on several areas for the influence of supportiveness on job satisfaction. These areas include the relationship of supportiveness to job satisfaction, the meaning of supportiveness and its role in communication.
In the area of social support and job loss, Gore (1974) has extensively reviewed the literature on the relationship of social support and stress related to work and social disintegration. She found that the difference between situational demands and what a person is capable of doing can result in the deterioration of behavior. The deterioration is ameliorated by relieving the individual of responsibility for the misfit or by altering the situational demands. In the area of role ambiguity in the work setting, social support alleviated the resulting strain and stress if one's subordinates were supportive. She concluded that social support is a protective asset and can be a buffer against psychological strain.

Other research has investigated the relationship between support and job satisfaction and retention. For instance, Blau (1981) has found that social support is negatively related to job dissatisfaction in bus drivers. Similarly, LaRocco and Jones (1978) found that social support in navy personnel has a direct influence on satisfaction and employment retention. They found that leader support was more relevant in achieving job satisfaction and work-group support was related to overall satisfaction with the Navy. In research with the hard-core unemployed trainees, Friedlauder and Greenberg (1971) found that when the work environment was viewed as supportive, the trainees were rated as good employees and were more reliable.
The results of this study provide additional support for the influence of supportiveness on job satisfaction. In Chapter I, research was reviewed that suggested staff have higher levels of morale when they believe they are playing an instrumental role in the treatment of patients. High patient turnover rates on psychiatric wards were related to negative views of the program. This leads to the expectation that the staff in residential rehabilitation would be more likely to score significantly higher on job satisfaction measures than detoxication staff. The results of this study did find such statistically significant differences.

However, when an examination of the variable supportiveness alone is made, it becomes apparent that the differences due to it are greater than that of the service type. This can be seen in the F-ratios for climate alone on Tables 29-31. An examination of Table 28 also shows apparent differences among the group means for the supportiveness variable.

Pearson correlation scores for supportiveness and the three satisfaction scales show strong and significant relationships between the variables. These relationships can be seen in Table 32. In contrast, the Closeness variable for the residential rehabilitation staff only has a weak but significant relationship with the Intrinsic scale. This coefficient was 0.33.
Another implication to consider is the meaning of social support in this and other studies that have examined it in relation to job satisfaction. In their study on the hard-core unemployed, Friedlauder and Greenberg (1971) defined support as help received on the job, how well the workers were able to get along with others, how close they could get to others, and if others did not take advantage of them.

Cartwright (1980) defined support as the help or clarification of professional responsibilities, help on dealing with clients, and help with personal difficulties. LaRocco and Jones (1978) defined it in terms of the amount of cooperative effort, work group esprit, level of friendliness and warmth, open communication and trust. Stern (1970) defined it as respect for the integrity of the individual, degree of fair play and openness, and degree to which dependency needs are accepted.

Each of these definitions has a common thread of openness and sense of fair play in them. There is also an
environment that is positive and emphasizes warmth and friendliness. The Stern definition, however, adds the element of dependency needs that are accepted. Because Stern's definition was used in this study, the relevance of supportiveness to job satisfaction can be expanded to include dependency needs that are satisfied within the facility.

A third implication of support and job satisfaction is in the area of communication. As indicated previously, a supportive environment is also one where communication can take place. This communication is an important aspect of support networks. Tolsdorf (1978) stated that the function of a support system is to provide support, advice and feedback. Similarly, Weiss (1974) saw the function of a support network as providing attachment, exchange of service, guidance, social integration, a sense of alliance, reassurance of worth, and an opportunity to provide nurturance. Thus, a supportive environment, job satisfaction and communication are all interrelated.

The influence of supportiveness, however, is not significant in relation to attitudes toward alcoholics. The lack of a relationship can be seen in Tables 22-27. It is underscored in Table 33, which shows Pearson correlations for both groups between supportiveness and the six scales of the Attitudes Toward Alcoholics Instrument. These correlations show a weak and nonsignificant relationship
between supportiveness and the six types of attitudes measured by the instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Residential Rehabilitation (N=30)</th>
<th>Detoxication (N=32)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Etiology</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Rejection</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Geneitic Etiology</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanism</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Weakness</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Illness</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instead, the only variable that had any significant relevance to these attitudes was facility type. Of the six scales, the residential rehabilitation staff scored significantly higher on the Medical Illness scale. Furthermore, this variable accounted for a greater proportion of the variance than the other two. A measure of this proportion can be found by examining the $\eta^2$ value (Kim and Kohout, 1975). For the facility type, this value was 0.19, whereas, the value did not exceed 0.02 for either of the other two variables.

In summary, the environmental variables of supportiveness and facility type had more relevance to the
dependent variables of job satisfaction and medical illness attitudes. The influence of the supportiveness variable, however, was greater than facility type on the job satisfaction attitudes although both had some relevance. On the measure of attitudes toward alcoholics, only the facility type had an influence on the Medical Illness scale. Closeness and the interaction of closeness and supportiveness in the environment had no significant relationship to job satisfaction and attitudes toward the alcoholic.

Finally, there are some implications for the directors of residential rehabilitation and detoxication programs. Developing a supportive work environment can lead to higher levels of job satisfaction among the staff members. This would be an environment that is characterized by warmth and closeness among the staff. Respect for the integrity of the individual is also characteristic of such an environment. Furthermore, the dependency needs of staff are met and there is a sense of openness and fair play in the environment. Another benefit to be gained with this type of environment is that the levels of communication among the staff can be improved. Communication, to be effective, requires an environment that is open and fair, otherwise, individual staff members will be reluctant to provide feedback to their peers.

For the directors of detoxication programs, the addition of programs that increase client length of stay will
also enhance levels of job satisfaction among staff along with the development of supportive environments. This will allow for the development of milieu characteristics similar to those of the residential rehabilitation programs.

**Limitations of the Study**

One limitation of the study is the fact that only one of the possible combinations of press and need was examined. Both the Activities Index and the Organizational Climate Index provide measures of other needs and press. For instance, the Activities Index provides scores on need for Expressiveness and Submissiveness. Each of these could be studied with press factors such as Orderliness, Personal Dignity, or Supportiveness as well.

A second limitation is the sample size. The small number of staff members in the cells of the three-way analysis of variance can raise a question as to the type of distribution the scores represented. A larger number in each cell increases the likelihood of having a normal distribution. In addition, the larger size would have enabled the researcher to do a more refined analysis such as multivariate analysis.

**Questions for Future Research**

The recommendations for future research focus on several areas. These areas are: further refinement of the Attitudes Toward Alcoholics Instrument, the role of the detoxication program in treating the alcoholic, staff
attitudes in other programs and geographic locations, and
the relationship of supportiveness to other variables such
as length of employment, level of professionalization, and
communication patterns.

In regard to the Attitudes Toward Alcoholics Instrument, several intercorrelations on the scales were obtained that raise a question as to the independence of the scales. Table 34 displays intercorrelations on scales that obtained significance for one or the other group.

Table 34
Intercorrelations on Selected Scales for Alcoholism Treatment Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairing</th>
<th>Residential Rehabilitation (N=30)</th>
<th>Detoxication (N=33)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Etiology/Humanism</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical-Genetic Etiology/Medical Illness</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Weakness/Social Rejection</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05.

Tolor and Tamerin (1975) obtained similar intercorrelations with graduate students on these scale pairings as was obtained with the residential rehabilitation staff. The high intercorrelation on the Psychological Etiology and Humanism scales for the detoxication staff was similar to results obtained by Tolor and Tamerin. Further refinement
of the instrument with a larger sample and with staff from other types of treatment programs would be of value to determine the independence of the scales.

The significant differences in job satisfaction between the two types of staff raises questions of role perception in the detoxication staff. This area of measurement should focus on how important they perceive their function in relation to the treatment of the alcoholic client.

Another area of investigation which has received very little attention is the literature is staff attitudes toward the alcoholic among other programmatic structures. For example, how do staff in residential programs differ from staff in outpatient settings?

Research has not focused on regional or geographic differences in staff attitudes toward the alcoholic. That is, to test for the effects of differences in alcoholic client groups on staff attitudes toward the alcoholic, comparisons of programs located in urban versus suburban environments would test for the influence of client type. Do the urban poor with few resources influence staff attitudes?

A number of other questions have also been raised by the findings. They are listed below in question format.

1. Is there a qualitative difference in communication among staff in work environments that are supportive versus those that are not?
2. If the staff of a program perceive their work environment as supportive, do the clients perceive a similar or different climate in the treatment program?

3. Is there any relationship between the degree of supportiveness in the work environment and the types of treatment modalities used?

4. Does a higher level of supportiveness in the work environment lead to improved client outcomes?

5. Does a higher level of job satisfaction among the staff lead to improved client outcomes?

6. Is a higher level of the view that alcoholism is a medical illness the result of differences in training or lengths of employment in the alcoholism treatment field?
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APPENDIX A

Activities Index
This booklet contains a number of brief statements describing many different kinds of activities. You will like some of these things. They will seem more pleasant than unpleasant to you, perhaps even highly enjoyable. There will be others that you will dislike, finding them more unpleasant than pleasant. The activities listed in this booklet have been obtained from a great many different persons. People differ in the kinds of things they enjoy, like to do, or find pleasant to experience. You are to decide which of these you like and which you dislike.

DIRECTIONS

On the special answer sheet print your name, and the other information requested. Then, as you read each statement in the booklet, blacken space

L-if the item describes an activity or event that you would like, enjoy, or find more pleasant than unpleasant.

D-if the item describes an activity or event that you would dislike, reject, or find more unpleasant than pleasant.

Be sure to fill in the whole answer space with a heavy black mark, using any #2½ or softer pencil. Do not use ball point or ink.

Copyright 1958, 1972, by George G. Stern
YOU MUST ANSWER EVERY ITEM

Work rapidly, going through the entire list of statements as quickly as you can. Occasionally compare item numbers from the booklet with the answer sheet space to see that they correspond. Please do not make any stray marks on the answer sheet or in this booklet.

Erase all errors and stray marks completely.

1. Setting difficult goals for myself.
2. Imagining what I would do if I could live my life over again.
3. Talking about how it feels to be in love.
4. Belonging to a close family group that expects me to bring my problems to them.
5. Going to a park or beach with a crowd.
6. Returning to a task which I have previously failed.
7. Being an important political figure in a time of crisis.
8. Wearing clothes that will attract a lot of attention.
9. Keeping my bureau drawers, desks, etc., in perfect order.
10. Learning how to repair such things as a radio, sewing machine, or car.
11. Studying wind conditions and changes in atmospheric pressure in order to better understand and predict the weather.
12. Setting higher standards for myself than anyone else would, and working hard to achieve them.
13. Admitting when I'm in the wrong.
14. Leading an active social life.
15. Pausing to look at myself in a mirror each time I pass one.
17. Talking about who is in love with whom.
18. Spending my time thinking about and discussing complex problems.
19. Organizing groups to vote in a certain way in elections.
20. Thinking about what I could do that would make me famous.
21. Daydreaming about what I would do if I could live my life any way I wanted.
22. Comforting someone who is feeling low.
23. Arranging my clothes neatly before going to bed.
24. Learning how to make such things as furniture or clothing myself.
25. Doing experiments in physics, chemistry or biology in order to test a theory.
27. Being corrected when I'm doing something the wrong way.
28. Belonging to a social club.
29. Doing something that will create a stir.
30. Thinking about winning recognition and acclaim as a brilliant military figure.
31. Standing on the roof of a tall building.
32. Having lots of time to take care of my hair, hands, face, clothing, etc.
33. Finishing some work even though it means missing a party or dance.
34. Working with mechanical appliances, household equipment, tools, electrical apparatus, etc.
35. Studying the stars and planets and learning to identify them.
36. Being a philosopher, scientist, or professor.
37. Working on tasks so difficult I can hardly do them.
38. Going to parties where I'm expected to mix with the whole crowd.
39. Leading a well-ordered life with regular hours and an established routine.
40. Planning ahead so that I know every step of a project before I get to it.
41. Avoiding something at which I have once failed.
42. Being an official or leader.
43. Being the only couple on the dance floor when everyone is watching.
44. Imagining situations in which I am a great hero.
45. Catching a reflection of myself in a mirror or window.
46. Making my bed and putting things away every day before I leave the house.
47. Going to a party or dance with a lively crowd.
48. Going to scientific exhibits.
49. Reading novels and magazine stories about love.
50. Accepting criticism without talking back.
51. Keeping to a regular schedule, even if this sometimes means working when I don't really feel like it.

52. Organizing a protest meeting.
53. Speaking before a large group.
54. Imagining how it would feel to be rich and famous.

55. Playing rough games in which someone might get hurt.
56. Finding out how different languages have developed, changed, and influenced one another.
57. Taking care of youngsters.

58. Fixing light sockets, making curtains, painting things, etc., around the house.
59. Collecting data and attempting to arrive at general laws about the physical universe.
60. Choosing difficult tasks in preference to easy ones.

61. Apologizing when I've done something wrong.
62. Going to the park or beach only at times when no one else is likely to be there.
63. Eating my meals at the same hour each day.

64. Doing things according to my mood, without following any plan.
65. Being the center of attention at a party.
66. Skiing on steep slopes, climbing high mountains, or exploring narrow underground caves.

67. Imagining the kind of life I would have if I were born at a different time in a different place.
68. Keeping my room in perfect order.
69. Being with people who are always joking, laughing, and out for a good time.

70. Reading scientific theories about the origin of the earth and other planets.
71. Listening to my friends talk about their love-life.
72. Receiving advice from the family.

73. Having my mistakes pointed out to me.
74. Going on a vacation to a place where there are lots of people.
75. Seeing sad or melodramatic movies.
76. Pretending I am a famous movie star.
77. Making my handwriting decorative or unusual.
78. Taking care of someone who is ill.

79. Having a special place for everything and seeing that each thing is in its place.
80. Learning how to raise attractive and healthy plants, flowers, vegetables, etc.
81. Reading about how mathematics is used in developing scientific theories, such as explanations of how the planets move around the sun.

82. Having people talk to me about some personal problem of mine.
83. Following through in the development of a theory, even though it has no practical applications.
84. Picking out some hard task for myself and doing it.

85. Inviting a lot of people home for a snack or party.
86. Influencing or controlling the actions of others.
87. Converting or changing the views of others.

88. Trying out different ways of writing my name, to make it look unusual.
89. Providing companionship and personal care for a very old, helpless person.
90. Reading about the love affairs of movie stars and other famous people.

91. Working out solutions to complicated problems, even though the answers may have no apparent, immediate usefulness.
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License to Use Selected Items from the Organizational Climate Index
PERMISSION TO COPY OR REPRODUCE COPYRIGHT MATERIAL
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Organizational Climate Index
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APPENDIX C

Items for the Supportiveness Factor from
the Organizational Climate Index
Listed below are a series of statements about your work environment. Beside each statement is a T or F for True or False respectively. Please circle the letter that best reflects your view of your immediate work environment within the residential program.

T F Criticism of administrative policies and practices is encouraged.
T F It is hard to make friends here because there is so little opportunity to meet with other people.
T F People treat the furnishings and equipment with care here.
T F Most programs are very well organized and progress systematically from week to week.
T F People here are always trying to manipulate the activities of others for their own advantage.
T F Procedures to be followed in case of fires, air raids, and accidents are not prominently posted.
T F The people here are easily moved by the misfortunes and distress of others.
T F No one needs to be afraid of expressing a point of view that is unusual or not popular in this place.
T F Everyone here has a strong sense of being a member of the team.

T F It is necessary to be polite under all circumstances in order to stay out of trouble here.
T F There is a lot of group spirit here.
T F Most people seem to be especially considerate of others.
T F Administrative policies, goals, and objectives are carefully explained to everyone.
T F Elections, peer-evaluations or other forms of ratings of group members by one another generate strong feelings.
T F The daily schedule includes some rough physical activities.
T F There is a lot of interest here in projects for collecting packages of food or clothing to help out others.
T F The value most stressed here is open mindedness.
T F People find others eager to help them get started.

T F People are seldom kept waiting when they have appointments with administrative staff.
T F There are many opportunities for people to get together informally in planned social activities after hours.
T F People here tend to be cautious and self-controlled at all times.
T F The ability to plan ahead is highly valued here.
T F The administration expects people to report any violation of rules and regulations.
T F Posters, drills, or slogans stressing physical safety are not unusual here.
T F This place has a reputation for being indifferent to the public welfare.
T F Regulations are interpreted and enforced in an understanding manner.
T F People often run errands or do other personal services for each other.
T F If something goes wrong, almost anyone is likely to be blamed, even those who had little to do with it.
T F People have little to say to one another here.
T F The administrative staff are often joked about or criticized.
T F Most activities here are carefully planned.
T F Personal rivalries are fairly common in this place.
T F Risktaking, in the physical sense, is part of the day to day program.
T F The activities of charities and agencies are strongly supported.
T F Criticism is taken as a personal affront in this organization.
T F People are expected to work out the details of their own problems in their own way.
T F People who work hard here do so in spite of the realization that someone else will be getting the credit.
T F Everyone is helped to get acquainted when new.
T F A lot of people in this place walk around with a chip on their shoulder.
T F All work assignments are laid out well in advance so that people can plan their own schedule accordingly.
T F The important people at this place expect others to show proper respect for them.
T F People here are sometimes reminded to take preventative measures against illness.
T F Training people for service to the community is regarded as a major responsibility of the facility.
T F Sound reasoning is rewarded here even though it may lead to unpopular conclusions.
People, here, have a great deal of freedom to do as they wish.

No one is expected to suffer in silence if some regulation happens to create a hardship.

There are few opportunities for informal talk with administrators.

When people dislike someone here, they make no secret of it.

Administrators are pretty practical and efficient in the way they go about their business.

There are no favorites at this place; everyone gets treated alike.

Conditions which involve some risk of physical danger are usually tolerated here.

There are excellent opportunities here for members of minority groups.

Many people seem to brood, act moody and are hard to figure out.

The administrative staff is hardly ever concerned with the personal problems of the people who work here.

People are made to feel inadequate here for admitting that they don't know the answers.

People are reluctant to call one another by their first names.

When people dislike a policy, they let the administrative staff know it in no uncertain terms.

The flow of important information down from the administrative staff is smooth and efficient.

Anyone who knows the right people in the administration can get a better break here.

Everyone here is "safety-first" conscious.

The underdog enjoys sympathy and compassion here.

There always seem to be a lot of little quarrels going on here.

People who are always offering their assistance are likely to be regarded as a nuisance.

The administration has little tolerance for complaints and protests.

People spend a lot of time together socially.

People are often noisy when brought together in groups.

There is no wasted time here; everything has been planned right to the minute.

There would be little opposition to the formation of a committee to control conduct and ethics.

Few people here smoke or drink.

People here expect to help out with fund drives, CARE, Red Cross, etc.
T F Administrative staff members are frequently jealous of their authority.
T F The administrative staff will go out of their way to help you with your work.
T F People here learn to accept criticism without talking back.
T F People often prepare their work together.
T F Most people pay little attention to rules and regulations.
T F People do not know how to prepare to be rated because they do not know what is being looked for.
T F People here always try to win an argument.
T F Few people bother with rubbers, boots or other special protection against the weather.
T F The people here are easily moved by the misfortunes and distress of others.
T F The administration expects that there will be no deviation from established practices no matter what the circumstances.
T F People here mind their own business.
T F There is a lot of apple polishing around here.
T F Members of the administrative staff listen to people as well as direct them.
T F People check carefully before deviating from common policies and practices.
T F Most people follow a regular plan for study and play.
T F There is a recognized group of leaders who receive special privileges.
T F People who are ill are encouraged to stay on the job and finish the day's work.
T F "Lending a helping hand" could very well be the motto of this place.
T F Many people here are superstitious.
T F People here are usually quick to help each other out.
APPENDIX D

Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire
MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE
(short-form)

The purpose of this questionnaire is to give you a chance to tell how you feel about your present job, what things you are satisfied with and what things you are not satisfied with.

On the basis of your answers and those of people like you, we hope to get a better understanding of the things people like and dislike about their jobs.

On the next page you will find statements about your present job.

- Read each statement carefully.

- Decide how satisfied you feel about the aspect of your job described by the statement.

Keeping the statement in mind:

- if you feel that your job gives you more than you expected, check the box under "Very Sat." (Very Satisfied);

- if you feel that your job gives you what you expected, check the box under "Sat." (Satisfied);

- if you cannot make up your mind whether or not the job gives you what you expected, check the box under "N" (Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied);

- if you feel that your job gives you less than you expected, check the box under "Dissat." (Dissatisfied);

- if you feel that your job gives you much less than you expected, check the box under "Very Dissat." (Very Dissatisfied).
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Remember: Keep the statement in mind when deciding how satisfied you feel about that aspect of your job.

Do this for all statements. Please answer every item. Be frank and honest. Give a true picture of your feelings about your present job.

Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?

Very Sat. means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.

Sat. means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.

N means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.

Dissat. means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

Very Dissat. means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

On my present job, this is how I feel about . . .

1. Being able to keep busy all the time.
2. The chance to work alone on the job.
3. The chance to do different things from time to time.
4. The chance to be "somebody" in the community.
5. The way my boss handles his/her workers.
6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.
7. Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.
8. The way my job provides for steady employment.
9. The chance to do things for other people.
10. The chance to tell people what to do.
11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.
12. The way company policies are put into practice.
13. My pay and the amount of work I do.
14. The chances for advancement on this job.
15. The freedom to use my own judgment.
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.
17. The working conditions.
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other.
19. The praise I get for doing a good job.
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job.
APPENDIX E

Attitudes Toward Alcoholics Instrument
ATTITUDES TOWARD ALCOHOLICS INSTRUMENT

This instrument consists of a number of statements describing possible attitudes toward alcoholics. Would you please circle one of the four possible answers for each statement.

A = Agree Strongly    d = Disagree Mildly
a = Agree Mildly      D = Disagree Strongly

There are no right or wrong answers. What is desired are simply your own personal reactions.

A a d D  1. The alcoholic can be helped if he gains insight into the role that his drinking plays in his efforts to adjust to personal problems.

A a d D  2. In general, alcoholics cause others great embarrassment in most situations.

A a d D  3. Although others may feel differently, I personally would rather have as little as possible to do with an alcoholic.

A a d D  4. Alcoholics have inherited a tendency to develop their drinking problem.

A a d D  5. Alcoholics are not essentially different from other human beings who have difficulty in adjusting to problems in living.

A a d D  6. Most anyone could turn to alcoholic abuse in the face of frustrating life experiences and certain opportunities to relieve tensions through alcohol.

A a d D  7. Alcoholics should not be sent against their wishes to any institution for drinking too much even if it is a hospital.

A a d D  8. Even if no clear-cut evidence has yet been discovered by scientists to establish a biochemical cause for alcoholism, I am convinced that it will be found in the future.

A a d D  9. Alcoholics are usually unreliable friends.
A a d D 10. Most alcoholics just want to live it up and are irresponsible.

A a d D 11. If alcoholics weren't so weak-willed, they could control their drinking.

A a d D 12. A good moral or religious upbringing is the thing that's lacking in the alcoholic.

A a d D 13. Alcoholics should be thought of and treated as sick people.

A a d D 14. All things being equal, the alcoholic has never learned to assume the responsibility of adulthood.

A a d D 15. Alcoholism is essentially the learning of a maladaptive habit.

A a d D 16. The alcoholic cannot be held responsible for being sick any more than a patient with a heart condition can be held responsible for his illness.

A a d D 17. Some people have a physical makeup that doesn't permit them to tolerate even a couple of drinks without becoming drunk.

A a d D 18. The best treatment for an alcoholic is early medical attention.

A a d D 19. Great care should be taken to treat the alcoholic not as an evil person but as someone who requires social understanding and assistance.

A a d D 20. The problem of alcoholism could be eradicated if only we could detect early in life the special abnormality found in the body of the person who will become alcoholic.

A a d D 21. Most alcoholics really have similar sensitivities and needs as most people.

A a d D 22. It is unfair to think of an alcoholic as having emotional problems because he is really suffering from an illness.

A a d D 23. Alcoholics will usually try to get other people to fall in with their bad drinking habits.
Alcoholics should not be charged with a crime for being drunk unless they commit an additional offense that would apply to other people as well.
APPENDIX F

Data Questionnaire
DATA SHEET

Introduction

Please answer all of the following questions as best you can. Remember, there is no need to provide any identifying information.

Demographic Variables

1. What is your age _____?

2. Sex (Circle one): Male Female

3. What is your race? (Check one)
   ____ White                  ____ American Indian
   ____ Black                  ____ Asian
   ____ Hispanic               ____ Oriental
   ____ Other, Please Specify ____

4. What is your level of education? (Circle highest level attained)
   Grammar School 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
   High School 1 2 3 4
   College 1 2 3 4
   Graduate School 1 2 3 4
   If you went to college, what was your major?
   As an undergraduate ___________
   As a graduate student ___________

5. What is your job title? _______________________

6. Do you currently hold a license or certification to practice a specialty?
   Yes _______ No _______
7. How long have you been employed with this agency?
   _____ Years _____ Months

8. How many years have you been in your current position?
   _____ Years _____ Months

9. How long have you worked in the field of alcoholism treatment?
   _____ Years _____ Months

10. Do you plan to be in the field of alcoholism treatment (Check one):

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

11. What percentage of time do you spend in the following programs?

    ____ Detoxication
    ____ Residential Rehabilitation
    ____ Outpatient
    ____ Halfway House
    ____ Other (Specify _________________________)

    100% Total
APPENDIX G

Letter to Program Director
Dear

I am in the process of writing my doctoral thesis at Loyola University and I would like to ask for your facility's cooperation in a study I am conducting.

The study will involve the direct care staff of your program. This includes staff from all three shifts and professional as well as non-professional staff. No clients from the program will be asked to participate. Staff participation is voluntary and all responses will be held confidential. There will not be a need for any staff member to identify himself on any of the materials.

The basic purpose of the study is to examine job satisfaction and attitudes of staff working in two types of residential alcoholism treatment programs. These will also be related to some personality and organizational climate variables.

I am asking staff to complete several questionnaires. One of them is a basic data sheet asking educational and work related questions. It should take approximately 45 - 60 minutes to complete the questionnaires.

When completed, the questionnaires can be returned to me by mail. I will supply the envelopes and postage as well as all other materials. Staff will not have to provide anything.

The questionnaires can be completed at each staff member's convenience. It will not be necessary to interrupt the program's routine in order to complete them. I will also ask that shift supervisors distribute the materials to staff that work with them. Instructions for their distribution will be provided.

The study has been reviewed by a University committee established to ensure that there is minimal risk to human subjects in any experiment carried out under the auspices of the University. The committee has given its approval to my study.

I will be willing to return and report my results to your staff as part of an in-service training program. Of course, if there are any other questions, I will be happy to answer them.

Thank you,

Ernest Marquez
APPENDIX H

Instructions to Supervisors
Dear Supervisor:

The attached envelope contain questionnaires that I am asking you to distribute to the staff that work with you. These materials are part of a study I am conducting for my doctoral thesis.

The basic purpose of the study is to examine differences in attitudes toward the job and alcoholics among staff working in residential treatment programs. In addition, I am asking staff to complete questionnaires on things they like and don't like to do as well as how they perceive the organizational climate. Finally, I am asking staff to complete a data sheet for background information.

I would appreciate it if you would distribute one envelope for each staff member. Each contains a letter asking him to participate in the study as well as some directions. You may explain as much as you know of the study to them.

Please assure them that all responses are anonymous and will be treated confidentially. Participation is voluntary. The questionnaires can be completed at their convenience and returned to me in the stamped envelopes.

Packets should be given to staff who have direct contact with the program's clients.

If there are any questions, I can be reached at my office in Elgin at (312) 742-1040, extension 2030. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Ernest Márquez
APPENDIX I

Letter to Staff Members
Dear Staff Member:

I am currently writing my doctoral thesis at Loyola University and am asking for your cooperation in my research study. This study is examining attitudes, job satisfaction, and work climate as perceived by staff in certain types of alcoholism residential treatment programs.

With your cooperation, I would appreciate it if you would answer the attached questionnaires as honestly as you can when you have the time. It should take no more than 45 - 60 minutes to complete them. There will be no need to put any identifying information on any of the forms. All responses will be treated confidentially.

Each of the forms has been coded for purposes of keeping responses from the same individual together in the event they should be separated. Please be sure and answer all questions and not leave any blanks.

Once you have completed the forms, return them to me in the stamped envelope by November 15, 1981.

I hope you find completion of the forms of some interest to you. I shall always be grateful for your assistance and cooperation.

Thank you,

Ernest Márquez
APPENDIX J

Follow-up Letter to Staff Members
Dear Staff Member:

In late October or early November you were given several questionnaires as part of a study I am conducting for my doctoral thesis. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you are planning to participate but have not returned the materials, I would appreciate it if you would complete and return them to me at your earliest convenience.

If you have returned them to me, I appreciate your cooperation.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at my office at 793-8440, extension 2030.

Thank you,

Ernest Márquez
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