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PUBLIC ASSISTANCE CLIENTS PERCEPTION OF SATISFACTION
WITH THEIR INTERACTION WITH ELIGIBILITY WORKERS

Abstract

by

SHANTHA BALASWAMY

This study focused on public assistance clients evaluation of eligibility workers interaction with them. In order to understand the variation in clients experiences with workers, the study explored the relationship between client demographics, select client attributes and level of satisfaction with workers interaction. Variation in clients perception of workers interaction are grounded in the theoretical assumptions that workers within a bureaucratic setting tend to practice discretion when dealing with clients, which is contrary to the traditional view of bureaucratic organizations.

The conceptual definition of the dependent variable i.e., worker-client interaction was further operationalized through factor analysis procedure which confirmed two dimensions namely, worker-attitude and worker-behavior. Multiple regression analysis were computed to test the effects of the independent variables on the two dimensions of the dependent variable.

Of the client demographics and attributes included in the regression models, race of the client was found to be the best significant \((p < .001)\) predictor of clients' satisfaction with worker attitude and behavior.
The study was conducted in the Cuyahoga County Department of Human Services. Cuyahoga county is the most populous county in the state of Ohio, and includes the major metropolitan area of Cleveland. The analysis of this study includes information from 715 public assistance clients who were receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children and General Assistance at the time of the interview.

The study seeks to provide a better understanding of workers relationship with clients and identify the determinants of satisfaction with worker-client interaction which policy makers and agency administrators can utilize to reassess workers role, strengthen workers skills, and formulate service policies to enhance worker-client interaction with the ultimate goal of helping clients.
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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to examine public assistance clients' satisfaction with eligibility workers interaction with them. Though the interaction between the client and the worker is considered to be an important factor in explaining the extent to which the public welfare services are effective, the existing studies fail to lend itself in understanding this relationship. In the past two decades since the separation of financial services from social service, only minimum effort has been made to examine the worker's interaction with clients, and the studies have been limited to worker's perspective.

This study focuses on clients evaluation of workers interaction with them in order to contribute to the understanding of variation in their experiences with workers. It explores the relationship between clients demographics, select client attributes and level of satisfaction with workers interaction. The client characteristics that were reported to have explanatory potentials as determinants of satisfaction in other studies were selected. As there are no specific measures developed to assess worker-client interaction, this study conceptualized the measures and tested its validity and reliability prior to examining the hypothesized relationship. Variation in perceptions of worker-client interaction are embodied in the theoretical assumption that workers practice discretion in dealing with clients, which is
contrary to the traditional view of bureaucratic organizations.

The study seeks to provide a better understanding of workers' relationship with clients and identify the determinants of satisfaction with worker-client interaction which policy makers can utilize to reassess workers' role, strengthen workers' skills, and formulate service policies to enhance worker-client interaction with the ultimate goal of helping clients.
OVERVIEW AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There has been a dramatic increase in the number of recipients on public welfare in the United States over the years. In 1960, there were approximately 3 million Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients and this figure rose to 11 million by 1981 (Tratter, 1989). According to the Bureau of Census, the average number of Americans receiving General Assistance (GA) nearly doubled, between 1977 and 1983, growing from 654,000 to 1,275,000 (U.S. Census Bureau, 1985). In Cuyahoga County the AFDC client population was 127,566 and the GA client population was 45,303 in 1988. Approximately, 85,000 clients come in face-to-face contact every month with the public assistance workers to obtain services under both of these programs (Cuyahoga County Department of Human Services Statistics Reports, 1988). This agency also received approximately 45,000 complaints from clients in 1988, through its Administrative Unit.

Millions of federal and state dollars are spent to provide services to the public assistance clients, but minimal effort has been made to obtain feedback on agency services from the clients’ perspective. The impetus for change in welfare policies generally tends to come from sources such as within the system, professionals and advocates in the field. On review of literature on clients evaluation of public bureaucracy the authors note that:
"There is a vast and profound neglect of perceptions, experiences, and reactions of the people who themselves are supposedly being served. There is lip service to the notion of public accountability as feedback, but the feedback comes from a technician concerned with some measure of his own, than genuine digging into the basic materials of client experience" (Katz, Gutek, Kahn and Barton, 1975:1).

Nelson (1981), notes that the reasons for reluctance in soliciting client evaluations of social programs are general disinterest in the clients perspective, higher importance given to bureaucrats, and perception of clients as poor informants. Input from public assistance clients has been generally restricted to clients social, economic and psychological characteristics in order to understand its relationship to their welfare dependency, and with a view to reduce welfare rolls.

With the recent passage of two important bills (Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 & Family Support Act of 1988) that address the welfare reform policies, there has been a growing interest in worker-client interaction within the Income Maintenance system. The states are mandated to provide a wide range of supportive services to sustain clients through the mandated training and employment programs with the goal to help clients become self-sufficient and reduce welfare dependency (Pillsbury, 1989).

Eligibility workers interaction with clients seem to be a critical component of these welfare reform proposals. It implies much broader definition of the workers role which includes non-traditional service activities (counseling, coordination of services, referral, psychological and service assessments), in addition to eligibility
functions. Limited available evidence indicates that determining grant eligibility for clients is the primary perceived function among workers (Wyers, 1981; Hagen, 1987). While the accurate definition of workers' role lacks clarity, small scale demonstration projects on implementation of welfare reform changes report that case management approach with greater emphasis on worker-client interaction may be the key to successfully helping clients become self-sufficient (Munna, 1989).

A review of existing literature shows that there is minimum knowledge on clients' relationship with workers, especially after the separation of financial aid services from social services in 1971. Most studies undertaken prior to the separation of financial aid from social service primarily examined clients' general reactions to the welfare services and occasionally assessed client satisfaction with some aspects of their workers' relationship.

These results may have limited relevancy to the current system, because of the changes in the functions of workers. There is agreement that workers' interaction with public assistance clients are limited to determining eligibility for financial assistance, and differs from the role of social workers (McDonald and Piliavin, 1977; Hagen, 1987). However, some workers may extent themselves to perform service activities beyond eligibility determination (Wyers, 1983). In the post-separation period except for one study which focused exclusively on clients' satisfaction with public assistance services (Edward-Orr, 1982), all other
studies examined citizens general satisfaction with various public bureaucracies including public assistance services (Katz et al., 1975; Goodsell, 1980; Hasenfeld, 1985). Although, workers interaction with clients was considered to be an important organizational factor in explaining satisfaction with overall services, none of the studies examined this relationship in any depth.

These client evaluation studies have generally reported higher levels of clients satisfaction with workers and overall agency services (Briar, 1966; Buchanan and Makofsky, 1966; Handler and Hollingsworth, 1971; Filiavin and Gross, 1977; Edward-Orr, 1983). The reported satisfaction levels among clients has been over 70 percent which is contrary to the notions of other researchers, authors and advocates in the field of public welfare. They have consistently documented the contemptuous treatment of welfare clients by the officials and reflected on the demoralizing settings of the welfare system (Piven and Cloward, 1971; Coalition of Human Needs, 1988; Wyers, 1976; Goodsell, 1984).

Almost all the investigations have assessed the relationship between various client demographics and client satisfaction with services (Buchanan and Makofsky, 1971; Handler and Hollingsworth, 1971; Katz et al., 1975), but the findings have been conflicting. Edward-Orr, study included both client demographics and organizational variables (size, error rates, working conditions, workers orientation towards work) to explain the variation in client satisfaction with welfare services and concluded that:
"The things which have the greatest impact on client satisfaction are those things closest to the client; either attributes of the client him or herself or the client's perception of what the agency is doing (1983:164)."

Among the clients attributes only race and length of time on welfare were related to client's satisfaction with overall service.

**Problems in client satisfaction research**

The studies on client satisfaction suffer from both definitional and methodological problems which limits the validity of their findings. A major weakness of this entire body of research, including Edward-Orr's study, is that it has failed to pay adequate attention to the measurement of the concepts. Studies have utilized either global satisfaction measures, or a combination of direct and indirect measures to define concepts (workers attitude, helpfulness, friendliness, courtesy, promptness, competency, fairness). While single global measures are said to contribute to positive response biases (Gutek, 1978), direct (subjective) measures and indirect (objective) are expected to produce very different types of responses (Linder-Pelz, 1982). As a result there are no adequate measures of concepts that are reliable to assess satisfaction with any aspect of the welfare services. Also, the association between the client characteristics and satisfaction is questionable. The lack of systematic research in this field alone is not unique, its absence in the evaluations of bureaucratic encounters has been
noted by authors, in their extensive review of the literature (Danet, 1980; Goodsell, 1981). Investigators when conducting client evaluation studies can obtain useful methodological information from the areas of patient and consumer satisfaction.

There is substantial agreement among marketing and social science researchers that ‘patient/consumer satisfaction’ is a multidimensional concept (Andreasen, 1977; Gutek, 1978; Linder-Pelz, 1982; Pascoe, 1983; Ware and Snyder, 1975). Therefore, when constructing satisfaction measures, it is suggested that a facet of satisfaction be specified and each facet or dimension be measured with multi-items (Gutek, 1978). Greenley and Schoenherr (1981) recommend that each dimension of satisfaction be examined independently, as each dimension of satisfaction tends to be influenced by different organizational and individual-level attributes.

Focus of this study

This study focused on clients evaluation of workers interaction with them, in order to contribute to the understanding of clients relationship with workers in Income Maintenance Services.

The Income Maintenance worker is considered to be the primary contact between the organization and the client. All communications between the agency and the clients transpire through the workers. The clients are dependent on workers for
information to access the much needed economic benefits. The workers are also the 'gatekeepers' of other agency services outside the system. The workers interactions with clients set the stage for clients overall experience with the agency. In other words, the clients view of the agency is shaped by their relationship to the workers. For example: the client may be dissatisfied with the agency rules but, a meaningful interaction with the workers can diminish some of the dissatisfaction with the service policy. It is imperative to understand this interaction at the micro level in order to understand the implications for policies at the macro level.

Worker-client interaction has generally been measured as an outcome variable (Nelson, 1981; Danet, 1981). There are several aspects of the workers interaction that clients can react to or express satisfaction with. Past studies have identified a number of issues that are pertinent to worker-client interaction and can be classified into broader concepts such as workers helpfulness, accessibility, availability, competency, courtesy, friendliness, responsiveness and humane treatment. As stated before, these measures have not been well conceptualized, most frequently single items have been used to measure concept.

However, studying the phenomenon of workers interaction with clients is complex and demands selecting which aspects of the worker-client interaction one desires to examine. Researchers are free to choose based on their notion of what is
important and the limitation of the methodology. Among the measures available from the data base were several items that were believed to measure certain dimensions of worker-client interaction, i.e. items that describe workers behavior and attitude.

In absence of precise definition and measures of worker-client interaction and the criticism raised about the past studies in the field, to operationalize these conceptualized measures, factor analysis procedures were undertaken to confirm its dimensionality. To further ensure the appropriateness of the contents of the scales reliability coefficients of the scales were also calculated. Operationalization of these measures may be a step towards building precise definitions of the concepts of worker-client interactions.

Clients satisfaction with workers interaction is explained within the framework of theories on bureaucracies. The function of the IM workers in delivering grants is best described by the rational Weberian (1947) bureaucratic model. Income Maintenance workers are described as ‘eligibility technicians’ or ‘eligibility specialist’. Their primary job responsibility is to determine grant eligibilities based on standardized rules, regulations and procedures (Hagen, 1987). For example: the grant amounts, the payment errors, the paper work involved, the processing time, to name a few, are all determined and controlled by agency policies to a large extent. The formal relationship between the IM workers, and the client are expected to be governed by the universal norms of bureaucracy.
While the bureaucratic norms imply equal treatment of the clients by the workers, it does not account for the variation in differential treatment of clients that may exist. The one aspect of the worker-client relationship that is not mandated or controlled explicitly by the agency is worker's behavior and attitude towards the client. Workers have considerable discretionary power in how they relate to the clients. For example: Workers can choose to be cordial or unfriendly to clients. They can extend themselves to help clients in areas which are not clearly mandated by the policies or choose not to. Therefore, it is assumed that within this rational system of providing services, there is some amount of discretion or latitude for workers to express favoritism towards clients. This discretionary practice among 'street-level' bureaucrats has been alluded to by Kroeger (1975), and confirmed by other studies (Katz and Danet, 1973; Prottas, 1979; Lipsky, 1981).

However, there is much debate on the level of debureaucratization that exists within public bureaucracies (Nystrom and Starbuck, 1981, Danet, 1981). This study hopes to make a contribution in understanding this phenomenon through the examination of worker-client interaction within the IM Services.

Also, the most common complaints voiced against bureaucracies are that they are
inefficient, impersonal, and inaccessible. Evaluations of bureaucracies have generally focused on investigating the extent of its efficiency and accessibility in delivering services (Katz and Danet, 1973; Danet, 1981). The claims about bureaucracies being inhumane have been empirically tested only to a small extent. How much inhumaneness exists in bureaucracies is not known (Danet, 1981). The extent to which clients rate workers' attitude as courteous or humane examines this question from the perception of the clients.

Several client demographics and a few attributes that were believed to be important in having explanatory potential for clients' satisfaction with workers interaction were selected.

Other important variables that explain variance in satisfaction are length of time on welfare (LOTW) and stigma (Handler and Hollingsworth, 1971; Edward-Orr, 1982). Both studies found that shorter LOTW was associated with greater expression of client satisfaction with the welfare experience. The authors speculate that clients who are less dependent on the system are less likely to be critical and/or the workers may treat clients differently based on some personal judgement. The feeling of shame or stigma attached to being a dependent on public welfare has been well documented (Wyers, 1976, 1984; Pinker, 1980; Piven and Cloward, 1971). Research on underutilization found that clients' who feel stigma tend to have a negative experience with the system (Flynn, 1976; Wyers, 1976; Stuart, 1975). Research also indicates that negative experiences with public
encounter leads to negative evaluations of services (Katz et al., 1975). Handler and Hollingsworth (1971) found that clients' feeling of stigma was negatively correlated to client satisfaction with the welfare services.

Drawing from previous literature and research on clients' evaluation of public welfare bureaucracies, this study examined a general model of public assistance clients' satisfaction with specific aspects of worker-client interaction which was based on subjective assessment, i.e. from the clients' perspective.

Client demographics and limited attributes (LOTW and Stigma) were identified as important determinants of satisfaction and their impact on clients satisfaction with workers interactions was examined. The researcher used the framework of theories on bureaucracy and welfare bureaucracy to explain variance in satisfaction among clients. In absence of precise definition of worker-client interaction, one purpose of the research reported here was to refine the conceptualized measures of worker-client interaction which included items that describes workers attitude and behavior. In sum, this study examined two interrelated questions: 1) What is level of satisfaction of public assistance clients with their worker's interaction with them? 2) What impact does client demographics, length of time on welfare and stigma have on that level of satisfaction?

This study extends current theories on client-official interactions in public bureaucracies and tests assumptions about client satisfaction measures. It
identifies the relationship between workers and clients, which sheds light on the role of Income Maintenance workers. Identifying the determinants of satisfaction with workers interaction may help policy makers to increase responsiveness to clients and formulate other service policies that would increase the agency's commitment to helping clients.

The data base for this study was from recent research conducted by this student for a Department of Human Services, the Division of Income Maintenance Services. It assessed organizational effectiveness from the clients' perspective. As the principal investigator of that research, during the negotiation process with the Department, permission was obtained to use the data and add items to the instrument for the purpose of this study.

Chapter II discusses the role of Income Maintenance workers and history of the separation of financial aid services and social services to provide background to the study. It reviews relevant literature and research in the field of client satisfaction, and the theoretical framework to explain the key variables under study.

Chapter III presents the method of the study to empirically test the questions raised in this research.

Chapter IV describes the process of analysis of the dependent variable leading to the operational definitions of the concepts worker-behavior and
worker-attitude. It also presents the results of the basic description of the client characteristics.

Chapter V reports the results of the hypotheses testing.

Chapter VI summarizes the findings of the entire study and its implications for theory, social policy and service delivery. It discusses the limitations of this study and identifies directions for future research in the area.
Most of the studies on client evaluation of the public assistance program in general and their relationship with workers in the system were conducted prior to the separation of the Income Maintenance Services from Social services. The findings of these studies may have limited relevancy to the current system, because of the changes in the structure and processes of service delivery system including the role of the workers. Prior to reviewing the studies, a brief discussion on the current role of the Income Maintenance workers (IM workers) and background history of the separation of the financial aid from social service is presented to understand the context within which workers interact with the public assistance clients.

Separation of Financial Aid from Social Services

In 1972 the public assistance or financial aid program was separated from social services by the federal government. There were several reasons for separating the financial aid services from social services. The two most frequently cited reasons in the literature are: one, that the system contained many coercive rules or conditions for obtaining financial aid such as binding clients to receiving social services as a requirement for getting financial assistance, workers making surprise
home visits, conduct harassing investigations and punitive measures of enforcing clients with children to enroll in job programs. Two, that the caseworkers were not productive, devoted more time to eligibility determination, caseworkers were exhibiting high disinterest in their work, frequent turnover, low social service volumes and referrals (Handler and Hollingsworth, 1971; Piven and Cloward, 1971; Norman, 1971; Wyers, 1976; Kahn, 1973). The overall intent of the separation as noted by Norman Lourie was improved administration of both the services and preserving the values and validity of both types of services. However, some have raised questions around the issues of accountability, effectiveness and behavior appropriate to workers and clients (Hoshino, 1972; Wyers, 1973).

However, in 1976 separation as a mandated policy was rescinded as part of the New Federalism, but most states have continued to separate Income Maintenance services from Social services (Benton, 1980).

Authors have noted the lack of evaluation studies on the impact of separation of services, especially its effect on service provision to clients in income maintenance services, and the role of IM workers (Wyers, 1983; Hagen, 1987). Of recent, there has been renewed interest in the IM services and role of workers, probably with passage of new welfare reform act which requires expanding the role of the IM services. In 1988, the Cuyahoga County-DHS rewrote the job responsibilities of the IM workers to include evaluation and identification of other social service needs of the public assistance clients and to make appropriate referrals, to
promote self-sufficiency among clients.

**Role of Income Maintenance Workers**

After the separation of income maintenance from social service, the main role of the workers was conceptualized as a clerical function. According to Wyers:

"The general assumption was that the income maintenance workers would become clerk or technician because the separation of social service from income maintenance would simplify functions relating to income maintenance and rule out the need for highly trained personnel. The income maintenance workers would complete forms, verify claims, and determine eligibility" (1983:261).

Income Maintenance workers are also referred to as ‘eligibility technicians’, ‘eligibility specialist’ or ‘eligibility workers’.

The basic job responsibility of the income maintenance workers are eligibility determination and recertification for public assistance and food stamps for recipients. The workers are expected to review forms, evaluate financial eligibility, and refer cases to investigation units for fraud.

More specific job duties conceptualized for income maintenance workers, are similar across the nation. For example, the State of Ohio rules and regulations define workers job responsibilities as interviewing clients to determine eligibility through use of standardized forms; verifying documents; notifying changes in the case status; refer cases fraud investigation; and refer cases to other human service agencies (Public Welfare Manual).
The primary job responsibility has remained the same for the past two decades, since the separation from social services. Except, there has been more emphasis placed on workers to provide additional services such as helping clients with financial management and working with other community/government agencies to assist clients reduce dependency on the system. The Public Welfare Manual also requires that the workers inform the clients of their rights and responsibilities; explain federal and state policies to clients; and represent the agency in fair hearing process.

There is some evidence to support that income maintenance workers perceive the most important function other than determining eligibility, to be protecting the agency from over payment and client fraud (Wyers, 1983; Hagen, 1987).

The workers come in face-to-face contact with the clients at least two to three times a year, when clients eligibility for grants are redetermined.

Review of Client Satisfaction Research

A review of literature indicates that research in the area of satisfaction in public welfare is almost non existent. There are only few studies on clients’ reactions to the public welfare agencies. This absence in research on satisfaction extends to other public encounters with government programs have been noted by authors who have undertaken extensive review of the literature (Danet, 1981; Goodsell, 1981). While most of the empirically research have consistently reported
presence of high level satisfaction among welfare clients, other authors and experts in the field see the welfare system as being inherently inhumane. However, they form the bases for conceptualizing the measures of this research study and help avoid some of the methodological and conceptual criticisms raised against these studies. The discussion focuses on review of the client satisfaction studies, summarizes the methodological issues in measurement of satisfaction which is followed by the review on key variables under study.

With exception for one research study which focussed on client satisfaction with public assistance services (Edward- Orr, 1983), all other studies have examined client satisfaction only in a small, limited ways (Buchanan and Mokofsky, 1970; Handler and Hollingsworth 1971; Piiaavin and Gross, 1977). Buchanan and Makofsky (1970) examined the adequacy of the grant amount received by 470 public assistance recipients in Baltimore. Respondents were asked whether they considered," the agency's to be fair" and "what they least liked about the agency". The findings reported that 91% of the respondents felt that the agency was fair and only one-fifth of the sample bothered to respond to the open-ended question.

In another study, on policies and practices which examined the integration of social services with the public assistance grant supervision. Among other questions, AFDC recipients were asked to assess the quality of their relationship with their caseworker and whether they were generally satisfied with their
welfare experiences. A majority of the recipients (82%) reported that they were satisfied with the agency and generally found their interaction with workers to be pleasant (Handler and Hollingworth, 1971:170).

In an experimental field study on AFDC recipients' view about the separation of social services from income maintenance services, respondents were asked about their various reactions to the overall agency services and their service workers. The authors noted:

"all the respondents of this study reported that the agency was 'moderately concerned' in helping them, 'usually fair' in dealing with them, and generally rated their overall experiences as being 'very satisfactory.' However, perceptions concerning service workers showed that, recipients under the integrated conditions (combined social services and income maintenance services), expressed a stronger view that service workers are concerned with providing them help and are marginally more likely to consider service workers as helpful " (Piliavin and Gross, 1971: 399-400).

Edward-Orr's research focused exclusively on measuring clients satisfaction with the welfare services. The study was based on secondary data analysis of information obtained through a quality assurance survey from 1,749 AFDC clients in Wisconsin. It explored the effects of organizational variables and client characteristics on clients satisfaction with agency services. The investigator reported that at least 70% of the clients were satisfied with agency services and 30% of the respondents were fell within the range of undecided and dissatisfied category.
Other related studies on public encounters with government agencies that have included public assistance clients in their sample have similarly documented inordinate amount of satisfaction with public agencies, but to a much lesser degree.

Gutek, Kahn, and Barton (1975), gathered comprehensive national data on peoples perceptions of service agencies and utilization behavior. The sample included welfare service among seven other public agencies. They asked the respondents to indicate their satisfaction with the way the office handled their problems and the extent to which they felt they were treated fairly by the office. The results indicated that 42.5% of them were "very satisfied", and 25.9% were "fairly well satisfied". On an average three out of four reported respondents felt they were treated fairly (75.9%). The public assistance respondents did not rate as highly as other respondents. Nevertheless 61.2 % expressed satisfaction with the welfare agency and 67 % felt that the agency treated them fairly.

An evaluation of three welfare programs including public welfare were compared with respect to their evaluations of service received. The study conducted 240 interviews with clients as they walked out of offices of agencies. While the investigator reported that public welfare programs received the second least favorable evaluation as expected, nonetheless on issues of workers concern, helpfulness, and courtesy, over 61 percent of them stated being content (Goodsell, 1980).
Authors who have conducted extensive review of literature provide documentation of other evaluation programs that support the findings discussed above (Danet, 1981; Nelson, 1981). However, contrary to these findings there is some evidence and agreement among the advocates that welfare clients are not overly satisfied with the welfare system (Prattas, 1979; Lipsky, 1980; Piven and Cloward, 1971; Coalition on Human Needs, 1987).

**Issues in Measurement of Client Satisfaction**

Past research on clients reaction to welfare agencies, has not been explicitly guided by a well-supported definition of the concept client satisfaction with agency services. Client satisfaction with agency service has been measured in relation to 'helpfulness' or 'fairness' of the agency or the worker. According to Gutek (1978), high level of satisfaction may be in part the function of the global, or abstract measures. The author, suggests specifying more facets of satisfaction measure, as one way of reducing response biases. The other problem identified is the wording of the questions, most research fail to distinguish the difference between 'agency' and 'workers'. These terms have been used interchangeably in studies which reinforces the positive evaluation. Nelson notes:

"Believing that abstract evaluation questions tend to encourage positive responses, we may be able to increase the validity of evaluation measures by careful reference to a specific person or event when asking for client evaluation" (1981:35).
The other studies have measured client's satisfaction concepts with single items or questions, for example asking clients "how satisfied are you with overall agency services or worker?". Such single item scales simply measures how much the respondent is satisfied, but it does not explain as what aspect of the agency service the client is responding to. According to Nunnally:

"it is unlikely that a single item can fully represent a complex theoretical concept or any specific attribute for that matter...Single items lack precision because they cannot discriminate among fine degrees of an attribute... ...And single item measures are less reliable than multi-items" (1978:66-68).

It is recommended that instead of measuring the amount of a particular property of an object, it is preferable to classify the object according to two or more properties (Gordon 1977). Besides, single measurement do not provide sufficient information to estimate the properties of the concept being measured (Blalock, 1970).

Edward-Orr's study violates most of the assumptions, but attempted to provide a conceptual satisfaction measure that was sound and based on some notion of client expectations from the public welfare agencies. Even though, the actual measurement of the concept had some serious flaws. In developing a multi-dimensional scale to measure satisfaction with overall services from five items, the investigator used items that measured direct and indirect satisfaction with services and combined clients reactions to both agency and workers.
Research indicates that direct and indirect approaches to measuring satisfaction, actually assess two different types of satisfaction (Gutek, 1978; Robert, Pascoe, and Attikssion, 1983; Steward and Wonklin, 1978). An author reviewing dimensionality of patient satisfaction scale reported that while both direct and indirect measures tap satisfaction, direct measures seem to assess 'micro satisfaction with services' and indirect measures 'macro satisfaction at the collective level' (Pascoe, 1983).

Along the definition line, another conceptual issue in Edward Orr's research was the definition of satisfaction with service. There was a discrepancy between measurement of the construct (overall satisfaction with service), and the stated definition.

While, the overall definition of satisfaction with service included 'simplicity of agency procedures' 'competency of workers' and 'treating clients with dignity' in relation to service delivery. Various combination of the five items were used to define the satisfaction concept. Further, four out of the five items weighed on the 'competence' criteria, making it more a scale for measuring competency than satisfaction with overall services. Therefore, there may be problems in interpreting the data accurately, because of the inappropriate operationalization of the measure.

Investigators in the field of satisfaction research have consensus that the 'consumer/patient/client satisfaction' with services is a multidimensional concept
(Ware and Snyder, 1875; Andreasen, 1977; Linder-Pelz, 1982; Pascoe, 1983), each dimension may be theoretically a different concept (Gutek, 1978; Nelson, 1981; Danet, 1981) and should therefore, be measured independently. Greenly and Schoenherr's review of patient/clients satisfaction measure concludes:

"Factor analyses and examinations of patient and client reaction reveal several separate dimensions of the concept, including satisfaction with humaneness, with competence, with cost, and with convenience of services. Since they may be empirically related to different organizational and individual-level factors, each should be examined in its own right" (1981:5).

Drawing on the existing knowledge on constructing satisfaction scales, this study attempted to avoid some of the conceptual and methodological pitfalls discussed so far. Within the available data were several items that were believed to be measures of client's satisfaction with workers interaction. These multi-item measures were subjected to factor analysis, to assess its dimensionality for further operationalization of the concepts.

**Worker-client Interaction**

It has been acknowledged that the behavior appropriate to the role of the IM workers is still unclear after the separation of financial aid from social services (Hoshino, 1972; Wyers, 1983). However, a recent study on IM workers found that some workers see themselves being more than an 'eligibility technician'. Workers see themselves as being empathetic listeners and extending themselves
to provide other services to clients (Hagen, 1987).

According to Blau (1960), the procedures established in bureaucratic organizations, impose limits upon role relationship between workers and client. Both negative and positive relationships between staff and clients have been observed in public encounter (Katz and Danet, 1973; Danet, 1981).

Human service agencies staff's perception of their role flexibility was found to have a negative association to client satisfaction with services. The author of this study notes:

"The lack of role discretion or the absence of freedom to make everyday work decisions may be a key factor in explaining why highly structured or bureaucratized human service organizations are often observed to give unsatisfying service and why their staffs are seen as inflexible, unresponsive, and uninterested" (Greenley and Schoenherr, 1981:15).

Handler and Hollingsworth (1971), in their examination of clients' attitude towards caseworkers found that clients were reluctant to trust workers. Also, black clients were reported to have more favorable attitudes towards caseworkers, than white clients.

Piliavin and Gross (1971), found that perceptions of clients of the caseworkers as being helpful was more positive under the combined social service and financial assistance than the separated model i.e. social services alone.

Studies of satisfaction with medical services found that patients report higher satisfaction with the personal aspects of care when they visit physicians in less
bureaucratized settings (Freidson, 1961; Mechanic et al., 1980). Katz et al (1975), noted that their study contradicted the stereotypes that people are generally dissatisfied with the bureaucracies. The respondents encountered with the bureaucracies were stated to be pleasant for the most part.

It is assumed that for a meaningful relationship to exist between workers and clients, the clients should be able to count on the worker; trust worker to provide accurate information; feel free to discuss problems; have worker help with information on job placements; and have worker show some concern.

In the helping profession a humanistic approach to delivering service has always been undeniable (Katz and Danet, 1973). Even though, much of the discussion in professional service organization revolves around the issue of the relationship between attitude and overt behaviors of professionals (Stone, 1981). In the welfare bureaucracies literature, the most frequently discussed issue is the impersonal and inhumane nature of services which is essentially how the attitude of welfare staff has been perceived. Authors have consistently reported that workers in their interaction with clients tend to take a negative, hostile and unsympathetic attitude towards clients, supposedly to discourage clients from becoming comfortable in their status (Prottas, 1979; Lipsky, 1981; Piven and Cloward, 1971).

Other, studies have documented that public assistance clients are more likely rate their workers to be impolite, inconsiderate, unsympathetic, discourteous and
disrespectful (Goodsell, 1980, 1981; Wyers, 1976; Coalition for Human services, 1989; Greenley and Schoenherr, 1981; Handler and Hollingsworth, 1971; Piliavin and Gross, 1977). The researchers who have investigated clients’ satisfaction with services agencies believe that the minimum that a client can expect from their workers/agency official in the process of providing services is to be treated humanely (Edward-Orr, 1983; Greenley and Kirk, 1981; Katz and Danet, 1973). The statements that have been used to describe ‘humaneness of services’ includes items such as professional staff’s courtesy, warmth, respect, interest, politeness, helpfulness, dignity, and consideration (Edward-Orr, 1982; Goodsell, 1981; Greenley and Schoenherr, 1981). It is arguable that regardless of ones status there is a need to be recognized and treated with some amount of respect, dignity, and politeness. An agency’s responsiveness can be measured by the manner in which they treat the client (Katz and Danet, 1973). Among the components identified that clients can expect from their interaction with the welfare agency, that would likely to "cause" satisfaction in clients is to be treated with dignity (Edward-Orr, 1982). Handler and Hollingworth, (1971), found that the clients expressed very positive attitude towards their caseworker, but had low expectation as to what their caseworker can do for them. A research on consumer satisfaction that included eleven help-delivery agencies, defined expectation in relation to overall quality of service provided by the agency and reported that lower satisfaction was
related to lower expectations from the agency (Greenley and Schoenherr, 1981). Some of the statements developed for the worker-client interaction scale describe workers' attitude that depict humaneness of services. Similar items were used to measure 'satisfaction with humaneness of services' in a patient/client satisfaction study (Greenley and Schoenherr, 1981).

Items such as professional staff's courtesy, warmth, respect, and interest in patients have been used to define humaneness of services. Satisfaction is seen as a innate or attitudinal concept.

**Length of Time on Welfare**

Enough is not known about the effects of length of time on welfare and clients satisfaction with services. And as evidenced by the previous research, information appears to be contradictory.

Edward-Orr's (1982) study found that clients who are on welfare for the shortest period of time are most satisfied and see themselves as passing by and therefore don't complain. Clients who have been in the system longer were more apt to see the shortcomings of the system and are therefore, less satisfied.

However, another study found that LOTW did not make a difference in clients satisfaction with the welfare experience in general. Clients who left the system within a short period of time were more likely to report positive attitude towards caseworkers (Handler and Hollingsworth (1971).
Clients' competency is said to increase with longer association with the bureaucracies and bureaucrats (Lipsky, 1981; Katz and Danet, 1973; Katz et al, 1975). Danet and Gurevitch (1972) identified three major routes towards bureaucratic competence: education, exposure to bureaucratic norms, and experience as client of the bureaucracies. These three factors can influence an individual to respond differently to impersonal organizations. This socialization seems to help individuals to have positive experience with the agency as they may use the competency to influence workers to treat them right (Danet, 1981). It is assumed that LOTW will explain some of the variation in client satisfaction.

Stigma

A review of literature on stigma and public dependency indicates that individuals who are dependent on the welfare system tend to feel stigma. (Wyers (1981) notes:

"Being dependent on charity has long carried with it a stigma. It is commonly "known" that receipt of public aid induces feelings of shame and loss of face in many recipients....The stigmatization of public welfare recipients and the role of stigma as a deterrent to public welfare participation have both been examined. All known research related to stigmatization of utilizer has found that a significant number of them do feel stigmatized" (1985:955).

Handler and Hollingsworth (1971) examined feeling of stigma amongst AFDC mothers and found it to be inversely related to satisfaction with services. Clients
who felt stigma were more likely to rate their experience negatively. Clients who felt dissatisfied with their welfare experience also mentioned more bad things about welfare. The respondent who felt more stigma was less inclined to say that the caseworker was someone they liked, trusted, or a person with whom they could talk to about problems.

Other studies on under-utilization of welfare services have documented that clients fail to use services because of the stigma attached to welfare recipients (Flynn, 1977; Wyers, 1976, Briar, 1966, Straut, 1975, Mc Donald and Piliavin, 1984). Studies that have focussed on welfare clients psychological makeup have consistently reported the presence of low self-esteem and feeling of powerlessness among clients who receive welfare (Goodwin, 1977; Goodban, 1976, 1985).

Other researchers studying the clients dependency on welfare report that clients who are longer on welfare tend more likely to feel helpless, powerless, and have low self-esteem than short time dependents (Rein and Rainwater, 1978; Goodwin, 1972).

Demographic Characteristics

Researchers have examined demographic characteristics such as age, race, gender, and education to explain satisfaction in clients. However, there are conflicting findings in the research, which can be partially attributed to
differences in methodology and sample population.

While the negative effect of race has been well-documented in relation to staff’s treatment of clients, the existing findings seem to be inconsistent, within available satisfaction literature. Similarly, other demographic characteristics such as age and education have also been found to be associated with satisfaction in some research and not in others (Hassenfeld, 1984; Edward-Orr, 1982; Katz, et al., 1975; Danet, 1981; Handler and Hollingsworth, 1971).

Kroeger (1975) found no influence of clients’ age, race, or education on officials decisions in giving public assistance to clients. Similarly, another study on patient/client satisfaction found that race, age, sex, religion, or occupational status were not related to satisfaction (Greenley and Schoenherr, 1981).

In studies on public bureaucracies, gender of the clients has not been found to be associated with officials treatment of clients, i.e. both men and women tend to be treated alike (Danet, 1981; Greenley and Schoenherr, 1981). Research in public assistance has generally investigated the AFDC population, primarily women. It is assumed that given the ‘strong work-ethic’ principle in the mainstream society, men who are on welfare may not be received very favorably by IM workers who may also have such strong feelings about ‘work ethics’. This study will include the General Assistance population, who are predominantly single males, with no children, and receive less grant amounts. The gender of the client in this study may help explain some of the variance in client
satisfaction.

Clients characteristics and attributes were included in the study to assess the differences in clients level of satisfaction.

The assumption was that differences in clients' characteristics contribute to their perception of their workers as much as the workers behavior and attitude towards clients. Hence, client demographics and attributes were considered to account for variation in clients' level of satisfaction with their workers interaction.
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Two very different approaches have been used to understand and explain clients’ encounters with welfare state bureaucracies. Each of these explanations lead to diametrically opposed conclusions. The first approach views bureaucracies as rational systems, where the discretion of officials is curbed and controlled by universal norms. The encounters within a rational system tend to culminate high levels of satisfaction (Katz et al., 1975). The second approach explains that bureaucracies are inherently irrational and wield considerable discretion in its treatment of clients, including rationing of much needed services (Lipsky, 1981). It implies that some clients will be treated differently regardless of the purpose of the contact. Therefore, some clients will be inherently discriminated by the agency officials, resulting in dissatisfaction with the system.

For the purpose of this study, both models partially explain the phenomenon of worker-client interaction as the major antecedent of client satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Both approaches will be utilized to support the assumptions in this study. While the job description and the functions of the Income Maintenance workers are best described by the first rational model of bureaucracies, the second irrational model helps explains the inequality, and favoritism that may exist within the system. The variation in client satisfaction or presence of dissatisfaction can be explained by use of both models. The
theoretical explanation that fits the assumptions of this study is the debureaucratization process examined by Katz and Danet (1973). It posits that within a bureaucratistic system, however rational, some amount of irrationality exists. This process may be present within the ‘Income Maintenance Services’, and account for the variation in workers’ behavior towards clients.

The impersonal orientation of the officials towards clients is seen as part of the bureaucratic organizations. In Weberian terms (1946), the essence of bureaucratization is rational decision making through impersonal application of the general, abstract rules, without regard for the person. Universalism implies that those people with similar attributes or qualifications will be treated equally regardless of their personal characteristics. The norms of universalism, specificity, and affective neutrality are said to govern the relationship within and between the organization and client.

Miller (1971), described the norm of specificity in relation to the welfare workers. This norm calls for a narrow role orientation on the part of officials and clients towards one another. To describe officials as inhumane is to point out that they take no general and personal interest in clients, but deal impersonally with only a narrow, specific segments of their lives. Studies using this rational model have reported that clients are generally satisfied (Katz et al., 1975; Kroeger, 1975).

Kroeger (1975) used bureaucratic and exchange models to predict organizational
outcome and found that even bureaucratic models must be expanded to accommodate the kind of debureaucratization which comes about as officials attempt to exercise discretion on behalf of their clients. Katz and Danet, (1973) stated that implicit in the structure of the bureaucratic organization is set a of norms which are supposed to govern interpersonal relationships within and between organization and its clientele. Universal manner includes 'humaneness of treatment'. The authors support that organizations that serve clients should do so just by regulations, by reasonable procedures, and humane treatment.

The assumption is that discretion exists within the IM services and can be explained by the debureaucratization theory. Variation in client satisfaction can be tested by clients' perception of workers flexibility within the bureaucratic norms. The flexibility of the workers is seen as the debureaucratization process that exists within the bureaucracy.

Pinker's (1979) theory on 'stigma' in relation to the social services (includes Income Maintenance) is seen as an unilateral exchange system. The system is said to create feeling of obligation, inequality, and produces guilt in users. Pinkers offered the unilateral model to further clarify the relationships between exchanges, social services, and stigma. He added three factors to help understand the differential roles of stigma in welfare bureaucracies: depth, time and distance. Depth refers to the degree of stigma that is attracted by different social status. The assumption is that persons are treated differently based on their
social status. Time refers to dependency. The longer persons are in a dependent position, the more likely they are to redefine themselves in terms of stigma. This explanation can be generalized to clients dependency on welfare. The assumption is that the longer an individual is on welfare, the more likely they will feel stigma. Distance refers to both spatial and psychological barriers between the giver and receiver. Social distance (indifference) between the giver and receiver, is assumed to create a disreputable feeling in the receiver, because of unilateral exchange system. As a receiver, one tends to accept ones status or stigma attached to that position. The general explanation of the relationship between givers and receivers can be extended to help explain the worker-client relationship in Income Maintenance Services. The assumption is that clients who feel stigma are also more likely to perceive their interaction with the worker to be less responsive. The social distance concept can be related to the positive or negative perception of the worker-client relationship. The literature on shame and public dependency has utilized the works of Goffman, (1963); Pinker, (1979); and Matz, (1966), to explain the presence of stigma among recipients and attitude of the official towards clients (Wyers, 1976, 1985). These theories will be utilized to substantiate the relationship between clients feeling of stigma and satisfaction.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

This study examines two interrelated questions: 1) What is the level of satisfaction of public assistance clients with their workers interaction with them? 2) What impact does client demographics, length of time on welfare and stigma have on level of satisfaction with worker-client interaction in a sample of public assistance clients? In other words, the study tests the effects of select client characteristics and attributes on satisfaction with worker-client interaction. A general research hypothesis was derived on the basis of existing theory, and research literature. The underlying assumption was based on the premise that clients who perceive their workers to be more responsive and humane in their relationship with clients will rate that interaction more positively. Those clients who fail to perceive their workers as being humane or responsive would rate their experience as being negative. The explanation for presence of differential perceptions among clients was grounded in the assumption that workers' interaction with clients are not always governed by the principle of universalism of bureaucracies. Thus, some amount of discretion is applied by workers in their dealing with clients. Especially, where attitude and behavior (tasks) are less concerned directly with determining eligibility of the clients. Specific client characteristics were expected to be related to the dependent variable. Those
client demographics and attributes that were found to be associated with their evaluation of agency services in previous studies were included. Based on these assumptions it was predicted that:

**HR:** There will be a relationship between client demographics, length of time on welfare, stigma and clients expressed satisfaction with worker-client interaction.

The secondary purpose of this research study was to further operationalize the dependent variable 'worker-client interaction' prior to testing the hypothesized relationship between variables. The outcome measure was tested for its dimensionality, reliability and validity. The refined operationalized definition of 'worker-client interaction' was incorporated into the study hypothesis. The results of the analysis are presented in the following chapter.

**Research Design**

A secondary analysis of data from a cross-sectional survey research design was used for testing the proposed study hypothesis. The data for this study was collected along with another research study conducted by this student for the Cuyahoga County Department of Human Services, the Division of Income Maintenance Service. Data was collected at one point in time from the public assistance client population who came in contact with the agency. The data
collected previously, provided all the necessary information to empirically test the question under investigation in this research study. A cross-sectional research design was considered to be an appropriate model for determining relationships between several independent variables and a dependent variable (Babbie, 1973). Figure 1., presents the conceptual model of the variables built into this design. It shows two sets of independent variables and one dependent variable. The arrows indicate that client demographics, and attributes such as stigma and LOTW are all antecedent to satisfaction with worker-client interaction. In sum, clients demographics, stigma, and LOTW, are hypothesized to have explanatory potential in understanding variation in the level of satisfaction and therefore serve as the independent variables. Satisfaction with worker-client interaction is the outcome or the dependent variable to be explained. The outcome variable was subjected to various statistical analysis procedures to assess its dimensionality and robustness.
FIGURE 1. CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF THE PROPOSED STUDY
Setting

The Department of Human Services where the data was drawn for this study is the largest county in Ohio and 13th largest county in United States (Greater Cleveland Growth Association, 1982). According to the 1980 census this county has a population of 1,498,300, of which 1,129,881 residents were white; 340,989 were black and 27,425 were from other minority groups (Greater Cleveland Growth Association, 1981 & 1982).

The Income Maintenance Division of the Cuyahoga County Department of Human Services (CCDHS) is responsible for administering federal, state, and local public assistance programs for Cuyahoga County. It provides public assistance benefits to approximately 211,000 recipients. The program areas through which benefits are provided include AFDC, General Assistance, Food Stamps, and Medicaid. The services are provided through its six neighborhood service centers called the Income Maintenance Centers (IMC).

Data were collected from recipients of three program areas, but only the information collected from AFDC and General Assistance clients were utilized in the analysis of this study. During the period when the primary data was collected the CCDHS had a slight increase in the total number of cases for both types of program. In January, 1988 the agency had 44,434 AFDC and 44,076 General Assistance cases. By March of 1988 the AFDC cases had risen to 44,569 and the General Assistance cases were 44,228 (CCDHS, Research and Reporting
Department, 1989).

Both, Intake and Ongoing eligibility determination are undertaken at all the IMCs' and clients are assigned to various centers according to the zipcode of the area of residence. The On-going eligibility workers are assigned generic caseloads. They are responsible for all on-going maintenance and eligibility redetermination tasks for a number of cases from all program areas. Workers retain responsibilities for individual cases over time and have face-to-face contacts with the clients.

Study Sample

Samples for the analysis of this study included clients from two program areas namely, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and General Assistance (GA). The AFDC and GA samples were drawn from the population of clients who were actually receiving assistance at the time of the study, i.e., clients were from "On-going Services". A list of the number of unduplicated cases within each of the five Income maintenance centers (IMC's) were obtained to get equal representation of the clients from the different geographical areas within the county.

The total AFDC and GA client population and the sampling frame from obtained were nearly identical in context to the time period. The sampling frame was identical in that the total number of clients enrolled in the two program areas for
the year was close to the number of unduplicated cases identified, from which the study sample was drawn. The sampling frame consisted of all the AFDC and GA unduplicated cases for the specific months when the data was collected. Data collection was undertaken from January through March of 1988. A total of 900 clients were interviewed from different program areas. Interviews were conducted throughout the three months, to account for differences in the client population and to ensure adequate sample size. Spreading the interviews over the entire month also helped ensure inclusion of respondents whose responses may vary because of their differential experiences with the agency services.

This analysis includes only the AFDC and General Assistance client sample population. The respondents receiving Food Stamp only were excluded from this secondary analysis because of some salient differences between the study sample and the Food Stamp clients. The Food Stamp clients were unlike the AFDC and GA clients in that: 1) they are recipients of non-cash assistance program; 2) they have limited contacts with workers; 3) the length of time on assistance is short and sporadic; 4) they are not bound by other service policies like job-placement, job-training etc.; and 5) the service delivery policies which dictates the worker-client interaction for cash-assistance programs are not applicable to non-cash assistance program. Approximately, 748 clients were interviewed from both program areas. Data from only 715 were retained for the analysis of the current study. Thirty-three cases were dropped because of inconsistent information. The
selected sample included clients from two ethnic backgrounds, i.e., whites and non-whites or African-Americans. Of the AFDC client population, 69.1% were whites and 30.9% of the clients were African-Americans. A slightly higher percentage of the GA clients tended to be white (72.2%) when compared to the AFDC recipients. Less than quarter percent of non-whites were receiving GA (23.4%) at the time of the study. The samples obtained for this study were representative of the population receiving assistance in these two program areas. For example, the Table below compares the study respondents sex by program area with the actual client population in CCDHS-IM around the same time period when the data was collected.

Table -1

Sex of the AFDC & General Assistance Respondents Compared with CCDHS-IM Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFDC Sample</td>
<td>6.4 % (23)</td>
<td>93.6 % (354)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCDHS data</td>
<td>12.3 % (5,504)</td>
<td>87.7 % (38,742)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Sample</td>
<td>61.6 % (207)</td>
<td>38.4 % (131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCDHS data</td>
<td>66.7 % (31,063)</td>
<td>33.3 % (15,446)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Background Information on Respondents

The clients who actually come in contact with the CCDHS to receive services are also identified as the caretakers or the primary recipients. The majority of AFDC clients who participated in the survey were females and caretakers of AFDC recipients. They were responsible for taking care of two to three children below the age of 18 years and belonged to single-headed families. A family of four received $382 per month in cash, plus Foodstamps in Cuyahoga county at the time of the survey in 1988. The AFDC are more likely to be on welfare longer than the General Assistance clients who use the system on and off. General Assistance clients are usually looking for temporary support from the system because of unemployment, mental health or health problems. Some of GA women clients have previously been on AFDC and move to GA because of age or change in family status. Majority of them are single males who are more likely to be a minority or non-white clients. The standard allowance for a single person on General Assistance was approximately $110 per month for room and board, and $23 for personal allowance. The descriptive data of the sample in the study was similar to the population served by the agency within the Cuyahoga county.

The primary caretakers or recipients were expected to visit the agency at least twice a year for on-going eligibility determination for both types of program. Most of the clients visited the agency more than twice a year to obtain, provide
or clarify information. They also maintained contact with the workers periodically over the phone to report changes in their family, employment, educational, daycare, residential, or health status.

**Instrument**

The data collection for the study was accomplished through personal interviews with welfare clients using a structured questionnaire. It consisted of fixed response questions on demographic variables, and items on clients experiences with agency services. The items described various aspects of agency and worker activities in provision of public assistance services to clients. The contents of the items were derived from previous research and literature on clients' evaluation of welfare services and consumers satisfaction with public bureaucracies studies. Some statements were developed to reflect the categories perceived to be important in assessment of welfare services. Input was also provided by agency officials in construction of the questionnaire and items. They reviewed the questionnaire for clarity, content and accuracy of information. This process provided validity to items utilized to measure the concepts specifically pertaining to the roles and responsibilities of the IM workers.

The responses to the items were scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale, a forced-choice response format. The scoring ranged from a 1 (strongly disagree) to a 5 (strongly agree). The items had a combination of negative and positive statements to avoid response set, i.e., deterring a person from selecting the same
response on all the items. To help respondents remember the multiple choice response option, the responses were written on a 5x3 card and given to clients during the interview process. This process was expected to increase the reliability of responses. The questionnaire in its entirety can be found in the appendices of the original study (A Report of Public Assistance Clients’ Evaluation of Agency Reorganization and Services, 1988), conducted by the students.

The questionnaire was pretested on 75 respondents from the Intake Department of the agency. The respondents selected to participate in the pretesting of the instrument had demographic characteristics similar to the sample population under study. The information collected at this phase was tested for its reliability and validity in a variety of ways.

Items that were confusing, too difficult to understand, or seemed inconsistent with concepts being measured were discarded. Corrections were also made on some of the scale items to increase clarity. The pretested instrument was then used to collect the final data.

The responses obtained on the items from the final data were tested for dimensionality through the factor analysis procedure using a common factor solution (Kerlinger, 1986; Dillion and Goldstein, 1984). This procedure confirmed the multi-dimensional nature of the items by producing several factors. Factors with eigen-values greater than one were retained and rotated using a varimax algorithm. The number of items within each of the factors or subscale
were sufficient, interpretable and conceptually meaningful. The reliability of each of the subscales were also estimated using a coefficient of internal consistency (i.e., alpha). Most of the subscales reliability coefficient were at acceptable levels, i.e., above .65 (McIver and Carmines, 1981).

In anticipation of using this data set for dissertation research, additional items were written into the instrument with permission of the agency officials (See Appendix B). The items included in the instrument were selected based on existing literature and research that have either been identified as having explanatory potential in assessing welfare recipients behavior or were found to be correlates of clients’ satisfaction with welfare services. A combination of these items were used to conceptualize the key measures of concepts in this study.

As noted previously, this research study, is based on secondary analysis of data. Therefore, variables believed to be relevant to this study were retrieved from the original data set. All statistical procedures were re-run, to account for the differences in this study sample.

Chapter 1V discusses the development and analysis of the study variables. It attempts to provide a refined operational definition of the dependent variable clients’ satisfaction with ‘worker-client interaction’.

**Survey Procedure**

The clients interviewed were selected randomly from the waiting rooms of the
various Income Maintenance Centers (IMC). To ensure the validity of the sample, a random selection procedure was used. Every third or fourth client waiting to see a worker was requested to participate in the study. Information from the clients was collected through face-to-face interviews by trained interviewers. Clients were informed that their participation in the study was completely voluntary and that they were free to leave when their appointment for eligibility was announced. Also, they were given the option to complete the interview after the appointment with the worker, if they desired. Fortunately, interruptions during the interviewing process did not occur very often. As the questionnaire took only 15 to 20 minutes to administer and clients normally waited longer than that for appointments with eligibility workers. Eleven questionnaires that had incomplete information, due to interruption in the interview were not included in the analysis. Overall, the clients were responsive and eager to talk, especially in the Downtown IMC. The researcher supervised and participated in the data collection process. Interviewers were closely monitored during the data collection process to maintain consistency in the procedures.

Conceptual and Operational Definitions

Client characteristics included race, age, education, gender, length of time on welfare (LOTW), and clients' feeling of stigma. LOTW and Stigma are seen as
attributes that are specific to clients on welfare. Clients feeling of stigma is considered as a psychological attribute. These variables were not actively manipulated in the study, clients were assumed to have these characteristics when they participated in the study. As information was gathered through clients self-reporting the measures are subjective in nature. Client demographics and attributes were seen as the antecedents of satisfaction with worker-client interaction.

Client demographics included race, age, gender, and education. Clients' age and education were measured as continuous variables, where clients reported their actual age and number of years of education at the time of the study interview.

LOTW was defined as the number of years and months on welfare as reported by the clients. It was measured as a nominal variable. There has not been much consensus among the authors of previous studies in defining short versus long term LOTW (Rein and Rainwater, 1978; Rank, 1988). However, there is agreement that long-term use of welfare is an indicator of dependency on the system. For the purpose of this study short-term LOTW was defined as being on welfare for less than three years and long-term was defined as more than three years.

Stigma was defined as the extent to which a client feels embarrassed or
uncomfortable about their welfare status. It was measured by two items: 1) Client is not ashamed to discuss their welfare status with others, and 2) Clients don't mind being seen at the welfare agency (See Appendix B). This variable was a modified version of the definition used by Handler and Hollingsworth (1971). They defined feelings of stigma in relation to embarrassment or uncomfortableness of being on welfare. One of the items used by these investigators was ambiguous. That item was substituted with a item that is believed to measure the concept. The previous study measured embarrassment of being on welfare from the perspective of others (friends and neighbor). This study measured embarrassment or uncomfortableness of welfare status from the client's perspective.

The dependent variable ‘Worker-client Interaction’ included a number of statements that measured clients perception of the extent to which the workers respond to clients needs and general treatment of clients. Items believed to measure worker-client interaction and some that have been used as independent measures in previous studies (Briar, 1966; Handler and Hollingsworth, 1971; Katz et al., 1975; Goodsell, 1980) formed the basis of this measure. Worker-client interaction was measured by items which address the clients' perception of the extent to which: 1) worker returns clients call; 2) worker answers to clients questions satisfactorily; 3) worker's friendliness and openness to client problems; 4) worker makes efforts to help the client beyond his or her financial needs; 5)
worker is empathetic to clients; 6) worker makes effort to be accessible to clients; 7) worker treats clients with fairness, respect, politeness and dignity.

The workers tasks and attitudes described above are also aspects of worker-client interaction that are not supervised directly by the agency supervisors. It is assumed that workers have more discretionary power in how they apply these to clients. The statements measure clients opinion on the extent to which it occurs. Agreement or disagreement with these statements were expected to indicate the positive or negative experiences that the clients had with workers. This is a reflection of the clients' satisfaction or dissatisfaction with workers interaction. The conceptualized measure of overall of worker-client interaction was considered to be a multi-dimensional concept.

As argued in Chapter - II, that measures of concepts are more reliable when more than one item is utilized in defining it (Nunnally, 1975, 1983; Miles, 1984), especially measures of opinion or satisfaction should be multidimensional in nature and not a unitary concept (Hunt, 1970; Gutek, 1978), and lead to assessing the dimensionality of the worker-client interaction measure. Thus, one of the goals was to develop a measure of worker-client interaction from existing items, that would meet the methodological and conceptual expectation of a satisfaction scale.

The following chapter describes the general findings of the independent variables and discusses in detail the procedure and the results of analysis leading to a
refined operational definition of the dependent variable i.e., 'worker-client interaction'. It also presents an operational model and the re-stated hypotheses that incorporates the re-defined dependent variables.
Chapter IV

Analysis of the Study Variables

In this chapter the analysis and findings of the independent and dependent variables are discussed. The information on the key variables conceptualized to be important for the purposes of this study were retrieved from the data collected for the original study. All the information about the clients were self-reported and is considered to be subjective in nature. However, the clients assessment of the workers interaction can be interpreted both as subjective and objective measures. It is viewed as being subjective because it measures clients perception, and is considered as objective from an evaluation perspective. Statistical analysis of the independent and dependent variables include univariate statistics, factor analysis and reliability procedures. Univariate statistics provide basic description of the client characteristics, and the distributions for the scale items. Factor analysis and reliability procedures were used to test the dimensionality and reliability coefficients of the scales.

ANALYSIS OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

The independent variables conceptualized to be important in having potential power to explain variation in the dependent variable included basic client demographics and client attributes. Basic demographic data included clients age,
gender, race and education. The two descriptive attributes considered as the key determinant of clients satisfaction with workers-client interaction were length of time on welfare and stigma. A descriptive analysis along with the results from the univariate statistics for each of the independent variables are presented.

Client Demographic

Clients were asked how old they were at the time of the interview. Age was recorded as a continuous variable. The data for this sample population indicates that the mean age of the respondents to be 31.6 years (SD = 10.8). The ages ranged from 18 to 64 years, and the median age was 29 years. The median age reported for AFDC (28.7 years) is similar to the median age reported in this study (Duvall, Goudreau, and Marsh, 1982). The General Assistance recipients median age is slightly lower (26.4 years) than the AFDC clients median age in the study (ODHS Database Statistical Report, 1989; DC-DHS Target Population Report, 1989). Table 2 presents information on the study samples age as a categorical variable.
Table 2: Age of the respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 21 years</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30 years</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40 years</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 plus years</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 715 respondents in the sample, 32.2% were males and 67.8% were females. Both white and non-white (black) clients were interviewed. A slightly higher percentage of the respondents were non-whites (55.7%), than white (44.3%). The breakdown of sample by age, sex and race is typical of the AFDC and General Assistance population in the income maintenance services of the study county (CC-DHS Target Population Report, 1989).

A little over forty percent of the respondents stated that they had graduated from high school (41.7%). Nearly a quarter of the respondents reported having 11th grade education or less (23.9%), and 16 percent had at least some college education. The percent of respondents with high school education is similar to the welfare population studied by Goodban (1985). Forty-six percent of the welfare clients in his study had finished high school (1985). Tables 3 to 5, provides information on the race, sex and education of the respondents.
Table 3: Race/Ethnic background of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Gender of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th grade or less</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th to 11th grade</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Grad. or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid Cases 711  Missing Cases = 3
Client Attributes

Length of time on welfare was retrieved as a nominal level variable from the original study data. Respondents were asked to indicate the year and number of month they had been on welfare. They were also asked to indicate whether they had been on welfare continuously since the stated year. Majority of the respondents (87.6 percent) in this sample had been on welfare continuously since the year they started receiving benefits. The largest number of clients (N=248) at the time of the survey reported being on assistance anywhere from 1 to 2.9 years. This figure reflects the national trend for average length of time a AFDC recipient is on assistance (Rein and Rainwater, 1978; Rank and Mark, 1985; Time February 16, 1987). The next largest percentage of clients (21.7%) who have been on welfare continuously for 3 to 4.9 years, is slightly higher than the pattern of welfare utilization among clients elsewhere in the nation (Goodban, 1985; Rank and Mark, 1985).

Close to 12 percent of the respondents were on assistance for 5 to 6.9 years, and 20 percent of them had been of assistance for longer than seven years. Table - 6 shows the breakdown of length of time on welfare by number of clients (See Appendix A).

The variable stigma was conceptualized as another key determinant of satisfaction with worker attitude and behavior. It was measured on a two-item scale. The items selected for the scale describes feelings of uncomfortableness of being on
welfare. As discussed in Chapter III, the operational content of the items captures the definition of feelings of stigma as utilized by other authors (Hollingsworth and Handler, 1971; Wyers, 1981). Hollingsworth and Handler (1971) used two questions to measure the feeling of stigma. Both questions were indirect measures of this concept, it focused on clients perception of attitude held by others about AFDC clients. A modified version of this measure of stigma was used in the current research study. The two statements conceptualized were believed to reflect the subjective measure of the concept. It focuses on clients' personal feelings about being on welfare. Clients were asked to report their degree of agreement or disagreement to the statements. The Instrument in Appendices presents the items along with the approach to scoring.

The scoring on the scale was such that a low score meant that the clients would feel stigmatized. This was contrary to what one might expect i.e., a low would indicated less feeling of stigma. During the data analysis process the scores were reversed, thus a high score on the scale would mean client feels stigmatized. An overall score was computed from two items, and a one-way frequency distribution of the scale is presented in Table - 7 (See Appendix A).

Over half of the respondents reported feeling somewhat embarrassed to being highly embarrassed to be on welfare (55.6%). There was only five percent disparity between the respondents who did not feel embarrassed or stigma (44.4%), and those who reported feeling highly embarrassed to be on welfare
Nearly sixteen percent of the clients felt some degree of stigma (15.8%). A slightly lower percentage of the clients in this study indicated a sense of embarrassment to be on welfare than the findings of the previous study. Handler and Hollingsworth's study reported that 61 percent of their respondents felt at least some stigma. Actually half of their respondents never felt embarrassed or uncomfortable about being on welfare (1971).

**ANALYSIS OF THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE(S)**

It was discussed earlier in Chapter II, that only limited attempt has been made in operationalizing the worker-client concept. There is some indication that worker-client interaction has both worker attitude and behavior components. Among the descriptive items (questions or statements) utilized to measure the worker-client interaction included: workers professional courtesy, warmth, respect, politeness, helpfulness, dignity, consideration, trust, and friendliness towards clients. However, most studies have not attempted to distinguish between the attitude and behavior measures. Further, the conceptual content of these concepts have been composed of single items or questions, that were treated as unidimensional measures. A persistent issue in consumer satisfaction studies has been use of single measures of concepts, which are considered to lack sufficient properties to measure the concept accurately.

It is suggested that multiple items be used to measure concepts, as it contributes
to sounder operational definition of the concept (Nunnally, 1983). Along the issue of dimensionality, researchers recommend use of multidimensional measures, as it is probable that different outcome measures may effect different aspect of client/consumer characteristic.

Therefore, it is likely that in previous studies the various single-item worker-client interaction measures are clusters of items measuring distinct dimensions of the construct. Based on the above premiss, one purpose of the research reported here was to develop and test the dimensionality of scales capable of measuring some aspects of IM workers attitude and behavior towards clients.

The statements conceptualized to measure these concepts were subjective in nature, i.e., from the clients perspective. The components of the scales assesses client's opinion of their worker's behavior and attitude towards them. Satisfaction is defined as a attitude, an internal state and consequently, can be measured by variables that express opinions (Attikins, 1983; Linder-Pelz, 1982).

A number of items measuring clients' opinion about their experiences with workers were retrieved from the original data. The contents of the items were developed from existing scales, knowledge, and theory. A total of 12 items were identified that fit the measures of worker attitude and behavior. These items are presented in appendices along with the approach to scoring. The items include both abstract and concrete statements. A high score indicated greater satisfaction with workers attitude or behavior and a low score indicated lesser satisfaction or
dissatisfaction. To maintain consistency in direction of scoring (low to high), some item scores were reversed.

Results of Scale Testing

The selected items from the instrument were tested for its dimensionality, reliability, and validity. First, the distributions for each item were examined to determine variability in response. Two out of the twelve items produced extreme skewness, where nearly 75% of the sample chose the same answer. These items were dropped from the analysis.

Second, factor analysis procedure was performed with the remaining ten items using the common factor solution. Two factors emerged, revealing that the items were composed of multi-dimensional measures. The items and their loadings on each of the factors are displayed in Table - 8 (See appendix A). Four items loaded on factor 1 and seemed to focus on the general attitude of workers. The rest of the six items loaded on factor 2 and seems to deal with clients assessment of worker behavior. An examination of the patterns reflect that the two factors are conceptually consistent and meaningful. Thus, the factors were labelled according to the related dimensions they exhibited i.e. worker attitude and worker behavior. The factor correlation matrix indicated that each of the dimensions were perceived independently by the respondents. Inter-item correlations within factor 1 were higher than that of factor 2. The factor correlation matrix indicated
low to moderately high correlations, confirming that the perceptions are generally independent. It appears that the sample population in this study differentiates between the two dimensions.

Third, additional factor analysis were performed for each of the factors to further assess the structure, pattern, and validity of the subscales. Also, analysis of the reliability of the subscales were undertaken. The categories confirmed through this process provides a refined operational definition of the dependent variable. A descriptive analysis along with the construct validity of the subscales follows.

**Factor 1 (Worker Attitude Scale)**

The items that loaded on factor 1 focuses on the workers humanistic attitude towards clients. The four items were: 1) worker treats me fairly, 2) worker treats me with respect, 3) worker is polite to me, and 4) worker listens to me carefully. In a bureaucratic organization such as the welfare system the least the clients can expect is to be treated with some basic courtesy and the universalistic norms of fairness. The item ‘my worker listens carefully’, appears to reflect a behavioral measure, operationally it seems to assess both ‘dignity’ and ‘respect’. It captures the essence workers treatment of clients with dignity and respect. The items seem to be an adequate measure of this dimension and resonates the operational definition of similar concepts used by other studies (Greenley and Schoenherr, 1981; Goodsell, 1981). Together these items explained 77.9 percent of the
variance. This can be treated as a unidimensional scale. The inter-item and item-total correlations are presented in Table - 9 (See in Appendix A). It reveals that the items share common variance with several other items. The reliability of this worker attitude sub scale was estimated using a coefficient of internal consistence. The coefficient obtained was .92 which is considered to be quite reliable. In another study a similar scale was constructed with five items (staff's courtesy, warmth, respect, friendliness, consideration to clients/patients) to measure satisfaction with humaneness of services. The reported Cronbach's alpha for the index for 411 cases was .94 (Greenley and Schoenherr, 1981).

The scores from the four items were added together, to create an overall measure of worker attitude. The scores ranged from 4 to 20. A high score on this scale would be indicative of a positive attitude towards clients or perception of greater satisfaction with worker attitude. As shown in Table - 10 (See in Appendix A), the frequency distribution of the scores on the total scale indicates a negative skew with 70% of the clients reporting satisfaction with their workers attitude. While the skewness is not serious, a square root transformation procedure was undertaken to adjust for the skewness. Regression analysis procedure was used to test the study hypothesis, which is based on the assumption that the dependent variable is distributed normally for its tests of significance.

Table -11 presents the summary of the estimate of internal consistency (alpha),
means, standard deviations, and distribution of this subscale.

Factor 2 (Worker behavior Scale)

The items in this factor focused on tasks that are likely to be performed by IM workers, which are not directly supervised by other agency officials. These items measure the client’s perception of the extent to which the workers in fact perform these tasks. The six items include both direct and indirect measures and seem to predominantly reflect the measure of this concept. The items were: 1) worker returns calls, 2) worker gives satisfactory answers, 3) easy to get information from the worker, 4) worker is very helpful, 5) worker lets me know of available services, and 6) talk to worker about non-financial issues. Item 4 was expected to load on factor 1, as it seems to be an abstract attitudinal measure. Its loading on factor 2 may reflect its association to other worker behaviors. Table - 12 presents the inter-item and item-total correlations (See Appendix A). It reveals that the items share common variance with all other items. The correlation between item 6 (in the table) and the total-item score is slightly lower. It may be due to the skewed distribution of item 6, nearly sixty percent of the clients gave the same response i.e., did not feel free to discuss non-financial issues with the worker. Such attenuated variability can contribute to low inter-item correlation. The percent of the variance explained by this single factor was lower (46 percent) than factor 1. While percent of variance explained was not so high, it still suggests that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Reliability coefficient alpha</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Shape of distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worker Attitude</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>slightly negatively skewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Behavior</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 714
it can be treated as a unidimensional measure of the concept. The reliability coefficient of this subscale was estimated at .82, and is at an acceptable level. Table -11 presents the estimates of internal consistency, mean, std. dev., and distribution of the subscale. An additive index was constructed from the 6 items, scores ranged from a low of 6 to a high of 30. The frequency distribution of this scale is presented in Table -13 , which reveals a normal distribution of the scores. A high score on this scale means that the clients perceive their workers’ behavior to be more satisfying and a low score indicates dissatisfaction with the workers’ behavior.

These measures of satisfaction with the workers attitude and behavior formed the two major dependent or outcome variables for this study.

**Summary of the Analysis**

The above explained factor analysis and reliability procedures confirmed that the previously conceptualized dependent variable ‘worker-client interaction’ was a multi-dimensional concept i.e., measures two different aspects of the same concept. One dimension is believed to measure workers general attitude and the other dimension measures specific workers behavior towards clients. The refined operational definition of the dependent variable includes both dimensions of the worker-client interaction. For the purposes of this study the refined operational definition of the ‘worker-client interaction’ was then stated as:
"Worker-client interaction is a multi-dimensional concept. It is composed of two measures 1) workers' attitude towards clients and 2) workers' behavior towards clients. Workers attitude is defined as a measure of clients opinion on how they are treated by workers in terms of fairness, respect, politeness, and dignity. Workers behavior is defined as the measure of the extent to which workers are responsive to clients in their behavior. It is measured by the extent to which workers return clients calls, give satisfactory answers to clients questions, being friendly enough to access required information, being receptive to discussion of non-financial issues, and being generally helpful to clients."

Measures of worker-attitude and worker-behavior were treated as two separate dependent variables. The effects of independent variables on both the dependent variables were tested. It is based on the previously stated assumption that clients' characteristics may have a different impact on different out-come variables. In other words, clients are capable of making the distinction between the worker's attitude and behavior, and may not necessarily rate their experiences in a similar fashion. To accommodate the results of the statistical analysis of the dependent variable discussed above, an alternative conceptual model was proposed. Figure II presents the overview of this operationalized model. It is comprised of the two sets of independent variables and two sets of dependent or outcome variables. The two sets of independent variables include client demographics and attributes.
FIGURE 2. OPERATIONAL MODEL OF THE STUDY

Client Characteristics

Demographics

- Age
- Race
- Gender
- Education

Attributes

- Stigma
- LOTW

Worker-Client Interaction

1. Satisfaction with Worker Attitude

2. Satisfaction with Worker Behavior
The outcome variables of client satisfaction comprises of workers' attitude and behavior. The arrows in the figure indicate those variables believed to affect other variables. Client demographics and attributes are considered to have direct effect on both the outcome variables. It also shows that client satisfaction is viewed as determined by the combination of both sets of independent variables. For example, older clients might be expected to have been longer on welfare, thus jointly influencing their reaction to workers attitude and behavior towards them. Also, the relationship between client demographics and attributes has been frequently studied (Hollingsworth and Handler, 1971; Katz, et al., 1975). But the results have been conflicting and therefore difficult to interpret.
Chapter V

Analysis: Testing the study hypotheses

This research involved a combination of descriptive and explanatory analysis. In the previous chapter, an attempt was made to test and operationalize the dependent variable and present the descriptive findings of the several independent variables. This chapter reviews the procedures undertaken to test the hypothesized relationship between the independent variables and dependent variable(s). It also discusses the results of this research study which sought to identify the best possible predictors of client satisfaction with worker-client interaction.

As noted in Chapter IV, the operative definition of the dependent variable 'worker-client interaction' was composed of two dimensions i.e., worker-attitude and worker-behavior. Both of these dimensions meet the criteria of being two exclusive variables and thus treated as two dependent variables. The detection of two dependent variables require that the general hypothesis posited in Chapter III be re-stated to incorporate the newly operationalized dependent variables. Hence, two hypotheses were conceptualized.

The first hypothesis tests the relationship between client characteristic (race,
gender, education, age), LOTW, Stigma, and satisfaction with worker-attitude. The second hypothesis explores the same relationship, but looks at satisfaction with worker behavior as an outcome variable. In other words, it was hypothesized that

1.1 Client characteristic and Client attributes will be related to satisfaction with worker-attitude.

1.2 Client characteristic and Client attributes will be related to satisfaction with worker-behavior.

The underlying rationale were similar to that posited in Chapter - IV which was based on assumptions that clients perception of workers deviating from the norms of bureaucracy i.e., being receptive to clients and performing tasks beyond eligibility determination might result in positive perception of workers interaction with them. This may culminate in rating higher satisfaction with the workers’ interaction with them. It was also posited, based on theoretical understanding of interaction between clients and workers within a bureaucracy such as the income maintenance services, that workers within this bureaucracy tend to use discretionary power in dealing with clients. Subsequently, the presence of satisfaction and dissatisfaction among clients with workers’ attitude and behavior is presumed to exist because of some amount of debureaucratization within the system.
As discussed earlier, the assumptions about the determinants of satisfaction with welfare services in general has been relatively well documented in the literature, even though the findings have been conflicting. Hence, the goal of the analysis was to test the theoretical assumptions and attempt to identify the determinants of satisfaction with worker-attitude and worker-behavior, which hold the most explanatory power.

Multiple regression analysis method was chosen as the technique to empirically test the above stated study hypotheses. It permits testing the effects of several independent variables on a dependent measure. Other multi-variate analysis considered to be appropriate in assessing the effects of several independent variables on two or more dependent variables, requires that the dependent variables be correlated at level higher than the correlation of the two dependent variables in this study (Cohen and Cohen, 1983). The dependent variables in this study were correlated at a moderate level (factor cor. = -.48). Therefore, two simultaneous regression analysis were undertaken to test each of the hypotheses proposed earlier.

Prior to subjecting the data to regression analysis, the categorical variables were transformed into dichotomous measures i.e., dummy variables. The transformed variables were: Sex (0=male, 1=female); Race (0=white, 1=non-white or
black); Length of time on welfare was collapsed to create three categories (0 = less than three years, 0 = less than five years, 1 = more than 3 years/five years). These different categories were created to assess which of the possibilities showed most explanatory power. It was based on the notion that the clients evaluation of their experience may be influenced by their length of time on welfare which may be a probable indicator of their dependency on the system. The assumption is that clients become more dependent on the system once they remain on welfare longer than certain number of years. There is no consensus among authors as to what constitutes short versus long term LOTW. Authors and empirical researchers have used different definitions of short versus long term length of time on welfare, as an indicator of dependency on the system (Rank and Mark, 1985; Rein and Rainwater, 1978; Schiller, 1971; Bane and Ellwood, 1983).

Handler and Hollingsworth, (1971) study found that AFDC women who leave the system do so within four years and their view of the welfare system differs from those who stay longer. Another research study found an association between LOTW and reaction to agency service, reported the existence of a difference between clients who were in the system for less than year and over a year (Edward-Orr, 1983). Between these extremes there is some agreement that most clients leave the system within three years and each additional year increases their chances of becoming long term dependents (Rank, 1988; Wilson, 1987).
Attempts were made to test a combination of these definitions proposed in the previous literature. The other independent variables such as age, education and feeling of stigma were all measured as continuous variables. All of these variables were included in the regression models as antecedents of client satisfaction with workers' attitude and behavior.

The rest of this chapter presents the results of this analysis and substantiates the findings.

Testing the Hypotheses

Prior to examining the proposed models that relates client satisfaction (with worker's attitude and behavior) to various client demographics and attributes, a correlation matrix of these variables was examined. The matrix assess the strength of the correlation between the dependent and each of the independent variables, as well as the correlations between the independent variables. Statisticians note that large intercorrelations between the independent variables can affect the results of the overall multiple regression analysis because of multi-collinearity (Cohen and Cohen, 1975; 1983; Dillion and Goldstein, 1984; Huck, Cormier and Bounds, 1974). The discussion of the findings for each of hypothesis includes the interpretation of the correlation matrix, the overall R-squared, partial regression coefficients and standardized coefficients.
Testing the First Hypothesis (HR : 1.1)

Table - 14 in the appendices presents the correlations among the variables included in the first hypothesis. It shows that except for race of the clients all other client characteristic variables has a weak correlation to satisfaction with worker-attitude. Clients race or ethnic background was correlated to satisfaction with workers' attitude at a low moderate level. The negative correlation suggests that the non-white clients tend to be more dissatisfied with the workers' attitude towards them than white clients. Inter correlation among the client characteristics and attributes indicates anticipated and some spurious correlations between certain variables. The correlations that are significant at .05 level were considered noteworthy and thus, discussed herein. Length of time on welfare was related to clients education negatively and positively to age and gender of the client. The clients who stated having been on welfare for more than five years also reported as having less than a high school education, slightly older in age and more likely to be female. These results are similar to the findings offered in other studies (Rank, 1988; Bane and Ellwood, 1983). Rank's analysis of longitudinal data on the racial difference in use of welfare found characteristics like low education and age of the client to be related to longer stay on welfare. Bane and Ellwood noted that AFDC clients who stayed longer on welfare had less education. There are no comparative data available on differences between male and female clients who are on welfare, other than local county data which
supports this result that male clients (General Assistance-mostly male) stay less
time on welfare than female clients (AFDC-mostly female).

Another interesting association is the relationship between clients education, age
and race. Older clients tend to report having less education and non-white clients
reported having higher level of education than whites. Non-whites reporting
higher education seems contrary to other studies which report the opposite
(Rank, 1988; Bane and Ellwood, 1983). One explanation could be the inclusion
of the General Assistance population whose educational level may be slightly
higher than the AFDC population. Further, the spurious negative relationship
between clients feeling of stigma and race suggests that white clients are more
likely to feel stigma than non-white clients. While the literature has documented
extensively the presence of shame and embarrassment among welfare recipients
(Ellwood, 1983; Lipsky, 1981; Wyers, 1981; Williamson, 1975), only one study
examined the relationship between race and stigmatization. This study found no
difference between race and feeling of embarrassment (Handler and
Hollingsworth, 1971).

It should be noted that the finding reported here were not investigated for its
significance, other than the strength of correlations which were all found to be
higher than or equal to .05.
Table 15: Regression of satisfaction with worker-attitude on client characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-0.27641</td>
<td>-0.03514</td>
<td>-0.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-1.90390</td>
<td>-0.25735</td>
<td>-6.847***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.01985</td>
<td>-0.05829</td>
<td>-1.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01985</td>
<td>-0.04097</td>
<td>-1.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigma</td>
<td>-0.10058</td>
<td>-0.04339</td>
<td>-1.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTW</td>
<td>0.05390</td>
<td>0.03788</td>
<td>0.988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-Squared = .08

10.25*** overall F with 6/714 df

*** p < .001

Sex (1 = male, 0 = female)
Race (0 = white, 1 = non-white)
Table -15 examines the first hypothesis which tests the impact of clients age, race, sex, education, LOTW, and stigma on satisfaction with worker's attitude. Of all the client characteristics and attributes included in the regression model, only one persists in having a significant impact on satisfaction with the worker's attitude. Race of the clients seems to be the best predictor of clients' satisfaction with worker's attitude. The negative coefficient indicates that the non-white or African-American clients are less satisfied with the attitude of the workers towards them. The regression coefficient shows that non-white clients tend to score less on the satisfaction with workers attitude scale on an average of 1.9 points. This relationship was statistically significant at .001. None of the other variables i.e., age, sex, education, stigma or LOTW were found to have any significant impact on level of satisfaction with workers' attitude, as expected. Even though, the overall contribution to the explained variance was not large enough for this model (MR = .28), the effect of race on satisfaction with worker's attitude is noteworthy. Thus, the general hypothesis that clients characteristics and attributes will be related to satisfaction with workers' attitude was only partially confirmed. In sum, the hypothesis that workers in bureaucratic organization such as the income maintenance services practice discretion in dealing with clients which might likely to result in expression of satisfaction or dissatisfaction among clients was confirmed to some extent. In other words, some amount of debureaucratization exists within the framework of bureaucratic rules and
policies. Greenley and Schoenherr (1981), study which tested the relationship
between socio-demographic data and a similar outcome measure (satisfaction with
humaneness of services), reported that clients demographic characteristics
including race was not related to satisfaction. However, another study whose
outcome measure partially included the definition of 'workers attitude', found a
strong correlation between race of clients and general satisfaction with public
assistance services (Edward-Orr, 1983). Its findings that black clients tend to be
more dissatisfied than white clients corresponds to the findings of this study. The
explanation for this finding is discussed after examining the results of the second
hypothesis. Both of these findings seem to be related.

Testing the Second Hypothesis ( HR : 1.2)

Table - 16 in the appendices presents the correlation between clients
demographics, attributes and satisfaction with worker's behavior. The correlation
among the clients characteristic and attributes are similar to the findings reported
earlier in the discussion of the first hypothesis. The association between the client
characteristics and satisfaction with worker's behavior are also similar. Non-white
clients view their worker's behavior towards them to be more dissatisfying than
whites. However, the strength of this correlation was slightly higher (r = .28) than
the correlation between race and satisfaction with worker's attitude (r = .25). Of
the client attributes stigma seems to make a difference in their rating of workers'
behavior towards them. A low negative correlation between stigma and satisfaction with worker’s behavior (r = .17; significant at .01) indicates that clients who feel stigma are more likely to report dissatisfaction with worker’s behavior.

Although a previous study reported the effects of LOTW on satisfaction with public assistance services (Edward-Orr, 1983), for this client population, LOTW does not seem to affect their perception of worker’s behavior towards them. Further confirmation of these results are seen in the regression model that tested the second hypothesis. It posited that clients who perceive their worker’s to be more responsive in their behavior i.e. returning calls, being trustworthy, helpful, accessible, discuss non-financial problems, would more likely to rate their worker’s behavior towards them as being positive or satisfying. The measures of tasks performed by workers in this definition are beyond mere eligibility determination. The underlying assumption was that workers are less likely to relate to all clients similarly, thereby resulting in differential perception of clients. Hence, some clients would be more satisfied than others, and their personal characteristics were expected to influence this relationship.

A weak correlation was observed between some of the client characteristics and satisfaction with worker’s behavior, in Table -16. Except for race and stigma (significant at least .01 level), none of the variables appeared as determinants of satisfaction in this regression model.
Table 17: Regression of satisfaction with worker-behavior on client characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-0.26852</td>
<td>-0.02741</td>
<td>-0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-2.59469</td>
<td>-0.28161</td>
<td>-7.538***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.01217</td>
<td>-0.02869</td>
<td>-0.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.14807</td>
<td>-0.04843</td>
<td>-1.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigma</td>
<td>-0.26895</td>
<td>-0.11793</td>
<td>-3.170**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTW</td>
<td>0.05020</td>
<td>0.02833</td>
<td>0.744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-Squared = .098  
11.32*** overall F with 6/714 df

** p < .01
*** p < .001

Sex (1=male, 0=female)
Race (0=white, 1=non-white)
Examination of Table -17 shows that client's race and feeling of stigma are the two important determinants of clients satisfaction with the worker's behavior. White clients seem to be more satisfied with workers behavior which is consistent with previous results however, non-white clients seemed to score even lower on satisfaction with the workers' behavior scale. They scored at least 2.6 points lower than the white clients which suggests that race or ethnic background does make a difference in their evaluation of worker's behavior towards them. Some other studies have also reported similar findings, eventhough these studies included only uninatary measure of some aspect of workers' behavior used in this study (Goodsell, 1980; Katz, 1975). Whether a client felt stigma or not made a difference in their rating of worker's behavior. Clients who felt stigma were more likely than those who did not feel stigma to perceive the worker's to be less responsive. A previous research finding corresponds to this results in that clients who felt stigma reported not having a satisfactory relationship with their workers (Handler and Hollingsworth, 1971).

Summary

Two sets of hypotheses were tested. The first set of hypothesis examined the relationship between client demographics, LOTW, Stigma and client satisfaction with workers attitude. The second hypothesis considered the relationship between the same sets of independent variables and client satisfaction with workers
behavior. The hypothesized relationships were only partially confirmed.

The select demographic variables in both the regression model explained only a small percent of variance in satisfaction with workers attitude and workers behavior. Although this suggests that most of the client characteristics do not have a strong impact on satisfaction, the two variables race of the clients and their feeling of stigma seem to affect their perception of satisfaction independently.

These findings were examined individually and are considered noteworthy because of the strength of the relationship. Race of the clients seem to be the best predictor of satisfaction with both workers' attitude and behavior. Non-white or African American clients being more dissatisfied with their workers attitude and behavior towards them came as no surprise. This finding has been supported by previous studies (Edward-Orr, 1982; Goodsell's, 1980). One of these investigator's evaluation of three programs which included the public welfare client, examined the correlation between clients demographic and their overall evaluation of the system and reported:

"...the only notable relationship was that whites, more than non-whites, expected to remember something "really nice" about the encounter" (1980:134).

Edward-Orr's (1982) study also found race to be one of the important predictors
of client satisfaction with the welfare services. Non-white clients were reported
to more frequently be dissatisfied with the overall system than the whites.
General explanations offered to explain this effect was that discrimination against
non-whites exists at all levels, and welfare workers may not be immune to such
behavior.

Another, interesting finding in this research was the effect of clients feeling of
stigma on client satisfaction with workers behavior. It suggests that clients who
felt uncomfortable with their welfare status were more likely to perceive their
workers behavior towards them as being negative. This finding corresponds to
Handler and Hollingsworth (1971) study which found that clients who felt stigma
reported to also rate their experience as being dissatisfying. The following chapter
discusses the findings of this study in greater detail.
Chapter VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

SUMMARY

This study examined the public assistance clients' satisfaction with eligibility workers interaction with them. It focussed on the effect of client demographics, length of time on welfare, and stigma on clients' satisfaction with workers interaction. To provide context to the conclusions and the implications arising from this study, a brief summary of the methodology, literature and theories utilized will follow.

The data for this research was from a recent study conducted by the researcher for the Department of Human Services, division of Income Maintenance Services, in a large metropolitan county in the State of Ohio. The primary research assessed the organizational effectiveness from the clients perspective. Additional data was included in the questionnaire for the purpose of this study, with the permission of the agency officials.

Information from the clients were obtained through personal interviews with clients, using a structured questionnaire with fixed response questions on client demographics. Several items were also included on various client experiences with the organization and workers. The responses to items were scored on a five point Likert-type scale which assessed clients agreement or disagreement with the
items. The analysis of this study includes information from 715 public assistance clients who were receiving AFDC and General Assistance at the time of the interview.

Available literature and research shows that while the official/worker-client relationship is an important indicator of organizational effectiveness, only minimum effort has been made to assess this relationship, especially from the clients perspective. Absence of research on worker-client interaction is much more obvious in the public welfare services after the separation of financial aid services from social services. Limited evidence in this area indicates that workers' perceive clients to have a negative image of them (Hagen, 1987) and clients' personal characteristics and attributes were reported to be the most important explanatory variables in explaining their satisfaction with public welfare services (Edward-Orr, 1982). Past research studies have been criticized for their methodological and conceptual formulations of concepts that measured clients' satisfaction with welfare services. The over reporting of client satisfaction with welfare services and conflicting findings on antecedents of satisfaction in these studies were partially attributed to lack of appropriate measures of concepts.

To avoid some of the methodological pitfalls discussed in relation to previous studies, in this research the measures utilized to assess client satisfaction with workers' interaction were developed from multi-items and statistical procedures
such as factor analysis and reliability coefficient procedures were undertaken to examine the scales dimensionality and accuracy of measurement of the concepts. These procedures yielded two dimensions of workers' interaction with clients i.e., workers behavior and attitude.

Theories on bureaucracies and welfare bureaucracies provide an understanding of the theoretical relationship among these variables and the predicted outcome for clients. The assumption was that welfare bureaucracies tend to violate some of the basic traditional views of bureaucracies like norms of universalism and role rigidity. The workers' attitude towards clients measured the extent to which clients perceive their workers to provide services in a humane manner, i.e., politeness, dignity, respect, consideration. The workers' behavior measured the extent to which clients perceived their workers to provide services that were beyond eligibility determination i.e., referring clients to other services, job placements, discussing non-financial issues, providing satisfactory answers, and overall being helpful. It was hypothesized that some amount of de bureaucratization i.e., perceived discretion of workers towards clients exists within the system which could explain why some clients could be more satisfied than others. It implies that workers may treat or deal with clients differently. Clients rating of their perception of workers' humane manner was assumed be the measure of client satisfaction with workers attitude. Similarly, clients rating of their perception on
the extent to which the workers provided the extra services beyond eligibility was considered to be their measure of satisfaction with workers behavior.

Several client demographics and two client attributes (length of time on welfare and stigma), that proved to have some explanatory potentials in previous studies were selected to examine their effect on client satisfaction with workers' attitude and behavior.

Length of time on welfare (LOTW) was considered to be a measure of clients dependency on the system. Studies have shown that clients who are on welfare for shorter time tended to rate their experience with the services more positively than those who stayed longer. A previous study reported that stigma or clients discomfort of being on welfare was related to negatively to their evaluation of the welfare services. In this study a relationship was assumed to exist between LOTW and stigma, based on the theory that the longer an individual occupies the dependent position the more likely they are to redefine themselves in terms of stigma (Wyers, 1983).

Drawing on previous literature, theory, and outcome from the analysis of the worker-client interaction through statistical procedures two sets hypotheses were tested in this study. The first hypothesis dealt with the relationship between client demographics, LOTW, stigma and client's satisfaction with workers attitude. The second set of hypothesis considered the relationship between client demographics,
LOTW, Stigma and clients' satisfaction with workers behavior. The results reported in Chapter V indicates that some of the client demographics to be correlated. The correlation was low but, significant. LOTW was correlated with clients age and education, older clients tended to report having been longer on welfare than younger clients. Also, clients who had been longer on welfare had less education. Similar results have been reported in other studies. Another interesting finding was the association between race of clients and stigma, again the correlation was weak but significant. Non-white clients reported less stigma than white clients. One speculation for this finding rests in the Julius Wilson's (1987) argument on geographical distribution of race and poverty. He argues that poverty is concentrated in inner cities and occupied by predominantly black people and whites occupy the suburbs. It could be possible that black welfare clients come from poor neighborhoods where other families are also, on welfare and therefore, less likely to be uncomfortable about being on welfare. Whereas, the white clients coming from less poor neighborhoods may not confront many who are on welfare, hence more likely to experience discomfort in being on welfare. However, the relationship between LOTW and Stigma was not associated as anticipated. In the overall testing of the two hypotheses using simple regression analysis, except for race and stigma none of the other independent variables were predictors of client satisfaction. The conclusions of this study presents the key findings from the testing of the study hypotheses, based on which implications for
social policy, theory, research, and service delivery are suggested. Also, a
discussion on the limitations of this study is presented following the conclusions.

CONCLUSIONS

The hypothesized relationship between client demographics and satisfaction with
worker-attitude and worker-behavior was only partially substantiated. Variables
other than race were generally unimportant in predicting satisfaction with
workers' attitude and behavior, with the exception to stigma which was the
second most important predictor for satisfaction with workers' behavior.

Race of Clients

Perception of workers discretion was found to be related to race of the clients.
Non-white clients were more likely to be dissatisfied with workers' attitude and
behavior towards them than the white clients. Other studies that found similar
association between race and clients' satisfaction with welfare services
(Goodsell, 1980; Edward-Orr, 1983), offered two possible explanations to
substantiate their results which may partially be applicable to this study's
findings. One, general discrimination against non-whites exists in the mainstream
society and workers are not immune to such practices. Two, even if clients are
not discriminated against significantly, the existence of discrimination in other
areas of their lives sensitizes them in recognizing and voicing their opinions more readily. The previous study data came from welfare agencies that had predominantly white case workers, which is unlike the general composition of eligibility workers in the county where this research data was collected (See Table 18 in Appendix A). A significant number of the workers are African Americans and, approximately 15-20 percent of them were clients who were employed as case-aides in the jobs program in the late 1970's, eventually hired as eligibility workers. This background information offers yet another possible reasonable explanation. It could be that animosity towards clients who are dependent on the system exists, because these workers have been successful in becoming economically independent, and most workers in the agency are of this situation and therefore may be less sympathetic. The researcher has worked with the agency for six years in various capacities, most frequently in training workshops with workers and supervisors during which time the existence of such animosity was observed and mentioned by several agency staff. To address some of these problems training curriculum included activities to increase workers' awareness of clients' plight and alleviate myths about welfare. However, based on the discussion of the findings of the previous study and this research it leads one to speculate whether workers from both ethnic groups tend to discriminate against non-white clients. It may also be possible that workers behave negatively towards non-white clients to discourage them from being on assistance longer,
probably because they too believe in the general myth of over-dependency on the system by this group of clients. The extent to which the discussed factors influence workers' attitude and behavior towards clients remain unknown.

Stigma

The other not so strong but important predictor that warrants further discussion is the association between clients feeling of discomfort about their welfare status and negative evaluation of worker's behavior towards them. In the analysis of the inter-item correlation among the independent variables, in Chapter V, a low correlation was observed between race and stigma. Without, taking into consideration the probable influence of this relationship on the worker's behavior, and the speculation provided for this relationship earlier in this chapter. A meaningful interpretation could indicate clients who feel more uncomfortable to be on welfare are likely to perceive their workers' behavior towards them as less satisfying. It is possible that clients who are less adjusted to their welfare status are ones who believe in the mainstream ideologies of welfare as a citizens right and at the same time believing in economic self-independence. Thus, probably the psychological conflict produces embarrassment of being on welfare and at the same time being comfortable in voicing their discontentment with their worker's behavior. However, an earlier research study that found an association between clients'
own attitude towards caseworkers and their feeling of stigma concluded that lack of adjustment to welfare status by clients prevents them from having a positive attitude towards their workers and the welfare system in general (Handler and Hollingsworth, 1971). While the explanation provided by these researchers may not be quite applicable to this study, its noteworthy for future research interests. From the previous and current research results one can only speculate the possible influence of the clients own attitude on their assessment of worker's behavior, as much as the influence of worker's behavior on client's attitude towards them and their relationship to client's feeling of stigma. Future investigation in this area can explore the possible relationship among these measures, to confirm or disconfirm these theoretical speculations.

Overall Satisfaction

In light of the previous emphasis on the much debated issue of over reporting of satisfaction with welfare services in general, it was deemed necessary to discuss the results of this study in context of the percentage of clients that are satisfied overall with workers' attitude and behavior. The over reporting of higher satisfaction with welfare services by previous researchers receives only partial support from the results of this study. Part of the clients response had a high positive tenor, similar to other studies (Goodsell, 1980; Edward-Orr, 1983, Katz et al., 1975), and contrary to the belief of authors and qualitative researchers
in the field (Wyers, 1983; Goodwin, 1983; Lipsky, 1981; Pruttas, 1975). However, the results of overall satisfaction and dissatisfaction needs to be discussed within the context of the concept being measured. Definite differences were observed in clients' evaluation of their worker's attitude and behavior. Results of this study shows that while 70 percent of the clients responded positively to worker's attitude, only a little over half of the clients (55.6%) perceived their worker's behavior towards them as being satisfying.

According to the department's Administrative Affairs unit where the data was collected, approximately three to five thousand complaint calls were received from clients every month (Monthly Report On Analysis Of Client-Contacts - CCDHS). While most complaint calls were stated to be related to benefit issues initially, the later part of the complaints were generally related to workers attitude (rudeness, hostility, disrespect). Hence, the 30 percent projected dissatisfaction with workers attitude by clients in this study may be slightly under reported.

Several possible explanations for under reporting and the dissimilar findings between satisfaction with workers' attitude and behavior are presented. The obvious explanation may be that workers are cordial to clients on the one hand and on the other, are less likely to go out of their way to support or help clients,
which involves performing tasks that are beyond eligibility determination. Their work orientation is likely to be influenced by the job definition given to eligibility workers. The role of the ‘eligibility workers’, is generally perceived as clerical function with primary responsibility to determine clients eligibility for grants using the standardized information obtained from the clients. However, the agency under study has written policies which expects workers to interact with clients at different levels beyond eligibility determination to provide other needed services. The extent to which workers performed such tasks were not known prior to this study.

It is possible that abstract measures, and positive wordings of all the items on the worker-attitude scale encouraged more positive responses from clients. And more specific behavioral items with a positive and negative measures minimized the acquiescent of responses. It is the contentions of some experts in field of satisfaction research that responses to abstract measures brings more positive response than specific measures.

A primary theoretical assumption from clients reporting of satisfaction and dissatisfaction rests on workers' discretionary practices within bureaucracies. Hence, the findings to an extent supports the existence of discretion among workers in their dealings with clients. Stated differently, it confirms that bureaucratic organizations such as the Income Maintenance Services does not
always function within the norms of universality and role rigidity. The finding that workers tend to favor some clients over others is indicative of existence of some amount of debureaucratization within the system, which accounts for some clients being more satisfied than others. Participant observation studies of workers in a welfare bureaucracy have acknowledged that actual discretion is practiced by workers substantially, even though formal discretion remain unsanctioned (Lipsky, 1981, 1984; Prottas, 1979).

However, the over reporting of clients satisfaction with workers attitude and behavior can also be understood from the perspective of Hirschman’s (1970), theory on consumers behavior in non-profit organizations. He postulates that consumers who are dissatisfied with services, have three options, they either exit the system, voice their discontentment, or are loyal to the system. Public assistance clients have no exit options as they are dependent on a system which has monopoly over services that are much needed. Therefore, they have only the other two options available to them which are to voice their discontentment or be loyal to the system. It seems possible that clients more frequently tend to be loyal by expressing satisfaction than voicing discontentment or dissatisfaction.

Despite all the explanations provided for understanding clients differential response to workers attitude and behavior, the results of the current research
does confirm that public assistance clients are not overly satisfied with their experience with workers. Further, the findings support that non-white clients seem to be more dissatisfied with their workers than white clients. And clients who felt stigma tended more likely to be dissatisfied with workers’ behavior than workers attitude.

LIMITATIONS/FURTHER RESEARCH/IMPLICATIONS

In reviewing the results more questions have been raised then answered, which is assumed to be the function of any research study. Prior to discussing the implications for theory, social policy and service delivery for local agency, and suggestions for future research in this area, generalizability and limitations of the study will follow.

Limitations

The findings of this study can be generalized to the AFDC and General Assistance client population in the county studied as the randomly selected sample population meets many of the characteristics of the population at large. Also, the large sample size makes the findings of this more reliable. Of the 88 counties in Ohio the other two large counties that have similar client populations are Montgomery and Hamilton. While these counties have fairly similar client population, Cuyahoga county is unique because of its large population and urban
development. These factors together generate problems that are unique to this county, thus the magnitude of clients served by the CC-DHS's income maintenance services may contribute to varying responses from clients. Traditionally, Cuyahoga county has had higher caseloads than other large counties with similar client population. Smaller counties are different in their size and composition of client population, therefore these findings may have less relevancy.

However, the findings have to be taken with some caution as the scales used for defining workers' attitude and behavior were constructed from limited available data. While theoretically and empirically supported, it still has the biases of the researcher in selection of the basic items that form the indicators of the concepts being measured. There are other measures of worker's attitude or behavior that may be more important to clients than the ones conceptualized for this study. The researcher was limited in what information could be added to the scale as the primary focus of the original study had to be kept in mind.

As noted in the development of measures, satisfaction researchers indicate that the effect of independent variables on different satisfaction measures varies. Therefore, the non-findings of the affect of variables such as length of time of welfare, gender of clients, and age cannot be perceived as not being predictors
of satisfaction with worker's interaction. These factors may be correlated with other aspects of the worker's interaction with clients like procedural competency, accessibility, and availability.

The data collected was subjective in nature including only clients' perspective on worker's attitude and behavior, therefore, limited to speculation of what attributes of workers may have influenced the interaction between the workers and clients. Also, interviews were conducted within the agency's various waiting rooms, which may itself have prevented some clients from being comfortable in expressing their views about their worker's attitude and behavior. Regardless of clients eagerness to participate in the study and observed incidents of some unhappy clients who were not selected to be interviewed, their responses if not influenced by the situation could have been determined by other personal characteristics and situational factors, such as, assertive clients, clients knowledge or awareness about their rights, family situation, waiting time for appointment, location etc.

Finally, a more effective way of testing the theory on the extent of debureaucratization would require building additional behavioral and attitudinal measures of encounters, that are perceived to be areas in which workers are more likely to practice discretion.
Suggestions for Further Research

Examination of the interaction between the worker and the client is complex, and aspects of the interaction chosen to be studied may not necessarily be of importance to other researchers who have interest in this area. This research was partially based on secondary data analysis, the researcher had limited control over the type of information that could be collected and the methodology, as the focus of the primary study was different. Based on the findings and methodological limitations, alternative approaches for future investigation in this area are suggested.

The effect of race on satisfaction with workers' attitude and behavior needs further investigation. Though the study did confirm the presence of this association, it was limited to speculating what other possible workers characteristics may have influenced clients' satisfaction with workers' attitude and behavior. Future studies on satisfaction may want to include the intervening effects of worker's characteristics and personal attributes to confirm its impact. Similarly, the weak effect of stigma on satisfaction with only workers behavior and not on workers attitude could be investigated further. Also, the non-effects of certain client characteristics on satisfaction, along with other psychological attributes identified earlier needs confirmation.
The components used to define the measure of workers' attitude was limited and abstract in nature. As discussed earlier, higher expressed satisfaction can be a function of abstract concepts, which could be given consideration when developing future measures of this or similar concepts.

A qualitative approach to constructing measures of satisfaction would contribute to establishing the expectations of the clients from the workers, making it more symbolically meaningful to the clients. It could then be empirically tested for its reliability and validity.

This study relied on empirically derived data from survey research. As mentioned earlier on, due to different methodological approaches to data collections in evaluation research of public assistance services, opposing conclusions and viewpoints exists. More frequently the empirical research shows higher percentage of welfare clients to be satisfied with the system, whether it be specific aspect of the services or general. This is contrary to observational and open-ended studies with welfare clients which have always reported higher dissatisfaction with the system. Overlooking the many confounding factors that may differentiate these studies, it would be inappropriate to overlook the contribution of either type of investigation in understanding the clients' encounters with public bureaucracies.
To increase the values of the findings of such studies, triangulation of methodology could enhance and validate the findings. The results can be presented to a small group of clients who can comment on the findings and reflect on their own experiences with the system. This process can provide more understanding to the findings. Future research can consider triangulation of the methodology as an option to increase the dependability of the findings, verify methodological differences and validate measures through consensus (Miles and Huberman, 1984).

Inquiry into worker-client interaction is a sensitive subject, especially if the respondent happens to be the beneficiary of basic economic need services. Conducting interviews as traditionally done in the agency where the respondent receives such benefits can influence their responses. Thus, innovative approaches like conducting interviews outside the public welfare building (Goodsell, 1980), may limit some of the anxiety in clients that may influence their response.

**IMPLICATIONS**

From the few key conclusions of this study arise the implications for theory, social policy and service delivery issues.
Theoretical Implications

This study's finding, that the majority of clients evaluate their worker's attitude (i.e. concept of humaneness) towards them, appears not to support the theoretical description of bureaucratic organization to be inherently "inhumane". The results of a few other studies similarly support that at least 68 to 70 percent of the clients have rated their encounters to be humane with public welfare bureaucracies (Katz, 1975; Greenley and Schoenherr, 1981).

According to Mintzberg, (1979), organizations change over time adapting to the environmental influences. For the past 10-15 years advocacy groups and experts in the field of welfare have lobbied extensively for making public assistance programs more humane. In view of such criticism, and public pressure agencies have created changes in the welfare system like providing orientation training to their employees in basic courtesy, and relationships skills with clients.

The other finding that race of the clients' makes a difference in their evaluation of worker's attitude and behavior supports the assumption that discretion exist in public bureaucracy and can explain the absence or presence of satisfaction with encounters with bureaucratic organizations. It seems, therefore, that the traditional view of bureaucracies as being governed by universalistic norms and staff role rigidity is in conflict with the finding of this study. The study supports Katz and
Danet's (1975), view that within bureaucratic organization's official tend to apply discretion in handling customers, favoring some customers over others, thus debureaucratizing the system.

**Social Policy Implications**

One key conclusion of this study raises questions regarding the role of eligibility workers. Current welfare reform polices more so than the past polices imply a much broader definition of the role of eligibility workers, than the stated and perceived function of the workers (Reworking Welfare, 1988; Benton, 1983). With the passing of Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (OBRA), and the Family Support Act of 1988, states have been required to implement a wide range of services to help reduce recipients welfare dependency. The presumed job description of the eligibility workers under the welfare reform policy is that of a caseworker prior to the separation of the Income Maintenance from Social Services. The expanded role of the eligibility workers include coordinating several economic and social services functions for clients, in addition to determining eligibility and case maintenance. However, after the separation of the income maintenance services from the social services, the function of the eligibility workers has primarily been perceived as that of a clerk or eligibility technician (Hoshin, 1972), whose basic responsibility is seen as determination of eligibility grants. Although, the accuracy of this definition has not been
substantiated (Hagen, 1987), the existence of discrepancy between administrative expectations and the workers perceptions of their role has been observed (Wyers, 1983). One of authors noted that:

"Defining the role of the income maintenance workers is complicated by several issues that have not been adequately addressed. Perhaps the most basic difficulty is the existing lack of specificity about the behavior appropriate to the role of income maintenance workers" (Wyers, 1983:261).

This research demonstrates that workers are less likely to perform tasks beyond their eligibility determination roles. Nearly half the public assistance clients interviewed were in agreement that their workers do not perform tasks that are beyond eligibility determination which includes being receptive to having a relationship with the clients.

Welfare reform demonstration projects (which are primarily independent programs) have reported that the key to helping recipients move into jobs and keep them off welfare successfully has been accomplished through a planned case management process, and a close working relationship between the workers and clients (Munna, 1989; Pillsbury, 1989). While these programs have primarily been small and independent, the job activities of the case workers in these programs have essentially been that of a social worker and eligibility worker. In essence, the ultimate link to implementing any strategies to address the problem of welfare dependency lies in the interaction between the workers and the
recipients. Then, serious consideration should be given to the current role of the eligibility workers by the policy makers and professionals in the field. The focus should probably be on strengthening the skills of eligibility workers through training, re-training and educational programs that formally re-define their roles from a clerical to a service worker. Also consideration should be given to setting minimal credential standards for workers, such as having a Bachelors in Social Work and/or being a Licensed Social Worker. The other option could be to merge both social services and income maintenance services, and re-train the workers. It is possible that lack of clarity in current functions of the eligibility workers may be one of the barriers to helping clients achieve independence from welfare. In short, creating separate units within income maintenance services or setting up independent programs to address ‘workfare’ may not be as cost-effective, if the caseworkers manning these projects are in essence replicating the jobs of eligibility workers and social workers.

If the goal is to provide comprehensive services to clients that are also cost-effective and provide continuity of services, then the current system may need to be reorganized. The current system promotes replication of client information and ‘agency hopping’ among clients who tend to get lost in the transitions (Rofuth, 1987).
Implication for local Agency

The two conclusions that have implications for administrative policies and service delivery for the agency were: one, effect of race on satisfaction with workers' attitude and behavior and two, the relatively higher dissatisfaction with the overall workers' behavior than attitude. Suggestions presented are generally and made with a view to increase clients' satisfaction with workers' interactions, and decrease workers discretion in dealing with clients.

Over the past six years the training for the IM workers has been primarily related to their job performance. The training curriculum have indirectly addressed the issue of equality of treatment of clients, and objectivity on the job. There has been no specific training provided in the areas of myths about welfare clients, sensitivity to clients dependency on welfare and creating awareness of discrimination or discrete behavior towards clients. Providing training in these areas using creative training techniques that allows for follow-up and close monitoring of the workers interaction with clients may prove beneficial.

Another area that will enhance the workers interaction with clients is to increase the workers competency through education. The agency can develop policies for recruitment and educational support. The workers in the system are the least
qualified, as a result of the HB 155 in 1976. The bill favored 6th grade education for eligibility workers which brought an influx of workers with low level of education, and most of them are still in the system. Educational incentives to workers could increase their competency level and they may be able to deliver a higher level of services to clients. The Administrative Affairs unit which handles all the clients' complaints could continue to play an important role, by mediating and monitoring the interactions between agency and the clients. Current services of this unit is limited to handling clients' complaints over the phone, its services could be expanded to include an empowerment program for the clients and a internal complaint monitoring system for the agency. Empowerment services for clients could include face-to-face periodic meeting with clients to receive complaints and provide information such as availability of resources, gaps in services, new policies, and clarify issues. The unit could venture into collaborative efforts with the local Welfare Rights Organization to educate clients of their rights and responsibilities. As a monitoring system for the agency, the unit could create a feedback system to various unit supervisors. Information shared on type of complaints, and identification of workers with most frequent complaints could help develop internal policies to handle complaints, disciplinary actions, and monitor complaints. The agency could also develop policy on expectations of workers' role to clarify their job responsibilities.


---------(1975). Evaluation of an Outpatient Pediatric Practice through the use of Consumer Questionnaire. Medical Care, 13, 250-255.

---------. (1974). Consumer Assessments of the Quality of Medical Care. Medical Care, 12, 328-337.


Wyers, N.L. (1983)


APPENDIX A: TABLES
Table 6: Respondents Length Of Time on Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length Of Time Welfare</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 MONTHS</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11 MONTHS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2.9 YRS.</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4.9 YRS.</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6.9 YRS.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8.9 YRS.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10.9 YRS.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 YEARS</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid Cases 713  Missing Cases 1
Table 7: Composite scores on clients feeling of embarrassment or stigma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not embarrassed</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat embarrassed</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly embarrassed</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>714</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 5.961  Median 6.000  Mode 4.000  
Std. Dev 1.9  Skewness .271
TABLE 8: Rotated Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VS25</td>
<td>.83935</td>
<td>.25273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS27</td>
<td>.84428</td>
<td>.31047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS26</td>
<td>.77139</td>
<td>.39439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS19</td>
<td>.71080</td>
<td>.44060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS37</td>
<td>.39602</td>
<td>.69709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS18</td>
<td>.42126</td>
<td>.68077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS38</td>
<td>.24813</td>
<td>.60473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS24</td>
<td>.31273</td>
<td>.55362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS13</td>
<td>.51339</td>
<td>.52590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS34</td>
<td>.09635</td>
<td>.40080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

vs13 worker returns calls  
vs18 wrk satis. answers to questions  
vs19 wrk treats clients fairly  
vs24 easy access to worker  
vs25 wrk treats client with respect  
vs26 wrk listens carefully  
vs27 wrk is polite  
vs37 worker very helpful  
vs38 wrk lets client know other ser  
vs34 talks with client non-financial issues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>VS19</th>
<th>VS25</th>
<th>VS26</th>
<th>VS27</th>
<th>TSCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vs19 wrk treats client fairly</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.7191</td>
<td>0.6668</td>
<td>0.6963</td>
<td>.8727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs25 treats client wth respect</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.7246</td>
<td>0.7855</td>
<td>0.6744</td>
<td>.9094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs26 wrk listens carefully</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.8697</td>
<td>0.8883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs27 wrk is polite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10: TOTAL SCORE FOR WORKER-ATTITUDE SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely dissatisfied</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**  
714  
100.0

Missing cases = 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>VS13</th>
<th>VS18</th>
<th>VS24</th>
<th>VS37</th>
<th>VS38</th>
<th>VS34</th>
<th>TScore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vs13 wrkr returns calls</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs18 satis. answers to quests</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.5789</td>
<td>0.4499</td>
<td>0.5247</td>
<td>0.4272</td>
<td>0.3451</td>
<td>.7564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs24 wrkr accessible to clnt</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5628</td>
<td>0.6470</td>
<td>0.4936</td>
<td>0.2511</td>
<td>.8044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs37 worker very helpful</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5440</td>
<td>0.3787</td>
<td>0.1760</td>
<td>.7086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs38 refer cliet to other sers</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3093</td>
<td>0.3093</td>
<td>.8034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs34 discuss non-finan issues</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.5633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13: TOTAL SCORE FOR WORKER-BEHAVIOR SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely dissatisfied</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Satisfied</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS: 714 100.0

Missing cases = 1
TABLE 14: Inter-correlation among Worker-Attitude, Client demographics and attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 WORKER-A</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>-0.254</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 STIGMA</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 LOTW</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 EDUC</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 AGE</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 RACE</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 SEX</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations of .06 or greater are significant at p < .05 (N = 715)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 WORKER-B</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.268</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 STIGMA</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 LOTW</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 EDUC</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 AGE</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 RACE</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 SEX</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations of .06 or greater are significant at p < .05 (N = 715)
TABLE 18: Gender, Race/Ethnic Background of Eligibility Workers in CCDHS-IM*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workers race/ethnic background</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (N)</td>
<td>Female (N)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Caucasian</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. African-American</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. American Indian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE
QUESTIONNAIRE

I. WORKER-CLIENT INTERACTION

The following 10 items relate to clients' evaluation of their relationship with workers

1) I can usually count on my worker to return my call.
2) My worker usually gives me satisfactory answers to my questions.
3) I talk to my worker about things (family problems, children, job) other than matters concerning my benefits.
4) My worker often lets me know of services that I can receive elsewhere.
5) Most of the time my worker is very helpful.
6) My worker often lets me know of services that I can receive elsewhere.
7) My worker treats me fairly.
8) My worker treats me with respect.
9) My worker listens to me carefully.
10) Most of the time my worker is polite to me.

II. STIGMA

The following two items were used to measure clients' feeling of embarrassment or stigma

1) I am not ashamed to tell others that I am on welfare.
2) I don't mind my friends seeing me at the welfare agency.

FOLLOWING RESPONSE CATEGORIES WERE USED FOR THE ABOVE SCALE ITEMS:

1 STRONGLY DISAGREE
2 DISAGREE
3 UNDECIDED
4 AGREE
5 STRONGLY AGREE
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III. LENGTH OF TIME ON WELFARE

How Long have you been receiving this assistance?

Years/ month

Have you received assistance in this county regularly since the above date?

yes/no (break in service).

IV. DEMOGRAPHICS

1. How old are you? _______ Years

2. What is the highest level of school you have completed?
   (Circle one #)
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

   12  high school graduate       13  some college
   14  college graduate          15  some graduate work
   16  post graduate