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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Within the past decade there has been an expansion of Departments in the area of Speech, Language, and Hearing Therapy in both rural and urban areas within the public school setting in the State of Ohio. The author has had the privilege of serving as a supervisor for the past decade for the second largest Department of Speech, Language, and Hearing Therapy in the State.

On numerous occasions, questions concerning the areas of Management, Organizational Setting, Job Climate, and Job Performance have been presented to the author. The majority of the questions have been unanswerable due to the limited amount of research which has been done in these areas within the field of speech, language, and hearing therapy. For this reason, the author chose to conduct a study on the relationships among Personal Characteristics, Organizational Setting, Perceived Job Climate, and Self Estimate of Job Performance and Rewards of public school speech, language, and hearing clinicians.
Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to investigate and determine the interactions among the four areas described above. The major question was, therefore,

What are the relationships among (a) personal characteristics, (b) organizational setting, (c) perceived job climate, and (d) self-rated performance and rewards of public school speech, language, and hearing clinicians?

This major problem or question can in turn be viewed as a series of sub-questions:

1. What are the relationships between (a) Personal Characteristics and (b) Organizational Setting? The varying age, sex, training, experience, and professional attitudes of the clinicians could result in their applying for, being accepted by, or assigned to school systems of varying sizes and locales. The size and locale of the system may in turn be related to types of policies, assignments, and work loads.

2. What are the relationships between (a) Personal Characteristics and (c) Perceived Job Climate? The age, sex, education, experience, and attitudes of the clinicians could influence the focus of their attention upon various aspects of the job climate. Younger inexperienced workers might for example be more likely to notice job definition and supervisory warmth or the lack of it. Older workers might be more interested in the clarity of responsibility
delegation and less aware of job structuring or of supervisory warmth and reward.

3. What are the relationships between (a) Personal Characteristics and (d) Self Evaluation of Performance and Rewards? Clinicians of varying age, sex, education, training, and professional attitudes could be differently motivated to work, be differently effective in achieving their goals, and consequently receive varying amounts of appreciation. They would also likely vary in the overall amount of satisfaction received and in the amount of satisfaction gained from various sources.

4. What are the relationships between (b) Organizational Setting and (c) Perceived Job Climate? The size and locale of the system in which the clinician worked, the policies controlling his activities, and the type of arrangement and amount of work load would surely lead to both actual and perceived differences in job climate. Indeed, it is the clinician's perceptions of the organizational setting and of his co-workers and supervisors which constitute job climate. One would expect these two areas, therefore, to be closely related.

5. What are the relationships between (b) Organizational Setting and (d) Self-Rated Performance and Rewards? Work setting, administrative policies, and work assignment, including work load, could certainly affect workers' motivation and success and the opportunity to receive appreciation.
This, in turn, could affect the amount and nature of satisfaction received from the job.

6. What are the relationships between (c) Perceived Job Climate and (d) Self-Rated Performance or Reward? If the proponents of studying job climate are correct, a warm rewarding atmosphere, good job definition, proper delegation of authority, and the absence of pressure and constraints should lead to increased motivation and consequently to increased performance. Increased amount and effectiveness of performance would in turn lead to greater appreciation and satisfaction.

While relationships, such as those suggested above, seem quite possible and logical they remain to be demonstrated. This study was an attempt to ascertain these relationships for public school speech, language, and hearing clinicians in the State of Ohio in 1975.

Definitions

Personal Characteristics. Clinicians differ with respect to sex, age, previous training, and experience. They also differ in their professional outlooks and their attitude toward work and energy expenditure.

Organizational Setting. Clinicians and supervisors work in school systems which vary in size (number of pupils, number of schools, number of clinicians), and locale (inner
city, urban, suburban, rural; and in socio-economic levels). Within these different settings they report to different levels of administration. Schools also vary in the policies regarding professional leave, types of meetings held, and assignment policies. The clinicians' work loads assigned vary in terms of number of schools, pupil load, and the relative amount of individual therapy.

**Perceived Job Climate.** The intent of administrative policies, the supervisory style of the superiors (consideration, structuring, democratic vs. autocratic), and varying reward systems, etc., are areas which describe job climate. The clinicians also interact with their colleagues, teachers, students, parents, and community agencies and facilities. This working climate is perceived differently by different clinicians. Some are more aware of certain aspects than are others. While some perceive the climate as warm and helpful others may view it as cold and restrictive, even when working in the same system. These perceptions, right or wrong, still influence the attitudes, motivation, and satisfaction derived by the clinicians.

**Self-rated Performance and Rewards.** Clinicians receive many types of rewards in addition to their salary, which incidentally they may view as high or low, as fair or disagreeable. In addition to praise and criticism of the supervisor, they enjoy the satisfaction which they have in feeling that they have done a good job, the satisfaction of
working with able and friendly colleagues, the satisfaction derived from their supervisors and administrators, etc. In addition, they are rewarded by the appreciation expressed by individuals (pupils, teachers, parents, administrators) and by the community (doctors, community agencies, etc.). As in the case of climate, different clinicians perceive these rewards differently—what some enjoy others scorn. The same actual rewards may be satisfactory to some and unsatisfactory to others. Hence, the clinicians' self-evaluation of their performance and satisfaction is an important area for the supervisor to be aware of and to respond to.

Summary of Chapter I

The author chose to conduct a study in order to ascertain what kinds of relationships exist between personal characteristics, organizational setting, perceived job climate, and self-estimate of job performance and rewards of public school speech, language, and hearing clinicians. These four areas were investigated by viewing a series of six subquestions that evolved from the inter-relationships among and between the four areas.
Climate Research

Litwin and Stringer (1968) developed a set of nine a priori scales to measure worker-perceptions of organizational factors and motivational tendencies of various organizations. These perceptions were called organizational climate. The nine a priori scales supposedly measured the following dimensions.

1. Structure - the feeling of constraints versus a lone and informal atmosphere.

2. Responsibility - the feeling of being your own boss and knowing that what you have to do is your job to do without a lot of checking before making decisions.

3. Reward - the feeling of being fairly rewarded for work well done.

4. Risk - the sense of an emptiness on taking calculated risks rather than playing it safe.

5. Warmth - the feeling of general good fellowship.

6. Support - the feeling of helpfulness from both above and below.

7. Standards - the feeling of an emphasis upon personal and group goals.

8. Conflict - the feeling that managers and other workers want to get problems out in the open and welcome hearing different opinions.
9. **Identity** - the feeling that one is a member of a working team.

Following a long series of investigations the authors arrived at several conclusions covering the usefulness of the scales:

a. Climates can be established in relatively short periods of time and remain fairly stable over time.

b. These climates have significant effects upon motivation and on performance and job satisfaction.

c. Seven of the nine scales showed good scale consistency.

d. Several of the scales were highly intercorrelated especially the ones for Warmth, Identity and Support, and Reward.

e. Overlaps in scales were not solved but could probably be corrected by regrouping or collapsing of the scales.

Several authors have attempted to carry out the grouping and collapsing suggested by Litwin and Stringer. Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler, and Weick (1970) conducted an extensive review of existing climate measures, including the Litwin-Stringer scales. On the basis of content analysis they decided that four factors were common to all sets of climate measurement scales:

1. Individual Autonomy,

2. The Degree of Structure Imposed upon the Position,

3. Reward Orientation, and

Meyer (1968) administered the Litwin-Stringer Climate Questionnaire to 300 professional and clerical employees in two General Electric plants and factor analyzed the questionnaire items. Unfortunately he did not report which items fell on which factors or how much variance was explained by each factor, but he did at least define each of six factors which he isolated.

1. **Conformity** - the feeling of being forced to conform to rules, procedures, policies, and practices.

2. **Responsibility** - the feeling of being more responsibility delegated so that one can run his job pretty much in his own way.

3. **Standards** - the feeling of emphasis placed after doing a good job, through challenging goals to improve personal and group performance.

4. **Reward** - the feeling of being fairly rewarded for good work rather than being only punished for bad work.

5. **Organizational Clarity** - the feeling that things are orderly rather than disorderly, confused, or chaotic.

6. **Friendly Team Spirit** - the feeling that management and fellow employees are warm and trusting and that the organization is one to which people identify and are proud to belong.

Sims and LaFollette (1975) also factor analyzed the Litwin-Stringer items. Their study was based upon 997 questionnaires administered to workers at a midwestern medical complex. The subprogram FACTOR from the Statistical Package for Social Sciences series was used to carry out the analysis. They ran 18 separate analyses using both
orthogonal and oblique rotations with from two to ten factors. They reported only a six-factor orthogonal rotation. They identified the following six factors:

1. **General affect-tone toward People** - identifies the way in which the respondent views his coworkers and other people within the organization (24.2% of variance accounted for).

2. **General affect-tone toward Management-Organization** - identifies the way in which the respondent viewed management - the "they" that persons blame things on in an organization (8.1% of variance accounted for).

3. **Policy on Promotional Clarity** - identifies the organization policies, structures, and job definition which help to make clear the policy and opportunity for promotion and advancement (3.7% of variance accounted for).

4. **Job Pressure and Standards** - identifies the feeling of pressure and high job standards imposed by management (3.2% of variance accounted for).

5. **Openness of Upward Communication** - ideal for the willingness of management to accept and act upon employees ideas and career counseling of employees by management (2.7% of variance accounted for).

6. **Risk in Decision Making** - identifies the degree to which management is willing to risk making decisions.

In addition the authors reported the reliabilities of the original nine Litwin-Stringer scales as ranging from .12 to .75 with four of the scales having doubtful reliability, risk (.12), conflict (.21), responsibility (.34), and standards (.37). The six new scales identified above, on the other hand, had reliabilities ranging from .58 to .92 for five of the new scales with only Risk in Decision
Making being unsatisfactory (.45).

The Relationship of Personal Characteristics
to Perceived Job Climate

That perception of job climate would vary depending upon the perceiver, seems quite evident. Several studies have attempted to verify the relationship.

1. Hodgkinson (1970) studied teachers and administrators from 40 elementary schools in the Vancouver area using the Halpin Job Climate Scale and the Scott Value Scales. His conclusions were mixed.
   a. Value systems indicating inner versus outer directions were unrelated to perception of the climate as "open" or "closed".
   b. Age, sex, and experience were partially predictive of value systems for teachers but not for administrators.
   c. Security, and hence less concern with climate, increases with length of time on a job or better performance in a role.

2. Friedlander and Margulies (1969) studying employees of Non-Linear Systems, Inc. in California found that work values held by the individual moderated both perceived job climate and job performance.

3. Kinnaird (1973) in a study of 165 school psychologists in Ohio found the school psychologists who were performing at a high level of their job and with a high level of job activity were relatively unaware of job climate.

The Relationship of Job Setting to
Perceived Job Climate

It also seems self-evident that job setting should influence the perception of job climate. Indeed the perceived job climate is the perception of the actual setting
of the job. Again several studies have been attempted to verify this relationship.

1. Litwin-Stringer (1968) compared 350 employees of two General Electric plants. In Plant A workers were assigned great individual responsibility while in Plant B the workers were subjected to much structuring and pressure. The scores on the Climate scales were considerably higher in Plant A.

2. Porter and Stone (1973) in a study of 576 employees of a western telephone company found that job title was highly related to work perceptions and attitudes.

3. Johnson and Laverne (1969) studying two samples of innovative and non-innovative school systems found that:

   a. Both teachers and administrators view climate as closed in non-innovative schools; and
   
   b. Highly innovative schools spent more money per child and had a younger staff.

4. Dieterly and Schneider (1972) reported that different environments produce different perceptions of power and climate.

5. Kinniard (1973) found that psychologists isolated in a few schools and working at a low organizational level in an inner city metropolitan setting see organizational climate as consisting entirely of structure and standards.

The Relationship of Job Climate to Job Performance and Satisfaction

The original intent of studying job climate was the belief that . . . perceptions would influence the motivation and behavior of the perceivers. (Litwin and Stringer, 1968 p. 1) The following researchers tend to support this attitude.
1. Ames et al. (1972) found that the more the climate is perceived as rewarding the more the effort expended by the group members.

2. Koplyay and Mathis (1967) found for 299 elementary school teachers that:
   a. an "autonomous" climate leads to greater task orientation and less concern with administrators' concerns, and
   b. an "open" as opposed to "closed" climate is associated with high morale.

3. Johnson and Laverne (1969) found that:
   a. an "open" climate leads to an energetic lively organization which is moving toward the goals, and
   b. a "closed" climate leads to an organization with a high degree of apathy.

4. Pritchard and Karasick (1973) found the climate was almost always related to individual job satisfaction while job performance was less likely to be related.

5. Friedlander and Margulies (1969) found that:
   a. organizational climate is a significant determinant for individual satisfaction, and
   b. the degree of impact of climate upon satisfaction varies with the type of climate and type of satisfaction.

6. Dieterly and Schneider (1972) found that a climate perceived as high on consideration tends to cause people to consider themselves as high on all the power dimensions.

7. Kinniard (1973) found that:
   a. persons who see the climate as warm, supportive, and rewarding gain job satisfaction from helping others, and
b. people keenly aware of all possible facets of job climates also see their jobs as providing a wide variety of satisfactions.

**Summary of Chapter II**

The Review of Literature related to studies in which researchers dealt with the relationships between personal characteristics, job climate, job setting, and job performance in the areas of industrial/organizational psychology and administrative education.

Litwin and Stringer (1968) developed a set of a prior scales which measured perceptions of organizational climate. Numerous studies have been conducted, using the Litwin-Stringer scales in an attempt to carry out the grouping and collapsing suggested by Litwin and Stringer. Campbell et al., decided that four factors were common to all sets of climate measurement scales, and Meyers (1968) was able to isolate six factors; and Sims and LaFollette (1975), six factors. There was some communality among the factors within all of the studies.

Studies of the relationships between the four different areas show there is less concern with climate as the length of time increases on a job. Job setting shows a definite influence on the perception of job climate; for example, individuals view climate as closed in non-innovative schools and psychologists in a large inner-city setting see climate as consisting of structure and
standards. Job climate influences the motivation and behavior of the perceiver; for example, climate is almost always related to satisfaction, while job performance is less likely to be related.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The design and procedures of the study are presented in this chapter which is divided into the following sections: (1) instrumentation and data collection, (2) preliminary scale analysis, (3) classification of variables, (4) the factor analysis, and (5) further combination of variables.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

A questionnaire was compiled and distributed to 675 public school speech, language, and hearing clinicians and supervisors in Ohio. The majority of the questionnaires were distributed by 25 supervisors. A letter of explanation, a questionnaire, and a self-addressed envelope were enclosed within a large envelope. The letter of explanation (see Appendix A) concerning the project and instructions for filling out the questionnaire.

The 11-page questionnaire (see Appendix A) was constituted as follows:

a. Pages 1, 2, and 3 consisted of 50 items covering nine Job Climate areas after Litwin and Stringer (1968) and four items from a work-ethic scale developed by Blood
(1967). These items were to be responded to on a 7-point scale of agreement or disagreement.

b. Pages 4 and 5 consisted of 12 short climate descriptions adapted from Pritchard and Karasick (1973).

c. Page 6 consisted of 10 scales meaning the following:

1. Overall job satisfaction
2. Amount of effort expended
3. Self-rating of overall job performance
4. Self-ratings in seven specific areas.

d. Page 7 contained 24 items describing job behavior.

   Items 1-9 covered nine areas of work to be checked once if they constituted over 10% of the clinicians' time and twice if they constituted over 25% of the clinicians' time. These items measured the degree to which concentration of work load in specific areas might be considered as restricting the range and variety of activities.

   Items 10-18 asked the clinicians to indicate the amount of appreciation received (on a 7-point scale) from each of the above nine areas.

   Items 19-24 covered five areas of work (three with individuals and two with organizations) and asked the clinician to rate them in terms of amount of service rendered (time spent on each from 1=none to 7=greatest amount of time).

e. Page 8 consisted of 17 Job-Satisfaction items covering four areas of Challenge, Recognition, Personal Relations, and Administration or Supervision adapted from Friedlander (1963). Response was in terms of 1=extremely dissatisfied to 5=extremely satisfied.

f. Pages 9-11 consisted of 24 Biographic and Demographic questions adapted from the Ohio School
The Psychologists Association Accountability Study (1972). The items measure:

1. Sex (male = 1, female = 2)
2. Age (coded as 20-29 = 1, 30 or over = 2)
3. Years experience coded as
   - 1-3 = 1
   - 4-6 = 2
   - 7-9 = 3
   - 10 or over = 4
4. Highest Degree, coded as
   - B.A. or B.S. = 1
   - Higher degree = 2
5. Most recent course, coded as
   - Before 1966 = 1
   - 1966-70 = 2
   - Since 1970 = 3
6. Attended a recent workshop (No=1, Yes=2)
7. Professional affiliations, coded as
   - Regional and State = 1
   - National = 2
8. Interested in Becoming a Supervisor? (No = 1, Yes = 2)
9. Rank of Immediate Boss, coded as
   - Chairman = 1
   - Supervisor = 2
   - Director = 3
   - Assistant Superintendent or Superintendent = 4
10. Schools assigned for at least one year? (No = 1, Yes = 2)
11. Assignments to schools changed yearly? (Yes = 1, No = 2)
12. Type of Staff Meetings held, coded as
    - For information only = 1
    - Other professional reasons = 2
13. Number of Elementary Schools served each year?
14. Number of Junior High Schools served each year?
15. Number of Senior High Schools served each year? 13-15 were coded as
   0 = 1
   1-5 = 2
   5-14 = 3
   15-19 = 4
   20 or over = 5
16. Type of Scheduling? coded as
    Traditional = 1
    Combination = 2
    Intensive = 3
17. Average Case Load, coded as
    0-40 = 1
    41-60 = 2
    61-80 = 3
    80-100 = 4
    over 100 = 5
18. Do majority of children receive individual therapy
    No = 1
    Yes = 2
19. Days officially given leave for professional meetings? Coded as
    No policy = 0
    1 day = 1
    2 days = 2
    3-5 days = 3
    6-8 days = 4
    unlimited = 5
20. Type of school system? Coded as
    City = 1
    Exempted village = 2
    County = 3
    Multi-district = 4
21. Size of School System, coded as
    under 1,000 = 1
    1,000-5,000 = 2
    6,000-21,000 = 3
    21,000-25,000 = 4
50,000-99,000 = 5
100,000 or over = 6

22. Number of Full Time Clinicians in System?
   Coded as
   1 = 1
   2-5 = 2
   6-12 = 3
   13-24 = 4
   25 or over = 5

23. Type of School District, coded as
   Rural, Rural Suburban, Suburban = 0
   Urban, Inner City-Urban, Inner City = 1

24. Socio-economic level of students and
    community?
    lower = 1
    lower-middle = 2
    middle = 3
    upper-middle = 4
    upper = 5

All items were coded as described above, punched upon
IBM cards, and verified.

Scale Analysis and Scoring

Each group of items representing a sub-area of the
Litwin-Stringer Job Climate, Friedlander Job Satisfaction,
and the Work Ethic Scale was analyzed to see if it did
indeed represent a reliable scale. This analysis was
carried out on a program called Tescan programmed by Pro-
fessor Wherry and available through the Behavioral
Science Laboratory. The program computes the mean, standard
deviation, and Kuder-Richardson Reliability (No. 8) for each
scale and in addition provide the mean, standard deviation,
and item-subtest correlation coefficient for each item
assigned to that scale. Combinations of other items were treated as possible scales using the same procedures.

These trial scales were selected as the first 21 variables to be analyzed further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Variable</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Reward</th>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Warmth</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Responsibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reward</strong></td>
<td><strong>Risk</strong></td>
<td><strong>Warmth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>Standards</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conflict</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Items: 1,10,19,28,37,44,48,50*</td>
<td>Items: 2,11,20,29,38,45,49</td>
<td>Items: 3,12,21,30,39,46</td>
<td>Items: 4,13,22,31,40</td>
<td>Items: 5,14,23,32,41</td>
<td>Items: 6,15,24,33,42</td>
<td>Items: 7,16,25,34,43,47</td>
<td>Items: 8,17,26,35</td>
<td>Items: 9,18,27,36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics indicate item that scale was reversed (eg. 1 equals 7, 2 equals 6, etc.) in scoring.*
Number of Variable

10 Protestant Ethic
Items: 51, 52, 53, 54
Page in Questionnaire: 3

11 Job Performance
Items: 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76
Page in Questionnaire: 6

12 Restrictive Block Assignments: Individual
Items: 1, 2, 3, 4
Page in Questionnaire: 7

13 Restrictive Block Assignments: Agencies
Items: 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
Page in Questionnaire: 7

14 Appreciation Received Individuals
Items: 10, 11, 12, 18
Page in Questionnaire: 7

15 Appreciation Received Agencies
Items: 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
Page in Questionnaire: 7

16 Services Rendered: Individuals
Items: 19, 20, 21
Page in Questionnaire: 7

17 Services Rendered: Agencies
Items: 22, 23, 24
Page in Questionnaire: 7

18 Satisfaction: Job Challenge
Items: 25, 27, 28, 30, 41
Page in Questionnaire: 8

19 Satisfaction: Recognition Received
Items: 26, 30, 36, 39
Page in Questionnaire: 8

20 Satisfaction: Personal Relations
Items: 29, 34, 35, 37
Page in Questionnaire: 8

21 Satisfaction: Administration-Supervision
Items: 31, 32, 33, 40
Page in Questionnaire: 8
The remaining variables from the questionnaire were then renumbered as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Page in Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Expectation of Devotion</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Conflict-Competition</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Friendly Social Atmosphere</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Rewards based upon Performance</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Status Differentiation</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Constraints</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Flexibility and Innovation</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Knowledge of Results</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Delegation of Responsibility</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Job Standards</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Page in Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Organizational Clarity</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Satisfaction, Overall</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Effort Expended</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Female (vs. Male)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Higher Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Most Recent Course</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Attendance Non-Credit Workshop</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Professional Membership</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Level of Aspiration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Variable</td>
<td>Reporting Level (Rank, immediate supervisor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Item: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page in Questionnaire: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Specific Schools for the Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item: 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page in Questionnaire: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Change Schools each year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item: 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page in Questionnaire: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Professional Type Staff Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item: 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page in Questionnaire: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>School Load: Elementary Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item: 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page in Questionnaire: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>School Load: Junior High Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item: 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page in Questionnaire: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>School Load: Senior High Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item: 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page in Questionnaire: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Traditional or Intensive Assignment Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item: 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page in Questionnaire: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Average Case Load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item: 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page in Questionnaire: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Majority of Children Receive Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item: 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page in Questionnaire: 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Professional Days Off (by Policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item: 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page in Questionnaire: 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>City or Multi-District or County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item: 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page in Questionnaire: 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Variable

56  Size of School System
    Item: 22
    Page in Questionnaire: 11

57  Number of Full Time Clinicians
    Item: 23
    Page in Questionnaire: 11

58  Inner City (Urban) vs. Suburban (Rural)
    Item: 24
    Page in Questionnaire: 11

59  Socio-Economic Level of Community Served
    Item: 25
    Page in Questionnaire: 11

Classification of Variables

For the purpose of answering the questions stated earlier, the 59 variables were classified into four areas as follows:

A. Personal Characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Higher Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Most Recent Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Attendance at Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Professional Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Level of Aspiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Protestant Ethic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Effort Expended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Job Setting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Reporting Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Specific Schools for Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Change Schools each Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Professional Type Staff Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>School Load: Elementary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>School Load: Junior High Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>School Load: Senior High Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Traditional vs. Intensive Assignment Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Average Case Load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Majority of Children in Individual Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Professional Days Off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>City vs. Multi-District County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Size of School System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Number of Full Time Clinicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Inner City (Urban) vs. Suburban (Rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Socio-Economic Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Perceived Job Climate Provided:

1. Structure  
2. Responsibility  
3. Reward  
4. Responsibility  
5. Warmth  
6. Effort  
7. Standards  
8. Conflict  
9. Identity  
22. Expectation of Devotion  
23. Conflict Competition  
24. Friendly Social Atmosphere  
25. Rewards based upon Performance  
26. Pressures  
27. Status Differentiation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Flexibility and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Knowledge of Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Delegation of Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Job Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Organizational Clarity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Perceived Job Rewards:

| 11       | Job Performance                           |
| 14       | Appreciation Received: Individual        |
| 15       | Appreciation Received: Agencies          |
| 16       | Services Rendered: Individual            |
| 17       | Services Rendered: Agencies              |
| 18       | Satisfaction: Job Challenge              |
| 19       | Satisfaction: Recognition Reward         |
| 20       | Satisfaction: Personal Relations         |
| 21       | Satisfaction: Administration-Supervision |
| 34       | Satisfaction: Overall                    |

The Factor Analysis

Since the purpose of the study was to find which items from the four major areas tended to cluster, it seemed desirable to intercorrelate responses and submit the table of intercorrelations to a factor analysis. Such an analysis scans the intercorrelation table and isolates independent groupings of high positively and/or negatively correlated variables. Several studies (Hodgkinson, Sims and LaFollette, and Kinnaird) using this technique were reported in the review of related literature.
The 59 variables were intercorrelated and subjected to a factor analysis using the Wherry Hierarchical Program on the IBM 165 computer. The program used principal factor analysis, stopped extraction of factors on the basis of largest residual or size of eigen value, then used minimum residual analysis to correct communality estimates. The factors were submitted to varimax rotation and a hierarchical rotation was attempted.

Further Variable Combination

Following the factor analysis, the variables were examined for possible combinations. Wherever a similar pattern of loadings occurred across a number of similar items, the items were combined and assigned their average factor loading in order to simplify the discussion. It was expected that certain such groups would occur among the Job–Climate variables although other combinations could occur as well.

Summary

A questionnaire was distributed to 675 Public School Speech, Language, and Hearing Clinicians in urban and rural areas in Ohio. The responses to items from the questionnaire were punched on IBM cards and verified. Each group of items (Job Climate, Job Setting, and Work Ethic) were analyzed for reliability using the program Tescan which
computes the mean, standard deviation, and Kuder-Richardson Reliability (No. 8) for each scale. Other combinations of items were submitted to the same procedure. The original 59 variables were classified into four areas (A) Personal Characteristics, (B) Job Setting, (C) Perceived Job Climate, and (D) Perceived Job Rewards and were intercorrelated by a factor analysis using the Wherry Hierarchical Program. The variables were then examined for further combinations in order to simplify the discussion.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The sample consisted of 675 questionnaires which were distributed to clinicians. Four hundred were returned, but 46 had to be discarded because of incomplete responses. This left 354 completed questionnaires (52%) for analysis.

Reliabilities of the 21 Proposed Scales

The 21 provisional scales mentioned in Chapter II were submitted to computer program Tescan for analysis. All scales had satisfactory reliabilities (Kuder-Richardson No. 8). The reliabilities are shown in Table 1.

Discussion

The nine Litwin-Stringer scales in the study were obviously more reliable for the present sample of speech, language, and hearing clinicians than they were for the medical employees studied by Sims and LaFollette (1975), especially the reliabilities for the four scales found to be deficient in that study: Risk (from .12 to .69), Conflict (from .21 to .61), Responsibility (from .34 to .56),
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE NO.</th>
<th>RELIABILITY*</th>
<th>SCALE NO.</th>
<th>RELIABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All significant at the 1% level of confidence.
and Standards (from .37 to .57). Of the remaining scales only Structure showed a decrease rather than an increase in reliability in this comparison (from .79 to .53).

The reliabilities of the other 12 scales were also satisfactory, ranging from .72 to .88 with two-thirds of them .80 or higher.

The Factor Analysis

The factor analysis yielded eight factors. The residual table (unexplained portions of correlations) is shown in Table 2.

This table indicates that some remaining correlations were in the ± .15 range. This would indicate that factor loadings of .20 or greater should be interpretable and that loadings of .15 or greater would usually be meaningful. These standards will be used in discussing the results.

The attempt to find hierarchical (higher order) factors proved unsuccessful; hence the original varimax factors were used for the analysis. The total factor structure is reported in Appendix B.

Further Scale Combinations

Job Climate Clusters

As expected on the basis of studies reported in the review of the literature, the 21 variables representing Job Climate fell into well-defined clusters. Each cluster was assigned a new variable number and name and assigned the
TABLE 2
RESIDUAL DISTRIBUTION LOWER LIMIT FREQUENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR LOADING RANGE</th>
<th>DISTRIBUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.149 and greater</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.122 to 0.148</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.095 to 0.121</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.068 to 0.094</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.041 to 0.067</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.014 to 0.040</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.013 to +0.013</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.040 to -0.014</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.067 to -0.041</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.094 to -0.068</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.121 to -0.095</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.148 to -0.132</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.149 or less</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
average loading of the old terms constituting that group. There were five of these Job Climate Factors (see Table 3).

**Discussion of the Climate Clusters**

The five climate dimensions isolated agree very well with those proposed by Campbell et al. (1970), Meyer (1968), and Sims and LaFollette (1975).

**Variable 60. Job Climate: Pressure** was based upon the combination of three short climate description scales adopted from Pritchard and Karasick (1973) encompassing Pressure, Constraints, and Expectation of Devotion. These factors clearly agree with Myer's (1968) Consistency Conformity, the Sims-LaFollette (1975) factor of Job Pressure and Standards. It is less clearly allied to any of the Campbell et al. (1970) factors but could probably be subsumed under the factor Degree of Structure. It was identified by a very large negative loadings for only Factor I in this study.

**Variable 61. Job Climate: Competition** was based upon a combination of two Pritchard-Karasick (1973) about climate description scales called conflict and competition on status differentiation. It was identified from high negative loadings on Factor I and VIII in our study. This was a rather small cluster. This cluster does not seem to agree with prior factorizations. It is probably a spin-off from the Pressure factor isolated above.
### TABLE 3

**NEW JOB CLIMATE VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW VARIABLE</th>
<th>OLD VARIABLES</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>(22-26-28)</td>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>(23-27)</td>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>(2-4-8-31-29)</td>
<td>Delegation of Responsibility</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>(1-7-32)</td>
<td>Job Structuring</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>(3-5-6-9-24-25-30-33)</td>
<td>Warmth-Reward</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variable 63. Job Climate: Job Structuring was defined by a combination of two Litwin-Stringer scales (Structure and Standards) and the Pritchard-Karasick (1973) scale of Job Standards. It clearly can be identified with the Campbell et al. (1970) factor of Degree of Structure imposed upon the Position and the Meyer's (1968) factor of Standards, and to overlap with the Sims-LaFollette (1975) factor of Job Pressure Standards.

Variable 64. Job Climate: Warmth-Reward combined the four Litwin-Stringer scales of Reward, Warmth, Support, and Identify and the Pritchard-Karasick scales of Friendly, Social Atmosphere, Rewards of Performance, Results, and Organization Clarity. This factor combines the two Campbell et al. (1970) scales of Consideration-Warmth-Effort and Reward Orientation. It seems to combine two major factors of Reward and Friendly Spirit. It also agrees well with
the Sims-LaPollette (1975) factor of General Affect toward People. The factor, also, agrees with the Litwin-Stringer combining the Warmth, Identity, and Support scales and agrees with the findings that Reward could also have been so combined.

In conclusion, the present groupings of the job climate scales agree to a large extent with the findings of other studies. It is conceivable that the original items—as Meyer (1968) and Sims-LaPollette (1975) used them—rather than the Litwin-Stringer scales, the agreement might have been higher. The extent of the agreement and the reliabilities reported earlier, seem to indicate that the respondents in this study filled out the scales thoughtfully and that speech, language, and hearing clinicians do not differ from other types of workers in the aspects of job climate which they perceive.

"Other Combinations"

Six other combinations to substitute scales for items also became apparent from a scanning of the remaining factor loadings (see Table 4).

Discussion

The generally high average loadings on these combinations (Large Work Segment: Individual, Large Work Segment: Agencies, Size of System, and Number of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW VARIABLE</th>
<th>OLD VARIABLE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>(37-38-40)</td>
<td>Old Expert</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>(12-13)</td>
<td>Restrictive Work Segments</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>(55R-58)</td>
<td>Inner City vs. Rural</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>(39-42)</td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>(56-57)</td>
<td>Large System and Staff</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>(48-49-50)</td>
<td>Load: Schools</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Two variables (41 and 46) were dropped because they had no significant loadings.*
Clinicians—ranging from .47 to .78) indicate that these variables would all have quite telling reliabilities. The one exception to this was variable 68, Professionalism, where the average loading was only .21, .24, and .20 and for the Factors (I, IV, and VIII) showing significant loadings. However, the combination of advanced degrees and membership in professional organizations into a Professional scale seems quite logical and would probably be replicated in other samples.

New Variable Classification

The combination of variables made it possible to reclassify the variables on the basis of the original four areas.

A. Personal Characteristics
   A1  36 Female (vs. Male)
   A2  65 Old Expert
   A3  67 Professional
   A4  43 Level of Aspiration
   A5  10 Work Ethic
   A6  35 Effort Expended

B. Job Setting
   B1  66 Urban vs. Rural
   B2  68 Large System and Staff
   B3  59 Socio-Economic Level
   B4  44 Level of Reporting
   B5  47 Non-Professional Staff Meetings
   B6  54 Professional Days Off
   B7  51 Rotational vs. Block Assignments
   B8  45 Schools for a Year
The Revised Factor Loadings are presented in Table 5. The order of Factors has been arranged to facilitate discussion of the relationship to the questions. The two factors (A and B) are large city school groups; the two factors (G and H) are the rural groups; and the four factors (C, D, E, and F) are the groups that range from intensive to traditional scheduling.

**Description of Factors**

Thumbnail sketches of each factor follow:
### TABLE 5

**FINAL FACTOR LOADINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>OLD FACTOR</th>
<th>NEW FACTOR</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>NEW VARIABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Old Expert</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Level of Aspiration</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Protestant Ethic</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Effort Expended</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Urban-Rural</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Size of System</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Socio-economic Level</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Level of Reporting</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Non-professional Staff Meeting</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Days Off</td>
<td>Scheduling Policy</td>
<td>Same Schedule Yearly</td>
<td>Load: Schools</td>
<td>Restrictive Work Segments</td>
<td>Case Load</td>
<td>Amount of Individual Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services Rendered: Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Services Rendered: Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Appreciation Received:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Appreciation Received:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Satisfaction: Job Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Satisfaction: Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Satisfaction: Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>Satisfaction: Adminstration-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>Satisfaction: Overall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table represents various satisfaction ratings across different categories. The numbers indicate the level of satisfaction, with higher values generally indicating higher satisfaction.
Factor A (II). People who are professional (.21), ambitious (.18) males (-.24) employed in very large (.78), urban (.50), low socio-economic (-.28) systems, reporting relatively low (-.15) in the hierarchical lot enjoying professional type staff meetings (-.33), see their job climate as involving Job Structuring (.24), Delegation of Responsibility (.24), and Warmth-Reward (.21). They express satisfaction with Administration-Supervision (.25) and more minimally with Recognition Received (.18) and Personal Relations (.17).

Factor B (VIII). People who are non-Professional (-.20), non-Ambitious (-.28) females (.39) employed in large (.24), urban (.20), lower socio-economic (-.21) schools who report low in the school hierarchy (-.35) and do lots of individual therapy (.21) with low case loads (-.27), expressed overall satisfaction (.27) and satisfaction in the four areas of Job Challenge (.31), Recognition Received (.29), Personal Relations (.30), and Administration-Supervision (.26).

Factor C (V). People who are Professional (.25), Hard Working (.21) Old Timers (.67) in middle class (.13) systems, who enjoyed modern type intensive scheduling (-.18) but was not hampered by large time consuming special assignments (-.31), seemed relatively unaware of Job Climate and while believing they did not give enough service to individuals (-.17) still expressed at least minimal satisfaction both overall (.19) and in the one special area of Recognition
Factor D (I). This group of undifferentiated persons is no special type of system but enjoying the modern intensive assignment policy (-.18), were in general the most aware of climate. They noted the absence of pressure (-.63) and of competition (-.35) and were well aware of Delegation of Authority (.43) and Warmth-Reward (.37), but didn't see much Job Structuring (-.15). They expressed high satisfaction with Administration-Supervision (.47), Personal Relations (.39), and Recognition Received (.36) and more moderate satisfaction overall (.27) and with Job Challenge (.21).

Factor E (III). This group of ambitious (.16), hard workers (.54) believe in the Protestant Work Ethic (.27), who are not restricted to any particular job setting and who also seemed unaware of Job Climate, expressed most belief in a job well done (.62), in service rendered to individuals (.50) and agencies (.40) and in appreciation received from individuals (.58) and from agencies (.46). They also expressed great satisfaction from Job Challenge (.50) and more moderate satisfaction Overall (.23), with Recognition Received (.22) and Personal Relations (.20) but were less pleased with Administration-Supervision (.10).

Factor F (VI). This group of unambitious (-.29), not hard working (-.14) males (-.17), employed by high socio-economic systems (.20) who did much individual therapy (.26)
under the old traditional rotating assignment policy (.29), saw their job climate as previously consisting only of Warmth-Reward (.34) and Job Structuring (.30). They admitted that they were doing a rather poor job overall (-.15) and were not rendering much service to agencies (-.15) but feel they were receiving appreciation from both individuals (.28) and agencies (.25). They expressed most satisfaction with Recognition Received (.40) Administration-Supervision (.37) and Personal Relations (.30). Their overall satisfaction (.24) was lower and their satisfaction from job challenge (.07) was low.

**Factor G (IV).** This group undifferentiated by personal characteristics worked in rural multi-county system (-.24) with a very high load of schools (.65) with largely specialized restrictive assignments (.47) where they did considerable individual therapy (.15) but offset somewhat by a liberal allowance of professional days off (.27), were oblivious of Job Climate. They saw themselves as rendering service to agencies (.16), but their satisfaction was either positive only with Administration-Supervision (.15) or minimally negative with personal relations (-.14).

**Factor H (VII).** This group of hardworking (.16) females (.22) employed in high socio-economic (.32) rural (-.31) systems where they had no special schools for the year (-.33), did little individual therapy (-.16) but still had somewhat restrictive block assignments (.16) and
however did enjoy professional type staff meetings (-.18), saw their job climate as having warmth-reward (.35), little competition (-.37), Delegation of Authority (.24) and Job Structuring (.22). They thought they were doing a fairly good job (.18) and were rendering service to both individuals (.19) and agencies (.14) and were receiving appreciation from individuals (.15). They expressed high overall satisfaction (.30) and both Administration-Supervision (.27) and Personal Relations (.22) and more minimally with Job Challenge (.17) and Recognition Received (.15).

Discussion

Subjective interpretations of Table 6 and Appendix B follow.

a. Factor C. The hard working, old expert professionals, apparently present in all types of systems appeared not to be satisfied with their jobs. Some adjustment has been made in their scheduling but apparently they would like to be enabled to feel more productive and more satisfied. They seem unimpressed by the job climate presently provided by them.

b. Factor E. The ambitious, protestant work-ethic believing, hard workers also present in all types of systems, who unlike the Factor C persons believe they are
doing a good job and are generally quite satisfied and especially so with job challenge and less so with administration and supervision. They seem to neither appreciate management or to be aware of its attempts to create favorable climate.

c. **Factor G.** The largely undifferentiated (by the study) persons in rural multi-county systems who have many schools to service in a highly restrictive way that they can't possibly get all the work done and who have little if any feeling of accomplishment and little, if any, satisfaction with their role. The only solution here seems to be more clinicians to reduce the load.

d. Two groups employed largely in large inner-city schools seem of special interest.

**Factor A.** A group of ambitious, professional males who are somewhat perceptive of job climate and who expressed marginal satisfaction and apparently are not proud of the job they are doing. They have been already accorded professional type staff meetings, but this does not seem to meet their needs.

**Factor B.** A group of non-professional (B,S, degrees), non-ambitious females who have been accorded small case loads and engage in individual therapy. While unaware of job climate they expressed satisfaction and especially satisfaction with job challenge. Apparently the
job assignment matches what they are able to do.

e. Two other groups are employed in predominately upper system socio-economic settings.

Factor H. A group of hard working females in a rural setting who have professional type staff meetings and only somewhat restrictive loads apparently because of less need for individual therapy. These clinicians are aware of job climate and express relatively high satisfaction in all areas. They seem to be doing all right.

Factor F. A group of somewhat indolent, unambitious males who are engaged in individual therapy seem to see their job as structured but unchallenging and not very well done. They apparently are misplaced or misused. They probably need to be reassigned, retrained or possibly replaced.

f. Factor D. This final group of heterogeneous clinicians from heterogeneous settings have only one common job setting; they serve under the modern intensive scheduling policy. Their group was the only one with significant loadings (or nearly so) on all five job climate dimensions and were the only group to disclaim any pressure or constraint. They did not, however, feel really proud of their job except to rate the receiving of appreciation from individuals. They did, however, show satisfaction in all areas including very high satisfaction with administration and supervision.
Further interpretations are framed as answers to hypothetical questions.

**Answers to Questions**

**Question 1. What is the relationship of Personal Characteristics to Job Setting?** The relationships in this area are presented in Table 6. The trends to be noted include the following relationships:

**a. Predominately male sub-groups were of two types:**

1) **Factor A.** Highly professional and ambitious clinicians who were found in very large urban lower class schools where they reported rather low in the hierarchy of supervisors.

2) **Factor F.** Unambitious and non-hard-working clinicians were found in high socio-economic systems of undetermined size and location under the old standard rotational assignment policy but without fixed schools for the year where they engaged in a lot of individual therapy.

**b. Predominately female sub-groups were also of two types:**

1) **Factor B.** Non-professional, unambitious females were found in large, urban, low socio-economic systems where they reported to low level supervisors and did primarily individual therapy with small case loads.

2) **Factor H.** Hard-working clinicians were found in high socio-economic, rural systems with professional type staff meetings and had restrictive type block assignments but did relatively little individual therapy.

**c. Old expert, professionals who were high in effort expended were found in no particular type of system but did tend to work under modern intensive**
### TABLE 6
RELATION OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS TO SCHOOL SETTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE NAME</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Female</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Old Expert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Professional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Level of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 Protestant Work Ethic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Effort Expenditure</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE NAME</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2 Size</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Socio-econ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Reporting Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 Professional Type Staff Meeting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 Professional Days Off</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7 Scheduling Policy</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8 Same Schools All Year</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9 Number of Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10 Restrictive Work Segments</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes Yes Yes
assignment policy and to be relatively free from restrictive block assignments requiring large portions of their time.

d. Very hard working, ambitious clinicians who believed in the protestant work-ethic were found in all types of school settings.

e. Two of the sub-groups had no particular differentiating personal characteristics.

Summary. Personal characteristics seemed to be relatively unrelated to school setting. The lone exceptions to this conclusion was that groups largely restricted to one sex were found in either high or low socio-economic settings and that hard working, old expert, professionals seemed to be granted somewhat less restrictive assignments under the more modern intensive scheduling policy.

Discussion

The absence of relationship between personal characteristics and job setting can be considered as a favorable condition. Salaries and opportunity must be fairly equal in all types of school settings. At least, it appears that neither the hard workers or the older professionals are found in any special setting.

The presence of predominately male groups in large inner city schools and in high socio-economic areas coupled with the predominately female groups in the inner city and in high socio-economic rural schools may indicate that elsewhere there is no evidence of sex bias.
The fact that low socio-economic, large inner city schools can attract ambitious, professional males while rural multi-county systems can attract hard working females would seem to indicate that any type of system can attract the kind of people it needs.

Question 2. What is the relationship of Personal Characteristics to Perceived Job Climate? The relationships in this area are presented in Table 7.

a. Of the sex differentiated groups, two males and two females:

1) One group of each sex perceived Warmth-Reward as very high while the other perceived it as only moderate.

2) Both female groups were aware of delegation of authority while only one male group seemed aware of it.

3) Both male groups (one quite highly) were aware of Job Standards while only one female group was even marginally aware of it.

4) Both female groups were aware of the absence of competition while neither male group seemed aware.

b. The two groups most differentiated by experience (group C) or by hard work (group E) seemed oblivious to job climate.

c. Of the two groups undifferentiated by personal characteristics, one (group G) seemed unaware of climate while the other (group D) was the only one unaware of pressure and highly aware of all other areas including less Job Standard emphasis.

Summary. In general, personal characteristics seemed not too strongly related to perceived job climate. Both
### TABLE 7

**RELATION OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS TO PERCEIVED JOB CLIMATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE NAME</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Sex</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Old Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Professional</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Level of Aspiration</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 Protestant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Energy Expenditure</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Competition</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Delegation of Responsibility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Job Standards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Warmth-Reward</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
highly differentiated groups and one completely undifferentiated group seemed completely oblivious of climate, with one undifferentiated group seemed most aware of climate. With respect to sex, females seemed somewhat more aware of Delegation of Authority while males seemed more aware of Job Structuring. None of the sex differentiated groups was aware of the Absence of Pressure.

Discussion

The finding that older professionals and hard working clinicians were little interested in climate seems to agree with the earlier findings by Hodgkinson (1970) that lack of interest in climate "increases with length of time on the job or with performance on the job." These persons apparently have less need for and therefore attend less to the presence or absence of any type of supportive or reinforcement climate or its absence. This also agrees with the Kinnaird (1973) finding that "experts" performing at a high level on their jobs and having a high level of job activity are unaware of job climate. Apparently school psychologists and speech, language, and hearing clinicians are alike in this regard. The fact that the hard working group was also the one who believed most in the Work Ethic, also, fits in with the Friedlander and Margulies (1969) finding that work values can and do modify perceived job climate. It is evident, therefore, that the findings of the present
study support the findings of previous research for other types of workers.

**Question 3. What is the relationship of Personal Characteristics to Self-Estimate of Job Performance and Rewards?** The relationships in this area are presented in Table 8.

a. The group of ambitious, protestant work ethic believers who expended most effort also perceived themselves as doing the most outstanding job (over all performance, services to individuals, and services to agencies) as receiving the most appreciation both from individuals and agencies. They also receive the most satisfaction from Job Challenge and expressed general high satisfaction in all areas except Administration-Supervision.

b. The hard working, professional, old experts, on the other hand saw themselves as deficient in services rendered to individuals and expressed only marginal satisfaction for the overall and Recognition Received scales.

c. Of the four sex differentiated groups, two male and two female:

1) In the area of Perceived Performance:

a) For the two low socio-economic groups, neither sex reported their performance as either high or low.

b) Of the two high socio-economic groups the males reported low overall performance and low service to agencies while the females perceive themselves as doing a good job in all areas. While both groups reported receiving appreciation from individuals only the males reported receiving appreciation from agencies.
### TABLE 8
RELATION OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS TO SELF-ESTIMATE OF JOB PERFORMANCE AND REWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE NAME</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Old Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Level of Aspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 Protestant Work Ethic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Effort Expended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Job Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Services Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Services Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Appreciation Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Appreciation Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Satisfaction Job Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Marg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 Satisfaction Recognition Received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marg.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Marg.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Satisfaction Personal Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marg.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D9</td>
<td>Satisfaction:</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>Satisfaction:</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>High Marg.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) In the area of Satisfaction:

a) Both female groups (one only marginal) reported satisfaction from Job Challenge while neither male group did so.

b) While all four groups reported satisfaction with Personal Relations, it was very marginal for inner city males.

c) While all four groups reported some satisfaction from Recognition it was only marginal for inner city males and for rural females.

d) With respect to Overall Satisfaction both female groups were high. Only one male group was high while Overall Satisfaction seemed absent for the other male group.

e) All four groups reported high satisfaction with Administration-Supervision.

d. For the two groups undifferentiated by personal characteristics,

1) The mixed location group (D) reported receiving appreciation from individuals and had high satisfaction both overall and in all areas and were outstanding by satisfied with Administration-Supervision.

2) The rural group (F) felt only that they were rendering good services to agencies but did not seem to receive satisfaction either overall or in any of the areas.

Summary. The relationships between these areas seemed to be fairly strong in some areas at least. The hard worker group (E) seemed most pleased with their performance. While the only group reporting low energy expenditure (F) seemed least pleased with their output. Old time professionals were neither pleased with their performance nor to receive
much satisfaction from their work, except a little from recognition received. Females seemed to receive more satisfaction from Job Challenge and from Personal Relations. In other areas of satisfaction, sex differences seemed to be moderated by location or to have no effect.

Discussion

The majority of the groups expressed satisfaction with their jobs, especially in the areas of overall Job Satisfaction, Personal Relations, and Administration-Supervision. On the other hand, only several groups felt satisfied with their job performance and services to individuals and agencies. It is significant to note that the older, more experienced clinicians felt they expended a great deal of effort but did not receive a great deal of satisfaction from their work or appreciation from individuals or agencies. The overall results indicate that clinicians are more satisfied with their jobs in the areas of Challenge, Recognition, Personal Relations, and Supervision, but less satisfied with Job Performance, services provided and appreciation.

Question 4. What is the relationship of Job Setting to Perceived Job Climate? The relationships in this area are presented in Table 9.

a. Absence of Pressure was noted only by one relatively undifferentiated group marked only by the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE NAME</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2 Size of System</td>
<td>Very Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Socio-econ. Level</td>
<td>Low Low Mid, Mid, High High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Level of Reporting Type Meeting</td>
<td>Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 Professional Day Off</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 Scheduling Policy</td>
<td>New New Old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7 Same School All Year</td>
<td>No No Heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8 Restrictive Work Segments</td>
<td>No Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9 Case Load</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10 Much Individual Therapy</td>
<td>Yes Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Pressure</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Competition</td>
<td>No No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Delegation of Authority</td>
<td>Yes Yes High Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Job Structuring</td>
<td>Low High Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Warmth-Reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

presence of a modern concentrated scheduling policy in a middle-class community.

b. Absence of Competition was noted only by one of two large system lower socio-economic setting and by one of four middle-class system groups and by neither upper-class system group.

c. Job Structure was perceived as high or present in both high socio-economic groups but was noted in only one lower socio-economic group. Of the four middle-class groups three failed to note it but one felt it was too low.

d. Warmth-Reward was perceived as high in both high socio-economic group and as present in both lower socio-economic groups. The one middle-class group which perceived it as high was the same group which had perceived the absence of pressure.

e. Two middle-class groups and one rural class group seemed completely oblivious to climate. These groups were the Old Expert Professionals (C), the Hard Workers (E), and the Overworked (G) groups.

Summary. Relationships between Job Setting and Perceived Job Climate were rather marginal. The group most aware of climate in general was from a middle-class socio-economic setting with a modern scheduling policy, but another group (the old pros) under the same policy seemed oblivious of climate. There seemed to be some differentiation in climate perception based upon socio-economic setting of the groups. Groups in higher socio-economic settings, as contrasted with low socio-economic settings, seemed to perceive Warmth-Reward and Job Standards as being stronger while Delegation of Authority was somewhat weaker.
Discussion

The findings that one group (Factor B) of clinicians in a large school system from a low socio-economic level, perceive the Job Climate as warm and rewarding with little job structuring was in contrast to the findings of Kinnaird (1973) who found in her study that school psychologists working in an inner city metropolitan setting, saw Organizational Climate as consisting entirely of structure and standards.

Question 5. What are the relationships between Job Setting to Self-Estimate of Job Performance and Rewards?

The relationships in this area are presented in Table 10.

a. The two large urban lower socio-economic class groups and one middle-class group (the older expert professionals) were the only groups which expressed no belief in anything well done or in any appreciation received. In contrast one group in a middle socio-economic class (the hard workers) and a rural high socio-economic community group expressed the strongest belief in a job well done and in appreciation received.

b. With respect to socio-economic level and satisfaction the lower socio-economic groups were higher in Job Challenge while the higher socio-economic area groups were higher in Personal Relations and Overall Satisfaction.

Summary. Relationship between Job Setting and Perceived Job Rewards were rather minimal. There seemed to be a slight trend for lower socio-economic groups to be less likely to perceive a job well done and to gain more satisfaction from Job Challenge but to have less overall
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE NAME</th>
<th>FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2 Size</td>
<td>Very Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Socio-econ. Setting</td>
<td>Low Low Mid. Mid. Mid. High Mid. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Level of Reporting</td>
<td>Low Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 Prof. Type Staff Meeting</td>
<td>Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 Professional Days Off</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7 Scheduling Policy</td>
<td>New New Old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8 Same Schools All Year</td>
<td>No No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9 Load: Schools</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10 Restrictive Work Segments</td>
<td>No Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11 Case Load</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12 Lots of Individual Therapy</td>
<td>Yes Yes Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Job Performance</td>
<td>Very High Low High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Service: Individuals</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Service: Agencies</td>
<td>Very High Low High High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Appreciation: Individuals</td>
<td>Very High High High High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Appreciation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Satisfaction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Satisfaction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>Satisfaction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>Satisfaction:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
satisfaction and less from Personal Relations.

Discussion

Rural and urban groups indicated greater satisfaction in the area of Recognition, Personal Relations, and Administration and Supervision. The majority of the groups in different socio-economic settings indicated satisfaction in Recognition, Personal Relations, and Overall Job Satisfaction. Therefore, clinicians indicated an overall satisfaction with their jobs regardless of their job setting throughout the state.

Question 6. What are the relationships between Perceived Job Climate and Self-Estimate of Job Performance and Rewards? The relationships in this area are presented in Table 11.

a. Of the three groups who were unimpressed by Job Climate two of the groups (C The Old Expert Professionals and G Rural Overworked) also expressed few perceptions of good urban performance and either low marginal or no satisfaction. The remaining group (E Hard Working) were most strong in expressing believe in a job well done, had very high satisfaction from Job Challenge and generally high satisfaction. It appears that these groups had their attention on other things than climate.

b. In contrast to the above, the one group (D) which had strong perceptions in all five climate areas claimed high satisfaction in all areas (especially with Administration-Supervision) but expressed belief in good performance only in the area of being appreciated by individuals.

c. A group (H) shows awareness in four climate areas also expressed belief in high performance and
TABLE 11
RELATION BETWEEN PERCEIVED JOB CLIMATE
AND SELF-ESTIMATE OF JOB PERFORMANCE AND REWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE NAME</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 JC: Pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 JC: Competition</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 JC: Delegation of Responsibility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 JC: Job Standards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 JC: Warmth Rewards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Job Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Services: Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Services: Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Appreciation: Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Appreciation: Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Satisfaction: Job Challenge</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Marg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 Satisfaction: Recognition Marg.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Marg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Satisfaction: Personal Rel. Marg.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9 Satisfaction: Admin.-Supv.</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10 Satisfaction: Overall</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Marg.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
appreciation received from individuals. They also showed high or marginal satisfaction in all areas.

d. Two groups perceived climate in three areas. Both perceived high Warmth-Reward and adequate Delegation of Authority and both expressed high satisfaction with Administration-Supervision. They differ in that:

1) The group who also perceived Adequate Job Structuring also expressed marginal satisfaction with Recognition and Personal Relations.

2) The group who also perceived the absence of competition also expressed high satisfaction both overall and in the areas of Job Challenge, Recognition, and Personal Relations.

e. The remaining group, which perceived climate only in the areas of Warmth-Reward and Job Standards, felt that its overall performance and services to agencies were low, but felt they received appreciation from both individuals and agencies. They expressed high overall satisfaction and satisfaction in all areas except Job Challenge.

**Summary.** Overall while perception of Job Climate seemed somewhat unrelated to perceived goodness of work done or appreciation received, it did seem more related to satisfaction received. Especially strong was the relationship of the perception of a Warmth-Reward Climate to satisfaction with Administration-Supervision. The largest exception to the above generalization was the group of hard workers (Group E) which seemed oblivious to climate but gave themselves high ratings on all phases of Job Performance and derived high satisfaction for all areas except Administration-Supervision.
Discussion

The results from this study correlate with the findings of Campbell et al. that Organizational Climate was more highly related to Individual Job Satisfaction than to Individual Performance. The study also indicated that satisfaction relates positively to individual's perceptions of the supportiveness and friendliness of the climate. Similar findings were shown in the studies done by Friedlander and Margulies (1969) in which their results indicated that Organizational Climate was a significant determinant of individual satisfaction. Kinnaird's (1973) study indicated that people who are aware of all facets of Job Climate also saw their jobs as providing a wide variety of satisfactions.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Procedures

This study was conducted to see whether information from four areas in which speech, language, and hearing clinicians in the public schools differed, could be useful to supervisors in answering questions and dealing with problems which arose in the day-to-day carrying out of their duties. The four areas were (a) Personal Characteristics, (b) Job Setting, (c) Perceived Job Climate, and (d) Perceived Job Performance and Rewards.

An eleven-page questionnaire covering the above areas was designed and distributed on a statewide basis to 675 clinicians, and 354 useable completely-answered replies were received.

The responses were combined into reliable scales to reduce the number of variables wherever possible. The final variables, numbering 33 after combinations, were distributed among the four major areas as follows: a. Personal Characteristics (6 items), b. Job Setting (12 items), c. Perceived Job Climate (5 items), and d. Perceived Job Performance (5 items) and Job Satisfaction.
(5 items). The statistical analysis, in addition to checks for reliability, consisted of a factor analysis to disclose (a) types of clinician groupings and (b) interrelations among the four descriptive areas.

The factor analysis produced eight major clusters of clinicians. Two of the groups were concentrated in large city, lower socio-economic areas.

A. A group of professional ambitious males.
B. A group of non-professional, unambitious females.

Four of the groups were not distinguished by type of school system.

C. A group of old time professionals
D. A group identified only as operating under the new type of intensive scheduling policy.
E. A group of very hard workers who believed in the protestant work ethic.
F. A group of ambitious males working in a high socio-economic area.

The remaining two groups were located in rural-multi-county systems:

G. A group working with restrictive assignments involving large numbers of schools.
H. A group of hard working females in a high socio-economic setting with more moderate assignments.

As to the interactions among the four classes of descriptive areas the following were the most notable:

1. Personal Characteristic and Job Setting: Groups primarily of one sex seemed to be restricted to high or low
socio-economic settings. Old timer professionals and believers in hard work were not restricted to any particular type of Job Setting. Two of the eight clinician clusters had no distinguishing personal characteristics.

2. **Personal Characteristics and Job Climate:** Sex had some effect upon the particular aspect of Job Climate. The old time professionals and the believers in hard work seemed almost oblivious of Job Climate.

3. **Personal Characteristics and Perceived Job Performance and Rewards:** The hard working group of clinicians seemed most satisfied with their performance. The old time professionals and the two male groups were least pleased with their performance. Females were more satisfied with performance than males.

4. **Job Setting and Job Climate:** Groups in middle-to-high socio-economic setting perceived Climate as very warm with rewards with a certain amount of structure. Delegation of Authority was perceived more by the clinicians in the low or middle socio-economic settings.

5. **Job Setting and Perceived Job Performance and Rewards:** Urban, lower socio-economic groups were less satisfied with their performance than upper class groups. The lower socio-economic working groups perceived more satisfaction with Job Challenge, Recognition, and satisfaction with Administration-Supervision. Clinicians working in
higher socio-economic areas were more satisfied with Personal Relations.

6. **Job Climate and Job Performance and Rewards:** Perceptions of Job Climate seemed relatively unrelated to Job Performance but was clearly related to Job Satisfaction except for the hard working group of clinicians.

**Implications of the Study**

Two groups of clinicians who perceived successful job performance and of services rendered and appreciation received, seemed to be highly correlated with energy expenditure and was further heightened if accompanied by a belief in the protestant work ethic and by a high level of aspiration. These clinicians, also, tended to report high overall satisfaction and satisfaction with Job Challenge and recognition received. Administration-Supervision should be very concerned with the results from this study in the areas of Level of Aspiration, Protestant Work Ethic and Effort Expended since the majority of the groups of clinicians indicated low Level of Aspiration, little Effort Expended, and did not perceive themselves as hard working people.

Three groups of clinicians seemed to be least satisfied and least perceptive of a job well done, and to differ considerably in Personal Characteristics and Job Setting:

1) The older, more experienced clinicians felt they expended a great deal of effort in their jobs and did not
receive a great deal of satisfaction or appreciation for their work. They, also, indicated a lack of interest in Job Climate and dissatisfaction with their Job Performance. In order to improve the role of the older, more experienced clinician, it may be necessary to develop new positions of higher rank for them, such as supervisors of student clinicians, coordinators of research projects, or chairman of various committees.

2) The clinicians working in the rural area indicated a complete lack of interest in Job Climate, dissatisfaction with Job Performance and indicated a limited amount of satisfaction for their jobs. Conditions may be improved by reducing the number of school assignments and expanding supervisory services within the rural areas.

3) The male clinicians expressed satisfaction only in recognition received for their work and in the area of Administration and Supervision and Personal Relations within their organizations. It may be necessary to change their roles, similar to the suggestions made for the older, more experienced clinicians, by developing positions for them of higher rank or place them with older students at the secondary level.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The results of this study indicate that administrators and supervisors must look more closely at the area of Job
Performance. Further studies should attempt to include other measures such as the relationship of salaries, reduction of case load, and school assignments to job performance.

Studies could be done to determine the number and location of the clinicians within the eight groups found in this study. Four of the groups were unidentified as to sex, urban or rural setting, or size of school system. From this study, supervisors would be able to look more closely at the perceptions, within the four dimensions, of the clinicians whom they supervise.

Additional studies could be done in the area of supervision. What effect, if any, does the supervisor have on the productivity and effectiveness of the clinicians within the organizations. A questionnaire could be developed which would include tests on supervisory styles and distributed to clinicians asking for their perceptions of their immediate boss or supervisor.
APPENDIX A

The Questionnaire
Instructions for the Questionnaire

This questionnaire is part of a research project being conducted for a Ph.D. dissertation at The Ohio State University. This is an attempt to relate organizational climate and work environment characteristics to the job-related attitudes of public school speech, language, and hearing clinicians.

This project can be accomplished only through the cooperation of practicing school clinicians like yourself. Your cooperation will be sincerely appreciated.

Please do not put your name on the questionnaire. When you have completed the questionnaire, seal it in the stamped envelope enclosed and return it by mail. Please, try to complete the questionnaire within two weeks.

The results will be available to you through the Ohio Speech and Hearing Association. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Doris White (Mrs.)
1160 Airendel Lane
Columbus, Ohio 43220
This questionnaire is for the purpose of learning how people feel and react to their job environment. Please read each statement carefully and mark each statement with a number as follows:

If you **Definitely Agree** with the statement, then mark it 2.

If you **Moderately Agree** with the statement, then mark it 6.

If you only **Slightly Agree** with the statement, then mark it 5.

If you **Neither Agree nor Disagree** with the statement, then mark it 4.

If you only **Slightly Disagree** with the statement, then mark it 3.

If you **Moderately Disagree** with the statement, then mark it 2.

If you **Definitely Disagree** with the statement, then mark it 1.

**Items**

1. _____ The jobs in this organization are clearly defined and logically structured.

2. _____ We don't rely too heavily on individual judgment in this organization; almost everything is double-checked.

3. _____ We have a promotion system here that helps the best person to rise to the top.

4. _____ The philosophy of our administration is that in the long run we get ahead fastest by playing it slow, safe, and sure.

5. _____ A friendly atmosphere prevails among the people in this organization.

6. _____ You don't get much sympathy from higher-ups in this organization if you make a mistake.
In this organization we set very high standards for performance.

The best way to make a good impression is to steer clear of open arguments and disagreements.

People are proud of belonging to this school system.

In this organization, it is sometimes unclear who has the formal authority to make a decision.

Around here the administration resents your checking everything with them; if you think you've got the right approach you just go ahead.

In this organization the rewards and encouragements you get usually outweigh the threats and the criticism.

Our system has been built up to what it is by taking calculated risks at the right time.

This organization is characterized by a relaxed, easy-going working climate.

The administration makes an effort to talk with you about your career aspirations within the system.

Our administration believes that no job is so well done that it couldn't be done better.

The attitude of our administration is that conflict between competing units and individuals can be very healthy.

I feel that I am a member of a well functioning team.

The policies and organization structure of this system have been clearly explained.

Supervision in this organization is mainly a matter of setting guidelines for your people; you let them take responsibility for the job.

In this organization people are rewarded in proportion to the excellence of their job performance.
Items

22. ____ Decision making in this organization is too cautious for maximum effectiveness.

23. ____ It's very hard to get to know people in this organization.

24. ____ People in this organization don't really trust each other enough.

25. ____ Around here there is a feeling of pressure to continually improve our personal and group performance.

26. ____ We are encouraged to speak our minds, even if it means disagreeing with our superiors.

27. ____ As far as I can see, there isn't very much personal loyalty to the system.

28. ____ Red tape is kept to a minimum in this organization.

29. ____ You won't get ahead in this organization unless you stick your neck out and try things on your own sometimes.

30. ____ There is a great deal of criticism in this organization.

31. ____ Our administration is willing to take a chance on a good idea.

32. ____ People in this organization tend to be cool and aloof toward each other.

33. ____ The philosophy of our administration emphasizes the human factor, how people feel, etc.

34. ____ Our administration believes that if the people are happy, productivity will take care of itself.

35. ____ In our meetings the goal is to arrive at a decision as smoothly as possible.

36. ____ In this organization, people pretty much look out for their own interests.
Excessive rules, administration details, and red-tape make it difficult for new and original ideas to receive consideration.

Our philosophy emphasizes that people should solve their problems by themselves.

There is not enough reward and recognition given in this organization for doing good work.

We have to take some pretty big risks occasionally to keep ahead in the educational field.

There is a lot of warmth in the relationships between administration and school speech language and hearing clinicians in this system.

When I am on a difficult assignment I can usually count on getting assistance from my boss and coworkers.

To get ahead in this organization it's more important to get along than it is to be a high producer.

Our productivity sometimes suffers from lack of organization and planning.

There are an awful lot of excuses when somebody makes a mistake.

If you make a mistake in this organization, you will be punished.

In this organization people don't seem to take much pride in their performance.

In some of the projects I've been on, I haven't been sure exactly who my boss was.

One of the problems in this organization is that individuals won't take responsibility.

Our administration isn't so concerned about formal organization and authority, but concentrates instead on getting the right people together to do the job.
Items

51. _____ Hard work makes you a better person.

52. _____ Wasting time is as bad as wasting money.

53. _____ A good indication of a person's worth is how well he does his job.

54. _____ If all other things are equal, it is better to have a job with a lot of responsibility than one with little responsibility.

For each of the short paragraphs below, circle the number on the scale that best indicates how descriptive the paragraph is about your work setting.

Items

55. ORGANIZATION EXPECTATION: Employees are expected to give "body and soul" to their jobs. Things are expected of the employee such as intense loyalty, willingness to put work ahead of the family, and other acts which are "above and beyond the call of duty."

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all descriptive

56. CONFLICT VS. COOPERATION: Employees conflict with each other in the process of getting things done. There is competition for scarce resources and things such as supplies, clerical help, etc.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all descriptive

57. SOCIAL RELATIONS: The work-setting has a friendly and warm social atmosphere.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all descriptive
Items

58. PERFORMANCE REWARD DEPENDENCE: The reward system (salary-benefits, promotions) is fair and appropriate. Rewards are based on worth, ability, and past performance rather than factors such as luck, who you know, or how well you can manipulate people.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all descriptive very descriptive

59. PRESSURE: The organization almost constantly pushes its people to get the work out.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all descriptive very descriptive

60. STATUS POLARIZATION: There are definite physical and/or psychological distinctions between levels in the work-group. (Note: Physical distinction would include special privileges such as parking places and office decoration. Psychological distinctions would include informal social boundaries; subgroup formation, and treatment of subordinates as inferior).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all descriptive very descriptive

61. CONSTRAINTS: There are many rules, procedures, policies, and practices to which employees must conform.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all descriptive very descriptive

62. FLEXIBILITY AND INNOVATION: There is a willingness to try new procedures and to experiment with change. (Note: This is a willingness to experiment not required by a crisis situation, but rather to improve a situation or process which may be working satisfactorily now but could be improved. Also refers to the speed with which such changes are made).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
not at all descriptive very descriptive
**Items**

63. **KNOWLEDGE OF RESULTS:** Employees are kept well-informed about their job performance. (Note: Besides quantity, this also refers to the quality of feedback, such as clarity and relevance.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

not at all descriptive
very descriptive

64. **RESPONSIBILITY:** There is a lot of individual responsibility delegated to employees. Employees can run their jobs pretty much on their own without having to check with the boss every time a decision has to be made.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

not at all descriptive
very descriptive

65. **JOB STANDARDS:** Emphasis is placed on doing a good job. Challenging goals are set and there is some pressure to improve personal and group performance.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

not at all descriptive
very descriptive

66. **ORGANIZATIONAL CLARITY:** Things are pretty well organized rather than disorderly, confused, or chaotic.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

not at all descriptive
very descriptive

This part of the questionnaire is concerned about self-rated behaviors and on the job self-perceptions. You will rate yourself on a seven point scale.

**Items**

67. **Overall, how satisfied are you with your job?**

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

very dissatisfied moderately satisfied very satisfied
68. How much effort do you put into doing your job (not in terms of time, but how much do you put out during your working time)?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
put out as   about   put everything
little as   average  I've got into
possible    my job

69. How well do you feel you perform your job?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
do a poor   about   do an outstanding
job         average  ing job

70. How would you rate yourself as a school speech and hearing clinician?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
poor        about   outstanding
           average

How do you feel in respect to the "quality" of work which you provide in the following six areas of service?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
do a poor   about   do an outstanding
job         average  ing job

71. _____ children
72. _____ teachers
73. _____ parents
74. _____ schools
75. _____ community
76. _____ profession
Check ( ) each group below with whom you spend over 10 percent of your time; double check ( ) if you spend over 25 percent of your time:

**Items**
1. -- 11. ________ children
2. -- 12. ________ teachers
3. -- 13. ________ parents
4. -- 14. ________ administrators
5. -- 15. ________ community agencies
6. -- 16. ________ physicians
7. -- 17. ________ counselors
8. -- 18. ________ psychologists
9. -- 19. ________ nurses

Rate on a 7-point scale the degree to which you believe each group below really appreciates your services.

<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></td>
<td>not at all appreciated</td>
<td>about average</td>
<td>really appreciates service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Items**
10. -- 20. ________ teachers
11. -- 21. ________ parents
12. -- 22. ________ administrators
13. -- 23. ________ community agencies
14. -- 24. ________ physicians
15. -- 25. ________ counselors
16. -- 26. ________ psychologists
17. -- 27. ________ nurses
18. -- 28. ________ children
Rate on a 7-point scale the time you presently spend in each of the following service areas:

<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>none</td>
<td>about</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>greatest amount of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Items**
19. —— 29. ______ children
20. —— 30. ______ teachers
21. —— 31. ______ parents
22. —— 32. ______ schools
23. —— 33. ______ community
24. —— 34. ______ profession

This section is asking about specific things in your current job which provide satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The following is a list of such things that you may have thought of. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with these things?

Please check each item once in this manner:

- Extremely satisfied--mark it 5
- Moderately satisfied--mark it 4
- Neutral--mark it 2
- Moderately dissatisfied--mark it 1
- Extremely dissatisfied--mark it 1

**Items**
25. _____ Performing challenging assignments on my job.
26. _____ Receiving recognition for a job well done.
27. _____ Work which requires the use of my best abilities.
28. _____ A feeling of achievement in the work I am doing.
Items
29. _____ The working relationship I have with my supervisor (or equivalent).
30. _____ The opportunity for advancement.
31. _____ Administration policies that affect the feelings of the employees.
32. _____ Working under a supervisor who really knows his/her job.
33. _____ A feeling of security in my job.
34. _____ The working relationship I have with my coworkers.
35. _____ Working under a supervisor who provides considerable freedom and very little constraint.
36. _____ The amount of responsibility I have on my job.
37. _____ A smooth and efficient work group with which to work.
38. _____ On the job training and experience that will help my personal growth.
39. _____ The opportunity for salary increases.
40. _____ Exceptionally good working conditions and equipment.
41. _____ Doing the kind of work I like.

This information is being requested in order to get a better description of the sample and to help interpret the information obtained from the other scales.

Depending on the question, please circle the correct number, or when requested, write in your response. Unless otherwise directed, please mark only one answer per question.
(1) Sex:
   1. Male
   2. Female

(2) Age:
   1. 20-29  
   2. 30-39  
   3. 40-49  
   4. 50-59  
   5. 60-69  
   6. 70-or over

(3) How many years have you worked as a school speech, language, and hearing clinician?
   1. 1-3  
   2. 4-6  
   3. 7-9  
   4. 10-12 
   5. 13-15 
   6. 16-18 
   7. 19-21 
   8. over 21 years

(4) Check the highest degree you have earned:
   1. B.A. or B.S.  
   2. M.A., M.S., or M.Ed.  
   3. Doctorate

(5) When was the most recent course you have taken for credit at a college or university?
   1. Before 1950  
   2. 1951-1960  
   3. 1961-1965  
   4. 1966-1970  
   5. 1971-1974

(6) Have you been in any kind of a workshop or institute (no college credit) to upgrade your professional skills?
   1. Yes ___ 
   2. No ___
(7) List the number of professional organizations in which you hold membership.
   1. Regional __
   2. State __
   3. National __

(8) Would you be interested in becoming a supervisor?
   1. Yes __
   2. No __

(10) Who is your immediate superior? (no names, only title) Write in answer.
   1. ___________________________

(11) Are you assigned to specific schools for a full year?
   1. Yes __
   2. No __

(12) Is it standard procedure to change the majority of your school building assignments from year to year?
   1. Yes __
   2. No __

(13) Do you have staff meetings for purposes other than administrative details and information sharing?
   1. Yes __
   2. No __

(14) How many elementary schools do you serve?
   1. None 5. 9 to 12
   2. 1 6. 13 to 16
   3. 2 to 4 7. 17 to 20
   4. 5 to 8 8. more than 20
(15) How many junior high or middle schools do you serve?
   1. None
   2. 1
   3. 2 to 4
   4. 5 to 8
   5. 9 to 12
   6. 13 to 16
   7. 17 to 20
   8. more than 20

(16) How many schools do you serve?
   1. None
   2. 1
   3. 2 to 4
   4. 5 to 8
   5. 9 to 12
   6. 13 to 16
   7. 17 to 20
   8. more than 20

(17) What type of scheduling do you use?
   1. Intensive (block) system
   2. Traditional (therapy twice a week per school
   3. Combination of both
   4. Other

(18) What is your average case load per year?
   1. 0-40
   2. 41-60
   3. 61-80
   4. 80-100
   5. over 100

(19) Do the majority of your children receive individual therapy?
   1. Yes
   2. No

(20) How many days per year are you permitted for attendance at professional meetings or conferences?
   1. 1
   2. 2
   3. 3 to 5
   4. 6 to 8
   5. unlimited
   6. no policy on this matter
(21) Type of school system served:
1. City
2. County
3. Exempted village
4. Multi-district or multi-county

(22) Size of school system (for county system indicate total pupil population)
1. under 1,000
2. 1,000-2,999
3. 3,000-4,999
4. 5,000-9,999
5. 10,000-24,999
6. 25,000-49,999
7. 50,000-74,999
8. 75,000-100,000
9. over 100,000

(23) Number of full-time school clinicians on your staff:
1. 1 or less
2. 1 to 2
3. 3 to 5
4. 6 to 8
5. 9 to 12

(24) Of the student and community population you serve, which of the following best describes those populations?
1. Rural only
2. Suburban only
3. Urban only
4. Inner City only
5. Rural-Suburban
6. Urban-Inner City
7. Other

(25) Of the student and community population you serve, which of the following socio-economic levels best describes the majority of the people in those populations?
1. Lower
2. Lower-Middle
3. Middle
4. Upper-Middle
5. Upper
APPENDIX B

Factor Analysis with Complete Loadings
## Factor Analysis with Complete Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>Reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>Warmth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>Protestant Work Ethic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>Work with Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>Work with Community and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>Appreciation from Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>Appreciation from Community and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>Work with Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>Work with Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>Personal Relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21  .47  .25  .10  .15  .09  .35  .27  .27  Administration and Supervision
22  -.60  -.13  .18  .01  .04  .00  -.06  -.15  Organization Expectancy of Devotion
23  -.35  -.09  .02  .06  .00  -.14  -.31  -.32  Conflict-Competition
24  .37  .15  .19  .01  -.08  .26  .37  .23  Friendly Social Atmosphere
25  .26  .00  .11  -.08  .09  .31  .23  .13  Reward Based Upon Performance
26  -.70  -.07  .08  -.03  -.01  .11  -.02  -.09  Pressure
27  -.36  -.03  .00  -.01  .02  -.09  -.31  -.26  Status Differentiation
28  -.58  .07  .01  -.09  .03  -.04  -.04  -.07  Constraints
29  .32  .25  .12  -.06  -.02  .13  .29  .23  Flexibility-Innovation
30  .18  .35  .13  -.13  .05  .32  .38  .25  Knowledge of Results
31  .54  .23  .07  .04  .00  -.07  .16  .27  Delegation of Responsibility
32  -.05  .24  .10  -.07  .02  .34  .30  .28  Job Standards
33  .21  .28  .16  -.16  .02  .27  .34  .26  Organization Clarity
34  .28  .14  .24  .04  .19  .24  .30  .27  Overall Job Satisfaction
35  -.02  .05  .51  -.03  .22  -.16  .16  .11  Effort Expended
36  -.03  -.24  .08  -.06  -.06  -.18  .22  .39  Sex
37  -.03  .06  .06  .06  .77  .00  .08  -.04  Age
38  -.14  .09  .05  .15  .81  -.03  .02  -.01  Experience
39  .04  .25  -.02  .10  .30  -.11  .10  -.16  Highest Degree
40  -.03  .07  .03  .07  -.43  -.11  .03  -.11  Recent Course
41  -.06  -.11  .13  .10  .01  .09  .00  -.12  Workshops
42  -.05  .16  .09  .10  .19  -.05  -.07  -.24  Memberships in Organizations
43  .01  .18  .16  .11  -.11  -.24  .04  -.29  Interest in Supervision
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rank of Immediate Boss</th>
<th>Specific Schools for at Least One Year</th>
<th>Assignments not Shifted Yearly</th>
<th>Staff Meetings For Information Only</th>
<th>Number of Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Number of Junior High Schools</th>
<th>Number of Senior High Schools</th>
<th>Type of Schedule</th>
<th>Average Class Load</th>
<th>Lots of Individual Therapy</th>
<th>Days Off for Professional Meetings</th>
<th>Rural vs. Urban</th>
<th>Size of School System</th>
<th>Full Time School Clinicians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>.04 - .16 - .02 .07 .06 .10 .13 - .34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>.08 .05 .04 -.21 -.06 .12 -.33 .11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>-.03 -.12 .08 -.16 .12 -.08 -.01 .13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>-.11 -.33 -.09 -.05 .07 -.09 -.19 -.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>-.05 .03 -.05 .54 .10 -.15 .05 -.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>.04 -.05 .00 .67 .11 .09 -.07 .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>.02 -.08 .01 .75 .14 .05 -.10 -.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>-.18 -.05 -.04 .05 -.18 .23 .02 .03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>.03 -.10 .12 -.05 -.06 -.04 -.02 -.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>.01 .07 -.04 .15 -.13 .26 -.16 .21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>.11 -.09 .08 .27 -.05 .08 .02 -.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>.10 -.42 -.04 .29 -.03 -.06 .21 -.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>.03 .77 -.04 -.07 .01 -.09 .05 .19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>.04 .80 -.01 .04 .01 -.13 -.04 .29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.25 City (Inner city) vs. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.21 Socio-econ. Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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