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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem and Its Significance

Social work practice, in the main, occurs within organizations. The variety of settings whether public or private, secondary or primary does not obviate the influence of these organizations on the delivery of social work services or the need to better understand their functioning.

The history of the development of social work as a profession is linked inexorably with the development of the organizations within which it functions. According to Ryan, "the history of providing social welfare services to people is a history of differing organizational auspices for the provision of those services."\(^1\) This development has had reciprocal effects. Richan has stated that, in fact, social welfare organizations have dominated the profession to the detriment of the profession.\(^2\) Furthermore, those organizations not only influence the profession but in part


determine the behavior of the individual worker:

... the behavior of the individual social worker within an organization will be influenced by the posture his profession assumes at large, and that posture, in turn, will be modified as the constituency of professional employees find a particular stance more or less consistent with the demands of the work setting.3

It is "the demands of the work setting" which, in part, determine the performance and satisfaction of the social worker. In turn, these factors will influence the efficiency and effectiveness of the service delivery which are of concern to the profession, to the consumers of their services, and to society at large. Olmstead has formulated the problem concisely:

As in all organizations, managers of social welfare and rehabilitation agencies must be concerned with creating conditions that will be conducive to effective personnel performance. The establishment of such conditions requires knowledge of the numerous factors within an organization that may impact upon performance and of ways that these factors may be managed for best results.4

Various studies in the social welfare field have been directed toward the determination of those factors influencing workers' performance. The extremely high rate of personnel turnover and other indicies of dissatisfaction

---

3Ibid., p. 148.

have stimulated efforts at examining the service delivery organizations' structure, potential conflicts between organizational goals and professional goals, potential conflicts between organizational expectations and professional expectations, and other organizational constraints. While these studies have contributed significantly to the professions' knowledge of social welfare agency functioning and its effects on professional workers, one critical variable of organizational climate, leadership, has received relatively little attention.5

In the field of general organizational theory, Hersey and Blanchard have asserted that:

... the successful organization has one major attribute that sets it apart from unsuccessful organizations: dynamic and effective leadership.6

The success or lack of success of a social welfare agency seems to depend entirely upon the performance of its workers rather than upon the production of goods; consequently, the relationship between leadership and performance assumes importance. In an extensive analysis of the organizational factors operating in social welfare and rehabilitation

5 Ibid, p. 110.

agencies, Olmstead concluded that:

Thus supervisory leadership is a critical
determinant in the satisfaction and per-
formance of social welfare and rehabilitation
workers, and this factor appears to warrant
much more research and management attention
than it has received.7

Among the variables which have been hypothesized to
be influenced by leadership behaviors are job satisfaction
and job performance. While the evidence appears to be clear
that a causal relationship exists between leadership practices
and job satisfaction, the evidence is inconclusive as to the
relationship between leadership behaviors and job performance
or between job satisfaction and job performance.8 However,
there is theory and empirical evidence to support the
assumption that the relationship between leadership behavior,
job satisfaction and job performance might be stronger among
professionals in social welfare and rehabilitation organiza-
tions than in production organizations and non-professional
workers.

The definition of a "profession", and consequently
"professionals", has received considerable attention.
Essentially, the core elements of a profession are a body of
theoretical knowledge, specific skills and competencies, and

7Olmstead, p. 111.

8Ralph M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership: A
Survey of Theory and Research (New York: The Free Press,
1974); also, Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal
a code of ethics.⁹ In the field of social work, Scott has asserted that social work does not meet these criteria, and it is at best a "semiprofession".¹⁰ Conversely, Hall has concluded that, "there is probably no argument over the proposition that social work is a profession."¹¹ For the purposes of this study Toren's conception of a continuum of professionalism was adopted. Social work activity is more or less professional dependent upon the degree of autonomy of practice. The most professional setting for social workers is community mental health centers.¹² Consequently, the assumption utilized in this study is that social workers functioning in mental health centers are professionals.

In support of these assumptions, at least two studies have demonstrated much more clearly defined correlations between the satisfaction and performance of professional


social welfare workers and the leader behavior of their supervisors than found in studies of production workers. The number of studies on leadership, job satisfaction and job performance are few in number, and those studies which do exist tend to focus on intra-system effects and do not deal with leadership influence across subsystem boundaries or in systems of interdisciplinary settings.

In short, it has been suggested that social welfare and rehabilitation agencies need to understand the organizational factors bearing upon the individual professional within that organization. One of the crucial variables seems to be the behaviors of the leaders in the organization. These behaviors appear to be related in some manner to the satisfaction and performance of the workers. Since the effectiveness of social welfare agencies is dependent upon the performance of these professionals, the relationship between the leadership in social welfare agencies and the job satisfaction and performance of the professionals in the agencies assumes importance.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this study, then, was to study the impact of differing leadership behaviors within and across

subsystem boundaries upon social work and similar professional's job satisfaction and job performance. In more concise form, the research question was stated as follows:

Does differing leadership behaviors operate within subsystems and between subsystems to affect the job satisfaction and job performance of social workers and related professionals?

In a broader sense, the research sought to examine:

(1) the concept of leadership behavior, and (2) its impact within the social welfare and rehabilitation field.

Essentially, the question was: are professionals in the social welfare and rehabilitation field more responsive to differing leader behaviors than in other fields? A question related to the previous one is: does the influence of particular leader behaviors impact upon the effectiveness of social welfare and rehabilitation agencies by influencing the satisfaction and performance of the key factors in the delivery of services—the professional workers?

Consideration of these questions led to a choice of community mental health centers and the directors of the administrative districts in which they were situated as the settings for the study. The rationale for this decision rested upon three assumptions. First, mental health centers traditionally have functioned with interdisciplinary staff, and they seemed to offer the most available opportunity to compare the reaction of social workers to differing leadership behaviors with those of other mental health professionals. While there is no available data to support the opinion that
social workers might differ in their reactions, in fact there is some suggestion that they are quite similar, the recent increase in multidiscipline, multifaceted approaches to problem solving in other areas (e.g., income maintenance corrections, civil rights, medical care) suggests that the approaches to mental health work might serve as models of problem solving in other areas in the future.\footnote{Robert W. Weinbach, "Identification with the Social Work and Mental Health Professions as Factors Relating to Social Worker Job Satisfaction and Job Performance: An Inquiry into the Value of the Interprofessional Model" (Ph. D. Dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1972).} Consequently, knowledge of the reactions of mental health professionals to leadership behaviors has implications for future social welfare programs. The second assumption was that the mental health setting most closely approximates a totally professional setting in the social welfare system. Furthermore, as compared to other social welfare agencies (e.g., Public Welfare Departments or Departments of Vocational Rehabilitation), community mental health centers appear to operate with less of the effects of bureaucratization: i.e., less rigid structure and procedures, more free-flowing communication patterns, less rigid role definitions, and more flexible job functions. Community mental health centers, then, were chosen in an attempt to minimize the effects which might be attributable to the structural aspects of a bureaucracy. The final factor in the decision to use community mental health centers was the administrative structure arrangement
of the Ohio Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation.
This structure delineated distinct subsystems which directly
impact on each other. Given a general systems theory of
organizational functioning, it was assumed that this struc-
ture would allow the testing of the effects of leader
behaviors as forms of information flow across subsystem
boundaries.

Summary
There are indications that the behaviors of leaders
as perceived by their workers effect the job satisfaction and
job performance of these workers. Furthermore, the literature
suggests that the relationships among these variables have
more impact on social welfare and rehabilitation professionals
than in other groups. This research was focused on the
exploration of these hypothesized relationships between leader
behavior, job satisfaction, and job performance among mental
health professionals in community mental health settings. Of
even more central concern to this study was the determination
of what aspects of leadership were impacting on what dimensions
of job satisfaction and job performance among these
professionals.

It is hoped that the findings of this research will
have relevance for the field of mental health, the field of
social work, and for the broader area of social welfare
services. If social problems are to be effectively addressed,
knowledge which increases our understanding of the factors
enhancing or mitigating against the success of service delivery organizations is of paramount importance.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Leadership

Any attempt to venture into the literature on leadership immediately plunges one into a morass of conflicting empirical findings, contradictory definitions and concepts, and complex sets of relationships for which there appear to be no simple explanations. Fiedler has referred to the literature on leadership behavior as "a mass of content without coagulating substances to bring it together or to produce coordination."\(^1\) Stogdill concluded that there were almost as many definitions of leadership as there were persons defining the concept.\(^2\) Consideration of these same factors led the Lashbrooks to assert that while the production rate of leadership studies is high and increasing the accumulation of knowledge is not significant.\(^3\)


This bewildering array of research has been guided primarily by seven theories or approaches. These are the great man, trait situational, style, functional, social influence, and interaction positions. By the end of World War II, the exploration of "traits" of leaders had led to an impasse. In 1948, Stogdill reviewed the literature in leadership and established a classification scheme for leadership traits; however, he mentioned that these characteristics may vary with the situation (group characteristics and goals). Furthermore, Stogdill noted that the traits which had been related to leadership were not consistently related to leadership. Research and theory since 1945 and the beginning of the Ohio State Leadership studies have tended to focus on the interactional determinants of leadership effectiveness. Stogdill has asserted that:

Theorists no longer explain leadership solely in terms of the individual or the group. Rather, it is believed that characteristics of the individual and demands of the situation interact in such a manner as to permit one, or perhaps a few, persons to rise to leadership status. Groups become structured in

---


terms of positions and roles during the course of member interaction. A group is organized to the extent that it acquires differentiated positions and roles. Leadership represents one or more of the differentiated positions in a group. The occupants of a leadership position are expected to play roles that differ from the roles of other group members.

In a thoughtful analysis of the theoretical approaches to small group leadership, Lashbrook concluded that the only approach which met the criteria of a theory was the interactional one formulated by Gibb. Furthermore, their methodological evaluation of the state of leadership research pointed out five basic criticisms of the state of the art. First, there is a wide variation in the rigor and methodologies employed. Secondly, the reporting of research is equally variable. The third consideration is that leadership researchers lack a shared language resulting in great diversity and operationalization of leadership and related variables. Fourth, replication of leadership studies is almost nonexistent. Finally, there is a lack of multivariate and process oriented analysis of leadership.

One interaction theory which seems to be solidly based on research findings is Stogdill's theory of Individual

---


Behavior and Group Achievement. It is a painstaking job of piecing together research in an effort to identify emerging patterns. In Beer's opinion, the theory successfully explains some of the conflicting results that have been obtained in investigations of job satisfaction, production, and leadership. Essentially, Stogdill's expectancy-reinforcement theory asserts that as group members interact and engage in mutual task performance, they reinforce the expectation that each will continue to act and interact in accord with his previous performance.

Thus, the individual's role is defined by mutually confirmed expectations relative to the performances and interactions he will be permitted to contribute to the group. The leadership potential of any given member is defined by the extent to which he initiates and maintains structure in interaction and expectation.

Beer summarized the essential elements of Stogdill's theory as:
The output of organizations are group integration, production and morale. Satisfaction of members' expectations lead to group integration and cohesiveness but is not related to production. Rather, production is a function of group structure as is morale (defined

---


as group enthusiasm to achieve group goals). Thus, morale and production are positively related to satisfaction only when conditions that lead to high morale and production, namely freedom of action for group members, lead to the reinforcement of workers' expectations. It is evident that Stogdill recognizes a complexity in the relationship between production, satisfaction, and morale that none of the other theorists recognize.  

In part, this theoretical framework is based on research conducted during the Ohio State University Leadership Studies, and the resultant leadership measurement instrument which was used in this study is consistent with Stogdill's theory. Since the theory appeared to satisfy the Lashbrook criticisms, offered an explanatory relationship between leadership, production, and satisfaction, and had available a test instrument congruent with the theory, it was adopted as the theoretical basis for this study.

Any examination of the empirical research on leadership must begin with Stogdill's most recent publication.  

Stogdill began the task of reviewing and abstracting the literature on leadership in 1946 culminating in his first review in 1948. Systematic abstracting has continued resulting in The Handbook of Leadership, 1974. More than

---

12Beer, p. 5.
13Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership.
14Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature."
five thousand abstracts were prepared. Deleted were studies only indirectly related to leadership or of an inspirational or advisory orientation. Since this reference is the most comprehensive analysis of leadership available, the summary of research which follows is drawn exclusively from this source.

In an introduction to the summary of studies on the "payoff" efforts of leadership (i.e., follower beliefs, satisfaction, behavior, productivity, drive, and cohesiveness), Stogdill asserts that the range of research conducted has been limited by a certain degree of theoretic bias. While hundreds of reviews of leadership research and opinion are available, they tend to consider the same small collection of studies over and over again resulting in the same misconceptions being perpetuated. Furthermore, the breadth and "purity" of leader behaviors studied are varied. In the studies of follower satisfaction and group productivity, definitions and differential measurements compound the problem of comparisons. While some studies measure global variables, others are related to narrowly defined and measured factors.

In order to compare the results of numerous studies, Stogdill formed two categories (person-oriented leader behavior and work-oriented leader behavior) and compared the results.

---

16 Ibid, p. 364.
in terms of effects on productivity, satisfaction, and cohesiveness of the group. As operationalized by the majority of researchers in the field, person-oriented leader behaviors (democratic, permissive, participative, follower-oriented, and considerate) are characterized by a primary focus on the social-emotional needs of the group as contrasted to a strict task focus. The second category, work-oriented leader behaviors (autocratic, restrictive, distant, directive and structured), was established to designate those activities of the leader, as defined by the original researchers, directed primarily toward the achievement of specific tasks or goals. Person-oriented leader behavior patterns are often treated as synonymous, yet they differ in their conceptualizations. The same consideration is true for work-oriented leadership patterns. Not only do they differ conceptually, they also exert differing effects on member satisfaction, group productivity and cohesiveness.17

In a tabulation of the findings of 93 studies utilizing the person-oriented leader behavior effect on productivity, the ratio of positive to zero and negative relationships is 47 to 46. This conglomerate pattern (person-oriented leader behaviors) is not related to productivity. Follower-oriented leadership, more than the other conglomerate variables, bears a positive relationship to

17Ibid, p. 403.
productivity (19 positive, 5 zero, and 3 negative).¹⁸

Work-oriented behaviors, however, seem to be related to productivity. Forty-seven studies demonstrated positive relationships to 33 zero and negative relationships between leader work-oriented behaviors and productivity. Two exceptions are autocratic and restrictive leader behaviors which tended to be unrelated to productivity. Behavior which is task-oriented, as often as not, is negatively related to productivity. Structuring behaviors, directive, and socially distant behavior are related positively to this factor.

The findings on the relationship of these two conglomerate categories to job satisfaction tends to be clearer. Person-oriented behaviors by a ratio of 48 positive to 16 zero and negative relationships indicates that these behaviors enhance employee satisfaction. Work-oriented behaviors tend to depress satisfaction (14 positive to 19 zero or negative studies). However, initiating structure is more often than not positively related to satisfaction.

Cohesiveness of the work group, in general, is positively associated with person-oriented behaviors (20 positive to 11 zero and negative findings) with the exception of permissive leader behavior which more often than not is related negatively to cohesiveness. Conversely, work-oriented behaviors tend to inhibit group cohesiveness.

¹⁸For the tabulations quoted and Stogdill's conclusions see Stogdill, ibid., pp. 403-420.
(9 positive to 7 zero and negative findings) with one notable exception. All of the relationships between initiating structure and cohesiveness are positive.

Stogdill has pointed out the error of equating initiating structure with autocratic, restrictive, and directive patterns of behavior.\textsuperscript{19} Initiating structure differs from these behaviors on two counts: (1) the items in the latest revision of the initiating structure scale describe expectancy behaviors of the followers and leader, and these behaviors are neither autocratic, restrictive, directive, nor task pressure oriented; (2) initiating structure has been shown to be positively correlated with satisfaction and group cohesiveness in contrast to the other work-oriented leader behaviors.

The previous summary is complicated by findings which indicates that task structure and group size influence the effectiveness of any particular form of leader behavior. Satisfaction of members in small, interaction-oriented groups is associated with person-oriented leadership while work-oriented leadership is associated with member satisfaction in large task-oriented groups. Group productivity is positively influenced by person-oriented leadership under conditions of medium structure and stress. On the other hand, work-oriented leadership increases productivity under

\textsuperscript{19}Ibid, p. 405.
conditions of very low or very high structure and stress.

While cohesiveness and satisfaction seem to respond to the same leader behaviors, cohesiveness and productivity seem to respond to two different patterns of leader behavior. In order to have a group that is both productive and cohesive, a leader needs to exhibit some degree of both forms of behavior. Stogdill asserts that this statement represents an oversimplification of the problem since there appears to be interactional effects dependent upon the situation.\(^{20}\)

In a summary of these findings, Stogdill set forth six statements:

1. Person-oriented patterns of leader behavior are not consistently related to productivity.
2. Among the work-oriented patterns, only those behaviors that maintain role differentiation and let followers know what to expect are consistently related to group productivity.
3. Among the person-oriented behaviors, only those providing freedom for member participation in group activities and showing concern for followers' welfare and comfort are consistently related to group cohesiveness.
4. Among the work-oriented behaviors, only the pattern that structures member expectations is uniformly related to group cohesiveness.
5. All the person-oriented behaviors tend to be related positively to follower satisfaction.
6. Among the work-oriented behaviors, only that structuring expectations is more often than not related positively to follower satisfaction.\(^{21}\)

In summary, with the exception of large task-oriented groups under very high or low conditions of stress, productivity, 

\(^{20}\)Ibid., p. 407.

\(^{21}\)Ibid., p. 419.
satisfaction, and cohesiveness are related to leader behaviors which are considerate and structure initiating. Community mental health centers seem to be organizations of smaller groups, moderate stress, and task-oriented. However, the nature of the task is interactional, and task-completion is to a great extent dependent upon the satisfaction and cohesiveness of the group. Consequently, it is assumed that leaders in mental health agencies need to evidence both high initiating structure and high consideration behaviors.

A review of the research settings reflected in Stogdill's compendium revealed one weakness for the purposes of this study. This weakness is that the vast majority of research has been conducted in industrial, military, governmental, and educational settings. Very few studies have dealt with the effects of differing leadership behaviors on the satisfaction and performance of mental health professionals.

At least two studies suggest that there is reason to hypothesize that leadership behaviors, satisfaction and performance are directly connected in the case of professional social welfare and rehabilitation workers. Sindwani investigated these relationships in four Family Service Agencies. His results demonstrated a high correlation between leadership behavior, job performance and satisfaction.22

Utilizing the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (which was utilized in this study also), a multivariate measure of job satisfaction, and a multivariate measure of job performance, Sindwani found seven of the twelve measures of leadership behavior to be positively and significantly correlated with seven differing dimensions of job satisfaction. The leader behavior measures of tolerance of uncertainty, tolerance of freedom of action, persuasion, structure, role enactment, consideration, influence with superiors, and reconciliation of conflicting demands were all positively correlated with the general job satisfaction measure. Eight aspects of job satisfaction demonstrated significant and positive correlations with five dimensions of worker performance. General job satisfaction (satisfaction with the agency and its management) showed highly significant correlations with the relationship with clients, relationships with colleagues, and loyalty to the agency performance measures. In brief, those Family Service workers most satisfied with the agency leadership tended to be the ones rated best in their performance by their superiors.

For rehabilitation counselors, Aiken, et.al., conducted research which concluded that the most important aspect of employment in state rehabilitation agencies is the interpersonal relationship between supervisor and counselor. In this study, behavior of the supervisor was a far more important consideration in worker satisfaction than working
conditions or the reward system of the agency.\textsuperscript{23}

Along with these empirical findings, there are theoretical perspectives which support the hypothesis that professional mental health workers might be more responsive to leadership behavior than other groups. A number of theorists in the field of general organizational theory have addressed themselves to the potential conflict between the needs of the organization and the needs of the individual.\textsuperscript{24} Ryan, Toren, and W. Richard Scott have concluded that the emphasis of social workers on autonomy, non-authoritarian ideology, professional ethics, standards, and practices appears to conflict with the organizations' need for supervisory control.\textsuperscript{25} Consideration of these factors led Olmstead


to conclude that "supervisory leadership is a critical determinant in the satisfaction and performance of social welfare and rehabilitation workers. . . ." Consideration of these factors also lends credence to McGregor's conception of leadership as the means whereby the demands of the individual and the requirements of the organization can be reconciled.

Job Satisfaction and Job Performance

The development of the human relations school of organization theory brought about an increasing concern with the needs of the individual in organizations. Much research has been devoted to the specification of those factors in organizations that influence individual behavior. Strongly influenced by the writings of Maslow and Herzberg, the interactional view of organizational behavior has stimulated voluminous amounts of research on specific variables influencing the individual's job satisfaction and job performance and the relationship between these variables.


27 McGregor, p. 49.


Much of the research on job satisfaction has attempted to relate job satisfaction to structural aspects of organizations, to intrinsic satisfactions for the individual, or to various leadership styles. Difficulty has been experienced in obtaining clear results. Part of the difficulty has been the ambiguity of concepts, the lack of valid instruments, and conflicts in the conceptualization of job satisfaction as a unitary of multi-dimensional factor.

Yet, a review of the literature pertaining to turnover among social welfare personnel is convincing evidence of the need to continue exploration of the area of job satisfaction. Galambos and Wiggins reporting on the turnover rate among public assistance workers found that 55 percent separated from their job within a three year period. Ryan reviewed a number of studies which reported a similarly high rate of turnover among social welfare and rehabilitation agencies. One of the major grievances of separating workers was the lack of autonomy and the organizational constraints


31 Ryan, p. 46.


33 Ryan, pp. 48-50.
placed upon their professional activities.\textsuperscript{34}

In the field of general organizational theory, Argyris studied several organizations. From this study, he set forth a series of propositions in which he suggested that self-actualizing persons (as defined by Maslow) will react negatively to situations restricting their opportunities for personal growth.\textsuperscript{35} These propositions are substantiated to some extent in the field of social welfare by the findings of Denhardt\textsuperscript{36} and Bridges.\textsuperscript{37} Denhardt, studying the anti-poverty programs in Appalachia, found that "nonprofessionals" as well as professionals have a strong self-actualizing need that may create a conflict when they are employed in a traditional organizational structure. Bridges cited eighteen studies that were concerned with some aspect of job satisfaction among social workers.\textsuperscript{38} None of these studies considered organizational constraints as influential variables.

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., p. 49.
\textsuperscript{35} Chris Argyris, Personality and Organizations, p. 233.
\textsuperscript{37} Bridges, p. 101.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., pp. 106-114.
on job satisfaction. However, he concluded that research in job satisfaction has revealed a generally high level of satisfaction among social workers. Intrinsic factors, i.e., challenge and the opportunity to use knowledge and skills, were found to have the greatest importance to social workers.

Empirical work by Lawler and Porter, and supported by the findings of Siegel and Bowen and Slocum has demonstrated a relationship between the satisfaction of higher order needs and job satisfaction particularly among professional workers. Studies in job enrichment have shown a positive relationship between job enrichment and job satisfaction. Bobbitt, et al., has summarized studies by Turner and Lawrence and Blood and Kulin. These studies indicated that workers who hold middle class "work norms" respond favorably to job enrichment programs while other groups do not. Job enrichment programs with an emphasis

---

39 Ryan, p. 53.


on consideration for the employee, greater work autonomy, more responsibility placed on the employee, and greater recognition given the employee, then, can be expected to increase satisfaction among professional workers.

In general, those empirical studies and theoretical writings which have dealt with job satisfaction have also attempted to deal with the relationship between satisfaction and performance. There has been considerable debate as to whether a relationship exists between these variables, in what direction the relationship flows, and as to whether these variables are or are not both dependent upon some other variable. In the last forty years, researchers have examined these variables in a wide variety of work settings, diverse levels of personnel, a range of administrative and technological environments differing units of analysis, and with various measures of satisfaction and performance.44

Through the thirties and forties, many studies attempted to determine the factors related to job satisfaction; e.g. age, sex, education, occupation, and income. A common assumption of this research seemed to be that satisfaction directly affects performance.45 Reviewers of the vast array


of literature in the field have come to differing conclusions. Brayfield and Crockett concluded that there was little evidence that employee attitudes had any appreciable relationship with performance. 46 Another review of the same studies and time period reached the opposite conclusion. 47 Herzberg, et al., asserted that there was frequent evidence that positive job attitudes are favorable to increased productivity. While the correlations were low, the relationship between satisfaction and production did exist. In a more recent review, Vroom reached the same conclusion as Herzberg, et al. Twenty of the 23 correlations cited by Vroom are positive, with a median correlation of +.14 between satisfaction and performance. 48 While these relationships are low, the consistency of the findings suggests that a relationship does exist. 49

In a review of the theoretical propositions concerning the relationship between satisfaction and performance, Schwab and Cummings have identified three major points of view:

46 Ibid.


49 Lawler and Porter, p. 22.
1. The view that satisfaction leads to performance,
2. The view that the satisfaction-performance relationship is moderated by a number of variables,
3. The view that performance leads to satisfaction or is cyclic in nature.

The first view was primarily stimulated by the work of the early human relationists. Vroom has asserted that "... human relations might be described as an attempt to increase productivity by satisfying the needs of employees."\(^{51}\) Herzberg, et al., seem to represent a more recent human relations view.\(^{52}\) These researchers separate job variables into two groups, hygiene factors and motivators. The hygiene factors—supervision, working conditions, salary, etc.—are seen as potential sources of dissatisfaction but not satisfaction. Satisfaction, and subsequent performance, are linked to motivators: i.e., challenging assignment, recognition, opportunity for professional growth, etc. The empirical basis for this stance is weak.\(^{53}\)

In the second view of the relationship between satisfaction and performance, the principal theorists are those

\(^{50}\text{Schwab and Cummings, p. 409.}\)
\(^{51}\text{Vroom, p. 181.}\)
\(^{53}\text{Pallone, et al., p. 474.}\)
of the "expectancy theory" school. These researchers argue that the relationship between satisfaction and performance is not a simplistic, monotonic one, but it is dependent upon a complex match between the employees expectations, abilities, and needs and the requirements of the work situation. A massive amount of work has been done in this area by Dawis and his colleagues at the University of Minnesota.

Dawis, et al., postulate that work adjustment is a function of employee satisfaction and satisfactoriness (performance). The correspondence between the individual's need set and the organization's reinforcer system is the major determinate of the individual's satisfaction and decision to remain with or separate from the organization. Satisfactoriness is the evaluation by the organization of the behavior of its members. This factor is assumed to be a function of the correspondence between the requirements of the job and the abilities possessed by the employee. Within this model is the possibility of a relation between satisfaction and satisfactoriness.

March and Simon offer an alternative, dynamic model which views satisfactions as a balance between inputs from

54 For examples, see Vroom, and Lyman W. Porter and Edward E. Lawler, Managerial Attitudes and Performance (Homewood, Illinois: Irwin, 1968).

expected value of reward and the levels of aspiration of the individual.\textsuperscript{56} This model suggests that both performance and satisfaction can serve as dependent variables.

The essential features of the third view, i.e., performance leads to satisfaction, can be summerized by Lawler and Porters' assertion that:

\textbullet \textbullet \textbullet good performance may lead to rewards, which in turn leads to satisfaction; this formulation then would say that satisfaction, rather than causing performance, as was previously assumed, is caused by it.\textsuperscript{57}

Empirical work by these writers has, in fact, demonstrated that there is a circular relationship involved between satisfaction and performance. However, the stronger relationship seems to be from performance to satisfaction. Slocum's research supported Lawler and Porters' findings, and he concluded that his findings might:

\textbullet \textbullet \textbullet also support a myriad of models positing a relationship between satisfaction and performance. Variables such as group integration, leadership, technology, and others yet to be explicates could also act as moderators of the relationship between performance and satisfaction.\textsuperscript{58}


\textsuperscript{57} Lawler and Porter, p. 23.
One failure of the Porter and Lawler model is the lack of accounting for all sources of employee satisfactions. Wanous, for example, using cross-lagged and dynamic correlations of satisfaction and performance based on Lawler and Porters' formulations found a positive relationship between satisfaction and performance but the direction of causality was unclear. Moreover, when job satisfaction was split into intrinsic and extrinsic components, the direction of causality varied. He concluded that a reciprocal causal view of job satisfaction and performance was confirmed by his study, but there probably is no single "correct" relationship between satisfaction and performance.

Based on both generic and the limited social welfare literature, the following assumptions served as a framework for this study: (1) professional social welfare and rehabilitation workers experience dissatisfaction as a result of organizational constraints placed on their activities and autonomy, (2) professional workers have a drive toward the satisfaction of higher order needs, (3) satisfaction of these higher order needs leads to satisfaction with the organization in which they function, and (4) there is a direct relationship between job satisfaction and performance

58 Slocum, p. 435.


60 Ibid., p. 143.
although the directionality is uncertain. Furthermore, both
of these variables can be perceived as dependent variables.

Organizations

Leadership, job performance and satisfaction exist
only within the setting of an organization. Since the organi-
zational setting is the background for the variables under
consideration in this research, some perusal of the literature
is essential to gain a perspective on this dimension.

The literature on organizational theory is volu-
minous in quantity and diverse in quality. Essentially, the
theoretical writings reflect three distinct conceptions of
organizations. The classical view of organizations was
strongly influenced by the writings of Max Weber. Classical
organization theory is built around four key concepts which
are: the division of labor, the scalar and functional
processes, structure, and span of control.61 Emphasis on the
structural, rational aspects of organizations has serious
limitations for all organizations62 and particularly for

61 William G. Scott, "Organization Theory: An Over-
view and an Appraisal," in Managerial Behavior and Organi-
zational Demands, eds. Robert T. Golembieski and Frank K.
62 Olmstead, p. 91.
human services organizations staffed by professionals.63

A more recent view of organizations is represented by the human relations school. This school of thought is based, to a great extent, on Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory64 and Herzberg's research.65 While the classical theorist focused exclusively on the structure of the organization to the detriment of the individual, the human relationist focused on the social-psychological effects of the organization on the individual and ways in which the conflict between the needs of the individual and the needs of the organization might be reconciled.

Several theorists have focused on this perceived conflict between the individual and organization as the key factor on which to build their theories.66 Studies of "job enrichment," job satisfaction, and various conception of new organizations evolved from this school. The primary limitation of this school of thought is similar to that of the classical school, i.e., in focusing on only one aspect of organizational functioning they have failed to account for

65 Herzberg, Mauser, and Snyderman.
66 Etzioni; Argyris; McGregor.
organizational functioning as a whole.

The third school of thought, modern organization theory, relies heavily on general systems theory. A holistic view of the organization has emerged that incorporates many of the notions from both the classical and human relations view. Bennis has criticized the traditional approaches as being "out-of-joint" with the emerging view of organizations as adaptive, problem solving systems and that conventional criteria of effectiveness are not sensitive to the critical needs of the organization to cope with external stress and change. Katz and Kahn and Shein have emphasized the systemic nature of organizations and the need to focus on processes within organizations rather than on invariant aspects of the organization. For social welfare agencies, Olmstead has asserted the importance of learning precisely how these processes affect and contribute to performance. For the purposes of this study, the modern

67 Ryan, p. 35.
68 Bennis, pp. 34-36.
71 Olmstead, p. 103.
organizational theory perspective was adopted.

With the assumption that mental health workers are professionals, another conflict which appeared to have implications for this study must be mentioned. Etzioni, Scott, French, and Ryan have detailed the incompatibility between the expectations of the professional and those of the organization which might create a conflict for the professional.\(^2\) Scott\(^7\) and Toren\(^7\) have asserted that for social workers the restriction of autonomy is one of the greatest conflicts between the professional and the bureaucracy in which they function.

**Specification of Variables Studied**

The research question addressed in this study dealt with the relationship between leadership behaviors and job satisfaction and performance among social welfare professionals. Several factors were suggested by the literature to be considered in evaluating this relationship. First, differing leadership behaviors have been found to be related to job satisfaction and performance. Considerate, follower-

---


\(^7\) W. Richard Scott.

\(^7\) Nina Toren.
oriented behaviors tend to be positively correlated with job satisfaction and cohesiveness of the work group while work-oriented behaviors tend to be related to increased productivity. However, initiating structure is positively correlated with satisfaction, cohesiveness, and productivity. A cautionary note is that productivity is not necessarily the same as performance. Pepinsky and Pepinsky have pointed out that each organization has its own relevant definition of productivity; furthermore, each individual within an organization has his own definition.75 Similarly, Likert has cautioned that a single effectiveness measure, "such as productivity," may be unrealistic.76 For these reasons, performance, which is inclusive of but broader than productivity, was utilized in this study.

The second major consideration is that social welfare professionals have strong drives toward satisfaction of self-actualization needs which are increased and confounded, in bureaucratic organizations, by professional ideals of autonomy and practice. Satisfaction of these individual and professional needs seems to lead to satisfaction with the work organization. Furthermore, there appears to exist a


relationship between the job satisfaction and the job performance of an individual professional.

Finally, organizations can be perceived of as dynamic systems responding to information exchanges across system boundaries. In this study, the assumption was made that leadership behaviors are a major source of information flow between subsystem; consequently, interest was directed toward information flows in the form of leadership behaviors across the subsystem boundaries of one larger system.

The hypothesized relationship utilized in this study was based on the research framework suggested by Olmstead to studying social welfare agencies. In his opinion, three broad classes of variables must be studied simultaneously. There are: (1) impact variables; (2) mediating variables; and (3) dependent variables. Impact variables are those factors which can be classed as input predictors or independent variables. Two major types of input variables are: (a) structural factors of the organization; (b) organizational climate factors. Mediating variables are those attitudes, perceptions, and motivations of personnel which affect performance and employee satisfaction. Dependent variables are the various aspects of employee performance and job satisfaction considered as two more or less independent variables.

---

Olmstead, p. 115.
In the research on leadership, leader behaviors are, in general, treated as the impact (independent) variable, and this tradition was continued in this study. Job satisfaction has been treated both as a dependent and independent variable; however, job satisfaction can be also viewed as an attitude, perception or motivation, i.e., a mediating variable in Olmstead's perspective.\textsuperscript{78} In this study, job satisfaction was treated as a mediating variable between the independent variable, leadership and the dependent variable, job performance.

**Hypotheses**

With this information as a basis, the focal research objective was stated as:

To measure variations in job performance and job satisfaction and between job performance and job satisfaction as a function of leadership behavior within a subsystem and across subsystem boundaries.

The major hypotheses which were derived from this objective, along with the direction suggested by the literature, are:

**Major Hypothesis 1.** Mental health professionals having leaders who exhibit high levels of both consideration and initiating structure behaviors will demonstrate a significantly higher level of job satisfaction than mental health professionals with leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors within an administrative sub-system.

\textsuperscript{78}Ibid.
Sub-Hypothesis 1a. Mental health professionals having leaders who exhibit high levels of both consideration and initiating structure behaviors will demonstrate a significantly higher level of intrinsic job satisfaction than mental health professionals with leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors within an administrative subsystem.

Sub-Hypothesis 1b. Mental health professionals having leaders who exhibit high levels of both consideration and initiating structure behaviors will demonstrate a significantly higher level of extrinsic job satisfaction than mental health professionals with leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors within an administrative subsystem.

Sub-Hypothesis 1c. Mental health professionals having leaders who exhibit high levels of both consideration and initiating structure behaviors will demonstrate a significantly higher level of general job satisfaction than mental health professionals with leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors within an administrative subsystem.

Major Hypothesis 2. Within an administrative subsystem, there will be a positive correlation between job satisfaction and the job performance of mental health professionals.

Sub-Hypothesis 2a. The job performance variable, quality of work, will demonstrate a positive significant correlation with the variables of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction.

Sub-Hypothesis 2b. The job performance variable, volume of work, will not be significantly correlated with any of the variables of job satisfaction.

Sub-Hypothesis 2c. The job performance variable, order and system, will not be significantly correlated with any of the variables of job satisfaction.
Sub-Hypothesis 1a. Mental health professionals having leaders who exhibit high levels of both consideration and initiating structure behaviors will demonstrate a significantly higher level of intrinsic job satisfaction than mental health professionals with leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors within an administrative subsystem.

Sub-Hypothesis 1b. Mental health professionals having leaders who exhibit high levels of both consideration and initiating structure behaviors will demonstrate a significantly higher level of extrinsic job satisfaction than mental health professionals with leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors within an administrative subsystem.

Sub-Hypothesis 1c. Mental health professionals having leaders who exhibit high levels of both consideration and initiating structure behaviors will demonstrate a significantly higher level of general job satisfaction than mental health professionals with leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors within an administrative subsystem.

Major Hypothesis 2. Within an administrative subsystem, there will be a positive correlation between job satisfaction and the job performance of mental health professionals.

Sub-Hypothesis 2a. The job performance variable, quality of work, will demonstrate a positive significant correlation with the variables of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction.

Sub-Hypothesis 2b. The job performance variable, volume of work, will not be significantly correlated with any of the variables of job satisfaction.

Sub-Hypothesis 2c. The job performance variable, order and system, will not be significantly correlated with any of the variables of job satisfaction.
Sub-Hypothesis 2d. Enthusiastic effort, a job performance variable, will be positively and significantly correlated with general job satisfaction.

Sub-Hypothesis 2e. The job performance variable of persistence will be significantly and negatively correlated with the job satisfaction variable of extrinsic job satisfaction and will not be significantly correlated with the variables of intrinsic and general job satisfaction.

Sub-Hypothesis 2f. The job performance variable of loyalty will be positively and significantly correlated with the job satisfaction variables, extrinsic and general.

Sub-Hypothesis 2g. The job performance variable, relationship to clients, will demonstrate a significantly positive correlation with all job satisfaction variables.

Sub-Hypothesis 2h. The job performance variable, relationship to colleagues, will demonstrate a significantly positive correlation with all job satisfaction variables.

Major Hypothesis 3. The distribution of high job satisfaction scores for mental health agency directors who relate to area executives demonstrating high consideration and initiating structure leader behaviors is not statistically different from the distribution of high job satisfaction scores of their workers, and this relationship will not hold true with any other combination of leader behaviors.

Sub-Hypothesis 3a. The distribution of high intrinsic job satisfaction of mental health center directors who relate to area executives demonstrating high consideration and initiating structure leader behaviors is not statistically different from the distribution of high intrinsic job satisfaction of their workers.

Sub-Hypothesis 3b. The distribution of high extrinsic job satisfaction of mental health center directors who relate to area executives demonstrating high consideration and
initiating structure leader behaviors is not statistically different from the distribution of high extrinsic job satisfaction of their workers.

Sub-Hypothesis 3c. The distribution of high general job satisfaction of mental health center directors who relate to area executives demonstrating high consideration and initiating structure leader behaviors is not statistically different from the distribution of high general job satisfaction of their workers.

Major Hypothesis 4. Within an administrative subsystem, mental health professionals having leaders exhibiting both high consideration and initiation of structure behaviors will demonstrate significantly higher levels of job performance than mental health professionals having leaders exhibiting any other combinations of these leader behaviors.

Sub-Hypothesis 4a. Mental health professionals having leaders with both high consideration and initiation of structure behaviors will demonstrate a significantly higher level of the quality of work job performance variable than mental health professionals having leaders exhibiting other combinations of these leader behaviors.

Sub-Hypothesis 4b. Mental health professionals having leaders with both high consideration and initiation of structure behaviors will not demonstrate a significantly higher level of the volume of work job performance variable than mental health professionals having leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors.

Sub-Hypothesis 4c. Mental health professionals having leaders with both high consideration and initiation of structure behaviors will not demonstrate a significantly higher level of the order and system job performance variable than mental health professionals having leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors.
Sub-Hypothesis 4d. Mental health professionals having leaders with both high consideration and initiation of structure behaviors will demonstrate a significantly higher level of the enthusiastic effort job performance variable than mental health professionals having leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors.

Sub-Hypothesis 4e. Mental health professionals having leaders with both high consideration and initiating structure behaviors will not demonstrate a significantly higher level of the persistence job performance variable than mental health professionals having leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors.

Sub-Hypothesis 4f. Mental health professionals having leaders with both high consideration and initiation of structure behaviors will demonstrate a significantly higher level of the loyalty job performance variable than mental health professionals having leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors.

Sub-Hypothesis 4g. Mental health professionals having leaders with both high consideration and initiation of structure behaviors will demonstrate a significantly higher level of the relationship to clients job performance variable than mental health professionals having leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors.

Sub-Hypothesis 4h. Mental health professionals having leaders with both high consideration and initiation of structure behaviors will demonstrate a significantly higher level of relationship to colleagues job performance variable than mental health professionals having leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors.
Definition of Terms

In consideration of the wide range of conceptualizations of the major variables in this study, definitions were chosen which were congruent with the objectives of the study. These were consistent with the operationalization of the study, and these appeared to reflect, at least, some consensus of the literature.

The major terms were defined as follows:

1. Organization—For the purpose of this study, Buechner's definition of an organization was accepted. An organization is, "a social unit (a human grouping) which has been deliberately constructed and reconstructed in order to seek specific goals." 79

2. Leadership—Leadership is an extremely complex social phenomenon which has been defined in a myriad of ways. To be consistent with the theory underlying the operationalization of leadership in this study, Stogdill's definition of leadership, "as the initiation and maintenance of structure in expectation and interaction," was accepted. 80 These dimensions were defined operationally in terms of the actual perceived behaviors of the leader as he directed the activities of the group.

80Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership, p. 411.
3. Leader—A leader was operationally defined as the person officially assigned a position of responsibility and delegated authority in order to exercise leadership in an organizational unit.

4. Job Satisfaction—The authors of The Theory of Work Adjustment which provides a theoretical base for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire have offered a general definition of job satisfaction:

Satisfaction is a function of the correspondence between the reinforcer system of the work environment and the individual's needs, provided that the individual's abilities correspond with the ability requirements of the work environments.  

Satisfaction, then, can be perceived as the individual's appraisal of the degree to which his needs are satisfied by the work environment.

5. Job Performance—Performance in a social welfare setting must be defined more broadly than simple productivity. Consideration must be given to the worker's relationships with users of the service, colleagues, persistance, effort, and quality of work as these factors constitute a contribution to the effectiveness of the agency. Broadly conceived, performance is a function of the correspondence between an individual's abilities and the ability requirements of the work environment. Since the subjective perceptions of a

81 Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership, p. 411.
82 Dawis, pp. 9-11.
supervisor are one measure of this correspondence, operationally, the performance of a professional will be defined as the rating of a supervisor along the aforementioned dimensions.

6. Administrative Levels—Each organization has various echelons or service levels in order to perform its functions effectively. At each level, there are persons performing various jobs assigned to them by a higher level.

In the next chapter, the methodology employed in this study is presented. Four major sections detail the design and procedure of the study, the instruments and rationale for their use, and the statistical procedures followed.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Study Population and Sampling

In previous chapters, a rationale has been presented for assuming that social workers employed in community mental health settings exercise the most autonomy, are least affected by bureaucratic structural arrangements, and engage in "professional" endeavors. Furthermore, it was assumed that there exists a need to explore the functioning of those organizations utilizing an interdisciplinary professional staff. Consequently, the decision was made to focus on professional workers in community mental health centers.

The sample was drawn from a population composed of the community mental health professionals working in the State of Ohio. Operationally, mental health professionals were defined as those persons employed in professional positions by the agencies of the Ohio State Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation. Since the study dealt with the leadership behaviors of two administrative level supervisors, the administrative structure of the state mental health services assumed some importance.

Administratively, the Ohio State Department of Mental Health and Retardation has established twelve districts
within the state which are headed by a district manager and
governing board. Primarily, these boards are for planning
purposes. Within each district are areas designed as "648
board areas" referring to the number of the state law leg-
islating their existence. The 648 advisory boards in con-
junction with the 648 area executive director are responsible
for planning for services for that area and for some dis-
tribution of funds to various agencies within the area. For
practical purposes, the 648 area executive director is the
administrative representative with whom mental health agency
directors must continually deal. Geographically, a 648 area
may be a county or multi-county, and it may encompass only a
few or many service agencies.

Within Ohio, there are twelve districts and fifty-
two 648 areas. Nine of these 648 areas were chosen as the
study sample on the basis of: (1) the area contained at
least three functioning mental health centers, and (2) geo-
graphic distribution. While twenty-four areas contained at
least three different types of services, only nine contained
three mental health centers. Three mental health centers
were necessary in order that the description of the 648 area
director's leader behaviors would be by at least three
persons (the center directors). Geographically, these areas
were distributed along a north-east corner to south-west
corner line.
In the nine 648 areas, thirty-two mental health centers were represented. Within each center, four staff members were tested. Total sample, then, was nine 648 area directors, thirty-two center directors, and 128 staff members; i.e., a total sample of 170.

Initial contact with the State Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation was made by an appointment with Dr. Paul McAvoy, Deputy Commissioner of Mental Health. Dr. McAvoy gave approval of the project and wrote a letter of recommendation to the 648 executive directors. Eight of the 648 area executive directors were interviewed in person to explain the research project and to elicit their cooperation in writing a letter of recommendation to the center directors in their area. The remaining 648 executive directors were contacted by telephone.

After receiving assurances of cooperation from the 648 area executive directors, letters explaining the project were sent to the mental health center directors in each area with the stipulation that a telephone call from the writer would be forthcoming to answer any questions. Telephone contact was established with twenty-two of the center directors, and further letters sent to the remainder not spoken with directly. Following this initial contact, the instruments were mailed out to the center directors and staff. The 648 area directors were given job performance rating forms to be filled out for the mental health center directors; the
mental health centers' directors received a LBDQ for the 648 area director, job performance rating forms to be completed on the staff members rating them and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire; and distributed to the staff members were the MSQ, and a LBDQ for the center director. At the end of three weeks, a reminder letter was mailed. Subsequent reminder letters and telephone calls were delivered to specific centers or persons not responding within certain time periods.

Of the total sample of 170, eighty were used in the data analysis. Six centers refused to participate either because of time demands or being a newly established center. Two centers were eliminated due to the lack of a director. Of the remainder, five centers did not participate for unknown reasons, and they did not respond to inquiries as to their nonparticipation. One entire 648 area did not respond, and another area was not used in the data analysis because the 648 director failed to send a performance rating on the mental health center directors in his area. In brief, a forty-seven percent response rate was obtained.

Relationship Among Variables

As stated in the hypothesis, this study attempted to study simultaneously certain impact (leadership), mediating (job satisfaction), and dependent (job performance) variables. This formulation is consistent with Olmstead's assertion that knowledge of social welfare organizations'
functioning will only come through such simultaneous measurement.

The impact variable, as defined by Olmstead, is synonymous with the concept of independent variable, defined by Rosenberg as a causal variable in an asymmetrical relationship. In an asymmetrical relationship, the independent variable is essentially responsible for the dependent variable. For the purposes of this study, leadership was considered to be primarily responsible for the dependent variable of job performance.

Mediating the relationship between leadership behaviors and job performance is the variable of job satisfaction. The concept of intervening variable, as defined by Rosenberg, clarifies the notion of a mediating variable. For a variable to be considered as intervening, three asymmetrical relationships must exist. First, there must be a relationship between the independent and dependent variable. Secondly, there must be a relationship between the independent and intervening variable. Finally, there must be a relationship between the intervening and dependent variable. In terms of relative strength, a quantitative difference must exist.


in these relationships in such a manner that the intervening variable is more strongly related to the independent variable than to the dependent variable.\textsuperscript{3} Job satisfaction, then, was assumed to be more closely related to leadership behaviors than to job performance; however, job satisfaction would be related to job performance, and leadership behaviors would be related to job performance. Since measurement of the variables in this study involved the assessment of multiple dimensions of each variable, attention was focused on the interactional effects of differing dimensions of each variable with every other variable rather than on just global measurements of leadership, job satisfaction, and job performance.

Included in the interactional assessment were certain demographic data thought to influence the independent and intervening variables. While various factors have been related to the variables under study, these relationships have not demonstrated any consistency. However, since the Sindwani study most closely approximates a similar population, there were certain demographic variables suggested by the Sindwani study which might have affect on leadership behavior, job satisfaction, and job performance.\textsuperscript{4} Information about these

\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., p. 57.

variables—age, sex, and years and months in the organization—was gathered. Added dimensions assessed were: professional identification, years and months as a professional, present job title, and years and months in this job. Each of these additional variables was assumed to have the potential of influencing the relationships among study variables.

Instruments were chosen which would test these relationships and which demonstrated sufficient reliability and validity.

Study Instruments

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed for use in obtaining descriptions of the behaviors of a supervisor by the group members whom he supervises. It can be used to describe the behavior of the leader in any group, provided the followers have had an opportunity to observe the leader in action.^5

In 1945, Shartle organized the Ohio State Leadership Studies to develop some satisfactory leadership theory.

---

^5 Ralph M. Stogdill, Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire - Form xii: An Experimental Revision (Ohio: The Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research, 1963), p. 1.
and empirical research. The trait theory focus of prior research had essentially been non-productive, and it had ignored the interactive component of leadership. Since the trait approach appeared to be a "dead-end" the approach selected, as suggested by Hemphill, by the Ohio State Leadership Studies staff was the study of the behaviors of leaders engaged in acts of leadership. From a list of 1800 descriptions of leader behaviors, 150 items achieved agreement among judges. These items became the first form of the LBDQ. Subsequent research found that a large number of hypothesized dimensions of leader behavior could be reduced to two strongly defined factors identified by Halpin and Winer as "Consideration" and "Initiation of


These two factorially defined subscales have been extensively used in empirical research in industrial, military, and educational settings. According to Halpin, several studies where the agreement among respondents in describing their respective leaders has been checked by a "between-group versus within-group" analysis of variance, the F ratios all have been found significant at the .01 level. "Followers tend to agree in describing the same leader, and the descriptions of different leaders differ significantly."12

While neither Halpin and Croft nor Stogdill were satisfied that two factors could adequately describe leader behavior, the decision was made to limit the analysis in this study to these two strongest factors, i.e. Consideration and Initiation of Structure.13 The rationale for this

---


11 For a summary, see R. M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership, op.cit., pp. 128-155; or R. M. Stogdill, Manual for the LBDQ - Form XII, op.cit.

12 A. W. Halpin, Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Mimeo (Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1957).

13 A. W. Halpin and D. B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools, Mimeo (St. Louis: Washington University, 1962); R. M. Stogdill, op.cit.
decision rests on the findings of Halpin and Winer that 83 percent of the factorial variance is related to these factors and, in social work, the findings of Sindwani.\textsuperscript{14} Sindwani, in a study of social work leaders, utilized ten scales of the LBDQ. Both Initiation of Structure and Consideration were positively correlated (significance greater than .05) with seven of the other scales while being negatively correlated with two or one respectively. Those scales which were negatively correlated with Initiation of Structure were positively correlated with Consideration and visa versa. In essence, Sindwani's findings seem to suggest that the other scales are related directly to variations of the Consideration and Initiation of Structure scales. Since these findings appeared to be consistent with those of Halpin and Winer, the decision was made to utilize only the Consideration and the Initiation of Structure scales.

Form XII of the LBDQ is composed of twelve subscales with either five or ten items per scale. However, based on information obtained from Dr. Ralph Stogdill, only nine subscales were used in this study. The remaining three subscales have demonstrated insufficient independence and

\textsuperscript{14}Halpin and Winer, p. 51; Khairati L. Sindwani, "Leader Behavior in Social Work Administration" (Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1962), p. 36.
reliability to be of value. These nine subscales are:

1. **Representation**—speaks and acts as the representative of the group. (5 items)

2. **Demand Reconciliation**—reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to the system. (5 items)

3. **Tolerance of Uncertainty**—is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset. (10 items)

4. **Initiation of Structure**—clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected. (10 items)

5. **Tolerance of Freedom**—allows followers scope for initiative decision and action. (10 items)

6. **Role Assumption**—actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. (10 items)

7. **Consideration**—regards the comfort, well being, status, and contributions of followers. (10 items)

8. **Production Emphasis**—applies pressure for productive output. (10 items)

9. **Superior Orientation**—maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status. (10 items)

The LBDQ was designed as a research instrument; consequently, no norms have been established. However, reliability, validity, and subscale intercorrelations studies have been run. Using the data from nine different studies, modified Kuder-Richardson reliability measures were performed to determine the reliability of the subscales. These coefficients ranged from .55 to .91. Factor-analysis and intercorrelations of the scales revealed that, in general, each factor is strongly dominated by a single subscale, and

---

Ibid., p. 8.
that followers are able to describe their leaders in terms of several distinct factors.\textsuperscript{16}

In order to test the degree to which the scales measure that which they purport to measure (validity), Stogdill, with the assistance of a playwright, wrote a scenario for each of six subscales (consideration, structure, representation, tolerance of freedom, production emphasis, and superior orientation). Using experienced actors, each role, supervisor and worker, was played by two different actors, and each actor played two different roles. Motion pictures were made of the performances. No significant differences in the ratings on the LBDQ audiences were found between two different actors playing the same role. Stogdill concluded that the scales measure what they are purported to measure.\textsuperscript{17}

On the basis of this literature, it was concluded that the LBDQ - Form XII offered a multifactored, sufficiently reliable and valid approach to the study of leadership behavior to be used in this research.

\textsuperscript{16}Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership, p. 149.

\textsuperscript{17}Ralph M. Stogdill, "Validity of Leader Behavior Descriptions," Personnel Psychology 22 (Summer, 1969):153-158.
Job satisfaction, the intermediate variable in this study, was measured by the Short Form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). This instrument which is composed of twenty items representing twenty subscales measures three facets of job satisfaction— intrinsic factors, extrinsic factors, and general satisfaction. A Likert-type format with five response categories is used in the MSQ.

The MSQ was developed during the Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, University of Minnesota, as part of the instrumentation for the Theory of Work Adjustment.\(^\text{19}\) This theory uses the correspondence (or lack of it) between the work personality and the work environment as the principal reason or explanation for observed work adjustment outcomes (satisfactoriness, satisfaction, and tenure). Research springing from the theory resulted in the MSQ which measures satisfaction with several specific aspects of work and work environment making it feasible to gain a more individualized picture of worker satisfaction than was possible using gross or general measures of satisfaction with the job as a whole.\(^\text{20}\)

\(^{18}\)Permission to use this instrument was obtained from Dr. Lloyd H. Lofquist, University of Minnesota.


\(^{20}\)Ibid., p. vi.
In its long form, the MSQ is composed of twenty scales of five items each. A short form (used in this research) of the MSQ was developed by choosing 20 representative items, one from each scale. The chosen items were those which correlated the highest with their respective scales. From a sample of 1,460 employed men, data was factor-analyzed yielding two factors— intrinsic (e.g. type of work, achievement, ability utilization) and extrinsic (e.g. working conditions, supervision, co-workers, company) satisfaction. In addition, all 20 items were scored as one scale—general satisfaction.  

Validation of the instrument rests essentially on construct validity, although available data indicates that the MSQ scales have a generally high level of internal consistency reliabilities. For the long form, Hoyt reliability coefficients were established for 27 different norm groups, including a group of 166 social workers. The short form MSQ demonstrated generally high reliability coefficients similar to the long form. Test-retest correlations of General Satisfaction scale scores yielded coefficients of


23Ibid., p. 23.
.89 over a one-week period and .70 over a one-year period.\textsuperscript{24}

Construct validity seems to hold for the short form MSQ as well as the long form.\textsuperscript{25}

Of the available instruments, the MSQ seemed to present the best empirically established measure which would give an indication of the three major factors of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction.

Ratings of Mental Health Professional Performance

This instrument is designed to measure eight aspects of performance of a professional worker as viewed by his/her immediate superior. In its original form the instrument was developed by the Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research and Dr. R. M. Stogdill as an evaluation of different aspects of unit performance—group product, integration and morale.\textsuperscript{26} Sindwani, with Stogdill's guidance, adapted the instrument for use in studying leadership behaviors, job satisfaction, and job performance in Family Service Agencies.\textsuperscript{27}

A combined ranking and rating scheme is used in scoring the eight characteristics in order to reduce the likelihood of all items receiving equally favorable ratings.

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid. \hspace{1cm} 25Ibid.

\textsuperscript{26}Ralph M. Stogdill, Manual for the Ratings of Unit Performance (Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1958).

\textsuperscript{27}Khairati L. Sindwani.
Each of the eight characteristics is ranked in order of the worker's own performance, and each characteristic is rated on a three point scale in comparison with other workers. A composite score is derived which is more likely to produce a dispersion among the characteristics.28

While there is no specific data available on the reliability or validity of the scales, there is some inferential evidence that the instrument has construct validity. This evidence is derived primarily from the performance of the instrument according to theoretical expectations in the Sindwani study.29

DATA ANALYSIS

Of the instruments used, two are Likert-type scales—the LBDQ and MSQ—and the job performance instruments yields a composite score essentially interval in nature. While there is some controversy over whether Likert-type scales can be considered interval data and statistically treated as such, sufficient evidence exists in the case of valid instruments that parametric correlations are the statistics of choice if caution is exercised in the interpretation of the results. Ferguson has supported this point of view.30

28Stogdill, Manual - Unit Performance, p. 2.
29Khairati L. Sindwani.
In a concise discussion of this point, Kerlinger has asserted that the criticism of ordinal scales as having no point of natural origin has little validity. The major criticism of treating ordinal scales as interval is based on the assumption of equality of intervals. Kerlinger stated that if two or three measures of the same variable demonstrate linear relations, then equal intervals can be assumed. Furthermore, the "best procedure would seem to be to treat ordinal measurements as though they were interval measurements, but to be constantly alert to the possibility of gross inequality of intervals." Given the extensive amount of research utilizing these instruments, and the multiple measures of variables within the instruments, Kerlinger's opinion was accepted, and the assumption was made that Likert-type instruments can be treated statistically as interval data.

Consequently, the statistical testing of this study's hypotheses relied on the use of a parametric technique, the Pearsonian Product-moment Correlation, and a non-parametric procedure, the Fisher's Exact Probability Test. The product-moment correlation was utilized in order to ascertain not only the intra and inter-associations between variables but the strength of these relationships as well.

Specifically, this technique indicated: (1) the relationship between the demographic variables and the major study variables and (2) was employed as the analysis procedure for Hypothesis 2.  

Statistical analysis for Hypotheses 1, 3, and 4 followed a format originally described by Halpin. The mean scores of the leaders within one administrative level were rank-ordered. Following division at the median, the leaders were assigned to one of four samples dependent upon whether they fell above or below the median on the two leadership measures. Consequently, the four samples were: (1) high consideration and high initiation of structure, (2) high consideration and low initiation of structure, (3) low consideration and high initiation of structure, and (4) low consideration and low initiation of structure leader behaviors. Two centers were eliminated from analysis since their scores were the exact median.

For each of the job satisfaction variables for job performance variables in Hypothesis 1 or 4 respectively, the scores of the followers were rank-ordered, divided at the median, and the number of highs and lows assigned to these

---

33 The computer program utilized was the Pegran Program from the Veldman Statistical System developed by Dr. Don Veldman, University of Texas.

two respective cells. Consequently, for each dependent variable, a 2 x 2 table was constructed for four classifications of leader behavior (High-High, High-Low, Low-High, and Low-Low). The High-High sample was compared with every other sample and with a combined sample of the other three samples.

Since Hypothesis 3 was focused upon the relationship of the job satisfaction of leaders to the job satisfaction of their workers, analysis was conducted within samples between the highs and lows of the mental health center directors and their staff professionals.

In light of the small marginal numbers in some of the 2 x 2 tables, the Fisher's Exact Probability Test was employed as the statistical procedure. This test is perfectly "efficient" since it is an exact method which uses all of the information in the sample. Use of the Fisher's Exact Test results in somewhat conservative probabilities; consequently, use of this procedure reduces the chance of committing a Type II error. Furthermore, the Fisher's Exact Test is considered to be the most powerful of the non-parametric statistical tests for data in a 2 x 2 table.

36Blalock, op.cit., p. 291.
Limitations

The original research question posed in this study was focused on whether certain relationships between leadership behaviors, job satisfaction and job performance which appeared to exist in other settings also existed among community mental health workers. Consequently, the decision was made to use an exploratory correlational design which would take advantage of existing natural groups. While this type of design cannot establish causation, it appears to have considerable strength in providing a preliminary survey of hypotheses, and those hypotheses which survive can then be subjected to more rigorous testing.\(^{38}\)

Another major limitation of the study was the sample size. With a total sample of 80, the strength of the findings are reduced. However, of the fifty-two 648 areas, seven, or approximately one-seventh, were represented in the sample.

Given these two considerations then, the findings from this study must be generalized to other populations only with caution.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Within this chapter, the study findings are presented in four major sections. The first section is a report of selected demographic characteristics of the study sample. Following this report are the three sections which present the interactions among variables: the product-moment correlations between the demographic variables and the major study variables, the product-moment correlations between the major study variables, and finally, the findings for each specific hypothesis based on the Fisher's Exact Probability Test or the Pearson Product-moment Correlation. Interpretation of the findings will be presented in Chapter V.

Selected Demographic Characteristics

of the Study Sample

Of the 80 respondents included in this sample, 56 were mental health professionals employed as staff members (hereafter referred to as staff), 17 were the mental health center directors (hereafter referred to as directors) in which the staff were employed, and 7 were the executive directors (hereafter referred to as 648 executives) of the "648" mental health districts in the State of Ohio. Each mental health center, to be included in the study, had a
minimum representation of two staff members. This same requirement applied to the 648 areas included in the study. Tables 1 and 2 present the demographic data for each level.

The sex ratio was 47 males to 33 females of whom 28 were located at the staff level representing a significant difference (.05 one tailed). In length of employment, males tend to have been on the job longer (significance at the .05 level, one tailed). Also, there were significantly (.025, one tailed) more males in the "upper" professional categories, i.e., psychiatrists, psychologists, or social workers. Some caution should be followed in the interpretation of these results, since professional identification, sex, and level were arbitrarily determined categories and not true values. However, following Kerlinger's assertion that ordinal scales can be treated as interval data if caution is used, the assumption is made that these relationships hold.¹

In professional identification, the total sample was represented as follows: psychiatrists—6; psychologists—22; social workers—30; guidance counselors, vocational rehabilitators, pastoral counselors—12; nurses—6; various others—4.

The 648 executives level contained no psychiatrists. One of the important findings in relation to this characteristic is that there were no significant correlations between this

TABLE 1.--Professional Identification Categories by Administrative Level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Staff (N=56)</th>
<th>M.H.C. Directors (N=17)</th>
<th>648 Executives (N=7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6) Psychiatrist or M.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(6) 3</td>
<td>(5) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Psychologist</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(5) 4</td>
<td>(4) 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Social Workers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(4) 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Guidance Counselors, Teachers, Vocational</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(3) 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Nurses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1) 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Undifferentiated Administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2.—Demographic Data by Administrative Level  
(N=80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years in Organization</th>
<th>Years in Job</th>
<th>Years as Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong> (N=56)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>X=38.32</td>
<td>X=3.32</td>
<td>X=7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD=3.87</td>
<td>SD=2.16</td>
<td>SD=1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Directors** (N=17) | 13  | 4   | X=39.05                | X=5.23       | X=12.64                |
|                     |     |     | SD=3.65                | SD=7.40      | SD=1.26                |

| **Executives** (N=7) | 6   | 1   | X=43.71                | X=3.42       | X=14.00                |
|                      |     |     | SD=4.31                | SD=2.68      | SD=1.54                |
variable and the major study variables; i.e., the studied leadership behaviors, job satisfaction, or job performance variables were not related to professional identification.

Significant correlations (less than .05, one-tailed) were found between the characteristics of level in organization, years as a professional, age, years in the organization and years on the job. These findings present few surprises since they contain the common elements of time. For example, 648 executives are older, have more years as a professional and in the organization than either directors or staff, and the same correlations exist between directors and staff on these characteristics.

Correlations Between the Demographic Variables and the Major Study Variables

In looking for interactions, correlation coefficients were obtained among all variables. As presented in Table 3, only two of the seven demographic variables were significantly related to the leadership variable, Consideration, and none of the demographic variables were significantly related to the leadership variable, Initiation of Structure.

Consideration was found to be strongly and negatively correlated (significant at the .005 level) with level in the organization. Since the scores on the leadership variables referred to that individual's supervisor, this finding seems to indicate that the higher one becomes in the organization
TABLE 3.—Correlation Coefficients for the Demographic Variables and the Major Leadership Variables of Initiation of Structure and Consideration (N=73)\textsuperscript{a}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Years in Organization</th>
<th>Years on this Job</th>
<th>Years as a Professional</th>
<th>Professional Identification</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>-.30\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.25\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}The 648 executives were not included in this analysis.  
\textsuperscript{b}Significant at the .025 level, one-tailed.  
\textsuperscript{c}Significant at the .005 level, one-tailed.
the less considerate one will perceive their supervisor. In brief, the higher levels of leaders (648 executives) were not perceived to be as considerate by their followers (center directors) as were lower-level leaders (center directors).

Similarly, years as a professional was negatively correlated with consideration (significant at the .025 level). Those followers who had been professionals the longest tended to perceive their leaders as less considerate than did younger professionals. In view of the relationship existing between level and years as a professional, it is possible that 648 executives were rated lower on the consideration dimension by the directors than the directors were rated by their staff.

While some of the demographic variables were correlated with the leadership variables, the demographic variables had no significant correlations with the three job satisfaction variables. Essentially, this eliminated these variables as having any influence on job satisfaction.

The correlational matrix presented in Table 4 sets forth those relationships found existing between the demographic variables and the job performance variables. Once again, time seems to have an influence on some of these findings. Older, more experienced workers tend to produce more and to be more loyal to the organization. Males, in the upper organizational levels, tended to be more persistent in their efforts. One finding which is difficult to reconcile with experience is the negative correlation (.005 level)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Years in Organization</th>
<th>Years on this Job</th>
<th>Years as a Professional</th>
<th>Professional Identification</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>-.32&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.31&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.25&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.27&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.27&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.24&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.21&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>.28&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.24&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.19&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Clients</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.19&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Colleagues</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .05 level, one-tailed.
<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .025 level, one-tailed.
<sup>c</sup>Significant at the .01 level, one-tailed.
<sup>d</sup>Significant at the .005 level, one-tailed.
between level and quality of work. Quality of work is a global measure of the followers overall performance. In general, then, the 648 executives perceived the directors as rating lower on their overall performance than directors rated their staff.

Younger workers tended to be more enthusiastic, and in addition, they demonstrated better relationships with clients.

**Correlations between the Major Study Variables**

The relationships among leader behaviors, satisfaction and performance were obtained by correlation coefficients. The interactions between leader behaviors and job satisfaction are presented in Table 5. The initiation of structure leadership behavior variable was correlated with the extrinsic job satisfaction variable at the .025 level of significance (one-tailed) while the consideration leadership behavior variable was correlated with the extrinsic satisfaction variable at the .005 level of significance (one-tailed).

Extrinsic job satisfaction, as defined by the manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, includes such factors as working conditions, supervision, co-workers, and the company.² The direction of these findings are consistent with those set forth in the literature indicating a stronger

relationship between consideration and job satisfaction than between initiation of structure and job satisfaction.³
Neither initiation of structure nor consideration were correlated with either intrinsic or general job satisfaction.
Then, intrinsic job satisfaction which is concerned with the nature of the work itself and general job satisfaction which is heavily loaded toward intrinsic job satisfaction did not appear to be influenced by the nature of the supervisors' leader behaviors. Consistency of direction was maintained across significant and non-significant correlations.

TABLE 5.—Correlation Coefficients Between the Selected Leadership Behaviors and the Job Satisfaction Study Variables (N=73)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Extrinsic</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Structure</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.23ᵃ</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.31ᵇ</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ᵃSignificant at the .025 level, one-tailed. ᵇSignificant at the .005 level, one-tailed.

The findings seem to suggest that the higher the level of consideration and initiation of structure

leader behaviors, then the higher will be the extrinsic job satisfaction of the followers.

Correlations were also obtained between the leadership variables and the job performance variables. As displayed in Table 6, these were four significant correlations. Initiation of structure leader behavior demonstrated a negative significance of .05 (one-tailed) with enthusiasm, i.e., the more that the followers perceived their leaders as exhibiting high levels of initiation of structure behaviors, then the less likely were the followers to be enthusiastic in their efforts.

Consideration, on the other hand, demonstrated three significant correlations with the eight job performance variables. Relationship to clients was very significantly (.005 level, one-tailed) correlated with considerate leader behaviors.

While the significance level of relationship to colleagues was not as strongly correlated with consideration as was relationship to clients, the level was positive (.025, one-tailed) and in the expected direction. Followers with leaders demonstrating high levels of considerate behaviors exhibited high levels of positive relationships with their colleagues.

Workers having considerate leaders, while possessing good relationships with clients and colleagues, were not necessarily high volume producers. A negative significance
TABLE 6.—Correlation Coefficients Between the Selected Leadership Behavior Variables and the Job Performance Variables (N=73)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Enthusiasm</th>
<th>Persistence</th>
<th>Loyalty</th>
<th>Relationship to Clients</th>
<th>Relationship to Colleagues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.19&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.19&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.31&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.26&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Significant at the .05 level, one-tailed.
<sup>b</sup>Significant at the .025 level, one-tailed.
<sup>c</sup>Significant at the .005 level, one-tailed.
level of .05 (one-tailed) was found between volume and consideration. In brief, those workers who perceived their leaders as exhibiting high levels of considerate leader behavior were seen as low volume workers.

Findings for each Specific Hypothesis

In this section are presented the findings for each specific hypothesis. The results for the major and minor Hypotheses 1, 3, and 4 were obtained by the use of the Fisher's Exact Probability Test comparing the high and low samples of the independent variable (leadership behaviors) with the high and low scores of the variable being analyzed. The composition of the leader behavior samples was determined by ranking the scores of the directors and 648 executives respectively for initiation of structure and consideration. After division of the rank order at the median, four samples were obtained as follows: Sample 1 ($S_1$) consisted of those leaders possessing both high consideration and high initiation of structure scores; sample 2 ($S_2$) were those leaders exhibiting high consideration and low initiation of structure; sample 3 ($S_3$) were those leaders demonstrating low consideration and high initiation of structure behaviors; and, finally, sample 4 ($S_4$) was composed of those leaders demonstrating both low consideration and low initiation of structure leader behaviors.

The statistical analysis of Hypothesis 2 was incorporated in the Pearsonian product-moment correlations, and
the essential findings were presented in the previous section. However, a discussion of the relationship of the findings to the hypothesis will be included in this section.

**Hypothesis 1**

The major Hypothesis 1 was stated as: Mental Health professionals having leaders who exhibit high levels of both consideration and initiating structure leader behaviors will demonstrate a significantly higher level of job satisfaction than mental health professionals with leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors within an administrative subsystem.

Based on indications from the literature, an instrument (the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire) was utilized which measures three aspects of job satisfaction— intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction. Consequently, sub-hypotheses were developed relating to each of these specific factors of job satisfaction. Acceptance or rejection of the major hypothesis was assumed to be dependent upon the results of the study samples in relation to each of these specific hypotheses, and a judgement made as to whether the results on the sub-hypotheses confirmed the major hypothesis.

Sub-hypothesis la was related specifically to the variable of intrinsic job satisfaction as follows:

Mental health professionals having leaders who exhibit high levels of both consideration and initiating structure leader behavior will demonstrate a significantly higher level of intrinsic job satisfaction than mental health professionals with leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors within an administrative subsystem.
As can be seen from Table 7, $S_1$ (high consideration and high initiation of structure) demonstrated no difference with any other sample or samples at the acceptable level. Consequently, sub-hypothesis la was rejected.

Sub-hypothesis 1b was stated in identical terms to sub-hypothesis 1a with the exception of the substitution of extrinsic job satisfaction for intrinsic job satisfaction. Extrinsic job satisfaction is specifically related to working conditions and supervision, and it was expected to demonstrate highly significant differences between samples. As displayed in Table 7, contrary to expectations, no differences acceptable at the minimal level were found between samples. Therefore, sub-hypothesis 1b was rejected.

Similarly, sub-hypothesis lc asserted the same relationships as la and 1b with the substitution of general job satisfaction for the dependent variable. The results of the Fisher's Exact Test, as presented in Table 7, revealed one difference between samples below the minimum acceptable level of probability. $S_1$ in comparison with $S_4$ (low consideration and low initiating structure leader behaviors) demonstrated a probability of .04 that this particular arrangement of cells in a $2 \times 2$ table would be obtained.

While these extreme samples demonstrated an acceptable probability, all other combinations of leader behaviors did not; consequently, sub-hypothesis lc was not accepted.
TABLE 7.—Exact Probabilities Obtained from a Comparison of the Samples on the Three Measures of Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Job</td>
<td>S1 vs S2</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>S1 vs S3</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 vs S4</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 vs S2,3,4</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Job</td>
<td>S1 vs S2</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>S1 vs S3</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 vs S4</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 vs S2,3,4</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Job</td>
<td>S1 vs S2</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>S1 vs S3</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 vs S4</td>
<td>.04a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S1 vs S2,3,4</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aProbability less than the minimum acceptable level of .05.
The requisite judgement about the acceptability of major Hypothesis 1 was based on consideration of the results of the Sub-hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c. Since all of these sub-hypotheses were rejected the major Hypothesis 1 was not accepted.

**Hypothesis 2**

Major Hypothesis 2 was set forth as follows: Within an administrative subsystem, there will be a positive correlation between job satisfaction and the job performance of mental health professionals.

The statistical procedure utilized to test this hypothesis was the Pearsonian Product-moment Correlation. As set forth in Chapter 2, specific sub-hypotheses were developed to account for the relationships among the three job satisfaction variables and the eight job performance variables. However, as shown in Table 8, only one significant correlation was found between any of the variables.

Volume, a job performance variable, was correlated (.05 level of significance, one-tailed) negatively with the extrinsic job satisfaction variable. Since this correlation is converse of the hypothesized relationship and does not include the other job performance variables, sub-hypothesis 2b was rejected. Similarly, sub-hypotheses 2a, d, e, f, g, and h were not supported. Sub-hypothesis 2c essentially stated the null hypothesis of no relationship between the job performance variable of order and system and any of the job satisfaction variables, and this lack of relationship was
### TABLE 8.—Correlations Between the Job Satisfaction Variables and the Job Performance Variables (N=73)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Enthusiasm</th>
<th>Persistence</th>
<th>Loyalty</th>
<th>Relationship to Clients</th>
<th>Relationship to Colleagues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extrinsic Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aSignificant at the .05 level, one-tailed.*
In view of these findings, that there were no significant positive correlations between the job satisfaction variables and job performance variables, major Hypothesis 2 was rejected.

Hypothesis 3

This hypothesis was directed toward the assessment of the affects of leader behavior across two levels of administration. Based on indications in the literature, it was assumed that leaders who themselves had leaders exhibiting high levels of initiation of structure and consideration behaviors would be highly satisfied, and this relationship would be reflected in higher satisfaction of their followers. Consequently, Hypothesis 3 was stated as:

The distribution of high job satisfaction scores for mental health agency directors who relate to area executives demonstrating high consideration and initiating structure leader behaviors is not statistically different from the distribution of high job satisfaction scores of their workers, and this relationship will not hold true with any other combination of leader behaviors.

Testing of this hypothesis required that each of the three aspects of job satisfaction be addressed separately. Therefore sub-hypothesis 3a was a restatement of the major hypothesis with the specification of intrinsic job satisfaction as the dependent variable. As can be seen in Table 9, there were no probabilities which met the acceptable level. Consequently, sub-hypothesis 3a was rejected.
TABLE 9.—Exact Probabilities Obtained from the Comparison of the Intra-sample High-Low Job Satisfaction of the Directors with the High-Low Job Satisfaction Distribution of their Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 3_a</td>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₂</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₃</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₄</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 3_b</td>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₂</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₃</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₄</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction 3_c</td>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₂</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₃</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S₄</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This particular finding is not surprising since intrinsic job satisfaction does seem to be related to the nature of the job itself and to be relatively independent of the supervision provided. However, the lack of any significant findings for extrinsic job satisfaction, the dependent variable in sub-hypothesis 3b, is more difficult to reconcile with the indications in the literature. Extrinsic job satisfaction is specifically focused on working conditions and supervision. However, since the findings did not confirm the predictions, sub-hypothesis 3b was not accepted.

Similarly, sub-hypothesis 3c, which specified general job satisfaction as the dependent variable, failed to demonstrate any probabilities at the minimal acceptable level. Consequently, sub-hypothesis 3c was rejected.

Furthermore, since all sub-hypotheses were rejected, the major Hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Hypothesis 4

The methodology for this study included the testing for job satisfaction as an intervening variable. According to the criteria proposed by Rosenberg for demonstrating an intervening relationship, the triad of relationships which must exist includes one between the independent variable (leadership behaviors) and the dependent variable (job performance). Hypothesis 4 was directed toward

the assessment of this relationship, and it was set forth as follows:

Within an administrative subsystem, mental health professionals having leaders with both high consideration and initiation of structure behaviors will demonstrate higher levels of job performance than mental health professionals having leaders exhibiting any other combinations of these leader behaviors.

Eight sub-hypotheses were advanced to account for the relationships thought to exist between the eight different measures of job performance and the leadership variables.

The first of these sub-hypotheses, sub-hypothesis 4a, was stated in identical terms to the major hypothesis with the specification of the quality of work job performance variable as the dependent variable. As can be seen from Table 10, one sample comparison, $S_1$ versus $S_2$, demonstrated a probability within the significant range. However, the direction of this finding was the converse of the hypothesized one; i.e., those professionals with leaders demonstrating high consideration and high initiation of structure behaviors had a larger proportion of low quality of work scores than professionals with leaders demonstrating high consideration and low initiation of structure scores. Given the lack of positive findings, sub-hypothesis 4a was rejected.

Sub-hypothesis 4b set forth the expected relationship between the job performance variable, volume of work and the various combinations of leader behaviors. Volume of work was established as the dependent variable with no anticipated
TABLE 10.—Exact Probabilities Obtained from a Comparison of the Samples on the Eight Measures of Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Work</td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_2 )</td>
<td>( .04^a )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_3 )</td>
<td>( .46 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_4 )</td>
<td>( .41 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_{2,3,4} )</td>
<td>( .17 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume of Work</td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_2 )</td>
<td>( .22 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_3 )</td>
<td>( .29 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_4 )</td>
<td>( .28 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_{2,3,4} )</td>
<td>( .17 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order and System</td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_2 )</td>
<td>( .47 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_3 )</td>
<td>( .57 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_4 )</td>
<td>( .43 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_{2,3,4} )</td>
<td>( .62 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic Effort</td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_2 )</td>
<td>( .61 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_3 )</td>
<td>( .13 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_4 )</td>
<td>( .56 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_{2,3,4} )</td>
<td>( .37 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Probability less than the minimum acceptable level of .05.
TABLE 10.—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persistance</td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_2 )</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_3 )</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_4 )</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_2,3,4 )</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty to Agency ( \text{h}_f )</td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_2 )</td>
<td>.05(5)(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_3 )</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_4 )</td>
<td>.04(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_2,3,4 )</td>
<td>.05(6)(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Clients ( \text{h}_g )</td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_2 )</td>
<td>.05(5)(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_3 )</td>
<td>.03(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_4 )</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_2,3,4 )</td>
<td>.05(6)(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Colleagues ( \text{h}_h )</td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_2 )</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_3 )</td>
<td>.004(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_4 )</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( S_1 ) vs ( S_2,3,4 )</td>
<td>.007(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Probability, while .05, is not less than the minimal acceptable level of .05.

\(^b\) Probability less than the minimal acceptable level of .05.
higher level being related to $S_1$ than to any other combination of leader behavior. The findings presented in Table 10 reveal that there were no probabilities at the significant level. Sample one was not significantly more related to volume of work than any other sample; therefore, null sub-hypothesis 4b was accepted.

The job performance variable, order and system, was not expected to demonstrate any differences between samples; consequently, sub-hypothesis 4c stated the null hypothesis with order and system as the dependent variable. The data presented in Table 10 substantiates the hypothesis as stated; therefore, sub-hypothesis 4c was accepted.

Enthusiastic effort, the dependent job performance variable in sub-hypothesis 4d, was conceived of as being positively correlated with the high consideration and high initiation of structure leader behaviors represented in $S_1$. It was anticipated that higher job satisfaction would lead to greater and more enthusiastic efforts on the part of the professionals. The results of the test for this relationship failed to reveal any significant differences between $S_1$ and the other samples (see Table 10). Therefore, sub-hypothesis 4d was rejected.

A null hypothesis was posited as existing between the job performance variable of persistence and the various combinations of leader behavior variables. Sub-hypothesis 4e essentially asserted that no significant
relationship would be founded between the dependent variable, persistance, and comparisons of the various samples. Table 10 (continued) portrays the data which lead to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

Sub-hypothesis 4f established the loyalty job performance variable as the dependent variable which would be more significantly related to S₁ leadership behaviors than to any other combinations of these leader behaviors. One comparison, S₁ to S₄ (the extreme combinations of initiating structure and consideration) demonstrated a probability of .04 (see Table 10—continued); however, the arrangement of data in the 2 x 2 contingency tables was reversed. In other words, S₄ leaders (low consideration and low initiating structure leaders) had followers who demonstrated more loyalty to the agencies than S₁ leaders. Therefore, sub-hypothesis 4f was rejected.

In sub-hypothesis 4g, the job performance variable, relationship with clients, was posited as the dependent variable which would show a significant and positive difference between S₁ and the other combinations of leader behaviors. As presented in Table 10 (continued) the data revealed only one comparison between samples at a probability below the minimum acceptable level. Sample one versus sample three (low consideration and high initiation of structure) demonstrated a probability of .03 which was in the expected direction, i.e., S₁ leaders had mental health professionals under their
supervision who evidenced better relations with clients than leaders who were low on consideration and high on initiation of structure behaviors. However, the other three comparisons did not meet the minimal acceptable level of probability; consequently, sub-hypothesis 4g was not accepted.

The eighth and final sub-hypothesis of major Hypothesis 4, sub-hypothesis 4h, set forth the job performance variable of relationship to colleagues as the dependent variable in relationship to which S1 was assumed to be more significantly and positively correlated than any other combination of leader behaviors. Table 10 (continued) presents the findings that two of the four comparisons were far below the minimal acceptable level of probability. Sample one compared to sample three (low consideration and high initiation of structure) demonstrated a probability of .004 in the expected direction, i.e., S1 followers were rated higher on relationship to colleagues than were S3 followers. In the comparison of S1 to S2,3,4, the probability of .007 was in the expected direction also. In brief, S1 compared to a combination of all other samples had a significantly higher number of mental health professionals who demonstrated highly positive relationships with colleagues than professionals with leaders exhibiting any other combination of these leader behaviors. While the other two comparisons were in the expected direction, their probability was above the acceptable
level. However, since the $S_1$ sample in comparison to a combination of all other samples (and consequently all other combinations of leader behaviors) was below the acceptable level, sub-hypothesis 4h was accepted.

Of the eight sub-hypotheses for Hypothesis 4, four were accepted. Three of these sub-hypotheses were null hypotheses, and only one sub-hypothesis was positive. In view of the paucity of significant findings, Hypothesis 4 was rejected.
CHAPTER V

THE PROBLEM OF INTERVENING VARIABLES

Within this chapter are set forth the relations of the findings to the hypothesized intervening nature of the job satisfaction variable, some implications and inferences drawn from the findings, and some methodological factors to be considered.

This study hypothesized an intervening variable, job satisfaction, as moderating the relationship between the independent variable, leadership behaviors, and the dependent variable, job performance. Rosenberg's definition of the nature of these relationships was accepted.\(^1\) According to his format, three asymmetrical relationships must exist. There must be a relationship between the independent and dependent variable, between the independent and intervening variable, and finally, between the intervening and dependent variable. In terms of relative strength, a quantitative difference must exist in these relationships in such a manner that the intervening variable is more strongly related to the independent variable than to the dependent variable.

As discussed in the findings, the independent variable, leadership behaviors, demonstrated only two positive correlations with the dependent variable, job performance. Considerate leader behaviors were positively and highly correlated with relationship with clients and relationship with colleagues (.005 and .025 level of significance, respectively). Initiation of structure was negatively correlated with enthusiastic effort but was not positively correlated with any job performance variable. This finding is supported by the results of the comparison between samples one (high consideration and high initiation of structure) and three (low consideration and high initiation of structure). A probability of .03 was obtained in the expected direction. From these findings, it can be concluded that considerate leader behaviors are highly related to followers' positive relationship with clients.

Relationship to colleagues, the job performance variable, appears to be included, in part, under two of Stogdill's three outputs of organizations—integration, morale, and production. Essentially, positive relationships with one's colleagues can be assumed to be behavioral indices of high morale and integration while, conversely, negative relationships with one's colleagues might be perceived as indices of poor morale and integration.

---

These two findings are not sufficient to support the hypothesized relationship between the independent and dependent variables. However, various writers have referred to the helper's relationship with the helpee as the most critical variable in effectively working with human problems. With the assumption that the primary function of mental health centers is to work with humans experiencing problems in living, this finding is of critical importance to leadership in mental health and social welfare settings.

In the original conceptualization of the study, it was assumed that the key leadership behaviors, consideration and initiation of structure, would be highly correlated with extrinsic job satisfaction which is defined directly in terms of supervision, but also, the positive extrinsic job satisfaction would influence the intrinsic and general job satisfaction. The interrelationship correlations found to exist between extrinsic, intrinsic and general job satisfaction (r=.65 and .87 respectively) would seem to support this assumption. Consequently, it was hypothesized that the independent variables would be positively and significantly correlated with all three intervening variables (extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction).

---

However, the product-moment correlations revealed that while consideration and initiating structure were highly correlated (.005 and .025 level of significance, respectively) with extrinsic job satisfaction that there were no significant relationships with intrinsic or general job satisfaction. In the comparison of samples \( S_1 \) versus \( S_4 \) (low consideration and low initiation of structure), however, these extremes demonstrated a probability of .04 on general job satisfaction. In essence, while the mass data revealed no differences on general job satisfaction, comparison of the extreme ends did tend to reveal differences on this variable in the expected direction. Intrinsic job satisfaction seems to be relatively independent of the external working conditions or supervision. Since the general job satisfaction scale of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire is composed of twice as many items of intrinsic satisfaction as extrinsic, a "dampening" effect might result which would only be reduced under conditions of extreme comparisons.

Consideration and initiation of structure were highly correlated, then, to extrinsic satisfaction and, under specific conditions, with general satisfaction. These findings, however, do not support the assumption of a global job satisfaction measure as an intervening variable.

The implications for leadership in social welfare agencies should not be obscured by the lack of substantiation of the hypothesized intervening nature of job satisfaction.
Weinberger has asserted that "job satisfaction is an important variable in professional life." Presumably, job satisfaction is related to tenure which, in view of the turn-over of personnel in social welfare agencies, becomes of importance to the stability of these agencies. In a study of job satisfaction, Ryan substantiated the relationship between tenure and job satisfaction. The leadership behaviors utilized in this study, then, assume importance in relationship to the extrinsic job satisfaction of professional workers and the potential effects on the efficiency of the organizations of which they are a part.

To complete the requisite triad of relationships in the substantiation of job satisfaction as an intervening variable, it was necessary for the job satisfaction variables to demonstrate positive and significant correlations with the job performance variables. These correlations were not found to exist. Only one relationship, extrinsic job satisfaction negatively correlated with volume of work (.05 level of significance), was significant.

---


In brief, the hypothesized relationships between certain leadership behaviors, job satisfaction, and job performance were not substantiated. While considerate leader behaviors were significantly related to extrinsic job satisfaction and to the relations to clients job performance variable, the required relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and relations to clients was not found. Consequently, even partial confirmation for job satisfaction as an intervening variable was not obtained.

Seven demographic variables were measured to ascertain any effect that these might have on the study variables. Product-moment correlations were run to determine any relationships and the direction of these relationships. While no correlations were found between job satisfaction and the demographic variables, several were found between the demographic variables and job performance.

In brief, older, more experienced professionals were high producers, loyal to the organization, and more placid in relation to their work, but they demonstrated poorer relationships with clients. Younger workers were more enthusiastic, and they demonstrated better relationships with clients. One inference of this data seems to be that older, more experienced workers tended to be more organizationally focused—loyal, persistent, productive—while younger workers tended to be more client-focused—enthusiastic in their efforts and with good relationship to their clients.
The quality of work job performance variable was negatively correlated with level in the organization at a rigorous level (.005 level of significance). One suggestion of this finding seems to be that upper-level supervisors tend to be more critical of lower-level leaders than lower-level leaders are of their staff. Since lower-level leaders are involved in a different set of tasks than are staff-level workers, the criteria for the assessment of their performance by the upper-level leaders might be correspondingly different from that lower-level leaders apply to their staff. Similarly, the expectations of the upper-level leaders of lower-level leaders might be higher, or at least different, than the lower-level leader's expectations of their staff.

The two negative findings for the leader behavior, consideration, and the demographic variables of level and years as a professional (.005 and .025 respectively) seem to indicate some interesting conclusions. Higher level, experienced professionals tend to perceive their supervisors as less considerate than lower-level and younger professionals rated their supervisors.

In view of the negative relationship between ratings of quality of work and level in the organization and the negative relationship between consideration and level (.005 level of significance in both instances), there appears to exist a negative interaction between the two levels of leaders. With a positive significance level of .005 between
level in the organization and years as a professional, 648 executives appear to have been more critically appraised by center directors than staff evaluated the center directors.

An analysis of the demographic composition of the high-low leadership samples and their staff by utilization of the students "t" for differences of means failed to reveal any significant differences between samples with one exception. Sample two leaders, high consideration and low initiation of structure, were all social workers with significantly more years as a professional than other samples. The staffs were heterogenous as to the demographic variables and revealed no major differences.

Since there were no significant relationships between job satisfaction and the demographic variables, the upper-level leaders were not used in the analysis, there are some difficulties in the use of the job performance instrument, and since the samples did not clearly demonstrate any differences on the demographic variables, these variables were not considered to have exerted any significant influence on the study outcome.

There are several methodological factors which must be considered in the interpretation of the study findings. One of the major factors is the interrelationships found to exist among the job performance variable.

In Table 11 are presented the correlations found to exist between the job performance variables. A perusal of
TABLE II.—Correlational Matrix for the Interrelationships between Job Performance Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Enthusiasm</th>
<th>Persistence</th>
<th>Loyalty</th>
<th>Relationship to Clients</th>
<th>Relationship to Colleagues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39^d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>.23^b</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>-.21^a</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.29^c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>-.22^a</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>-.19^a</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.21^a</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Clients</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.35^d</td>
<td>-.30^c</td>
<td>-.21^a</td>
<td>-.21^a</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Colleagues</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.34^d</td>
<td>-.24^b</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.44^d</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.41^d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Significant at the .05 level, one-tailed.
^b Significant at the .025 level, one-tailed.
^c Significant at the .01 level, one-tailed.
^d Significant at the .005 level, one-tailed.
this table reveals several clusters of variables which are internally significantly related to each other but negatively related to another cluster of variables. Quality, volume, and order are significantly interrelated. Enthusiasm and persistance are negatively related to quality of work (.05 level of significance), and in addition, enthusiasm is negatively related to order (.01 level of significance). On the other hand, loyalty is negatively related to both quality (.05 level of significance) and to enthusiasm (.05 level of significance). Similarly, workers who demonstrated good relationships with clients and with colleagues were rated low on volume, order, enthusiasm, and persistance (significance levels of .005, .01, .05, and .05 or .005 respectively).

Part of this clustering effect might be attributed to the structure of the job performance instrument. In the original design of the instrument, for assessing unit performance, Stogdill had established nine items which were to be ranked in terms of the unit's own performance while each of these items was also rated from one to nine in terms of the units's performance as compared to other units. The use of a ranking-rating scale enhanced the probability of negative correlations.

Sindwani's version of the instrument, utilized in this study, was based on eight factors which were ranked in

---

6 Ralph M. Stogdill, Ratings of Unit Performance Manual (Columbus: The Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research, 1958).
terms of the individual's performance; however, the rating scale for each item—this individual as compared to co-workers—was based on a three point scale. While the original instrument allowed for the ranking to be combined with the rating in such a manner as to allow low ranked items to be rated high leading to the possibility of tie scores, the version used in this study tended to reduce the influence of the rating score and to increase the effect of the ranking score. An illustration of this point might be as follows: with the original instrument, a unit might receive a rank of one on a particular item and yet receive a rating of nine in relations to other units yielding a mean of 5.0 or visa versa, i.e., a rank of nine and a rating of one. However, with the Sindwani version, an individual receiving a rank of eight and a rating of one would have a mean of 4.0 while a rank of one and the top rating of three would yield a mean of 2.0. Therefore, the ranking score on this instrument was exaggerated.

The ultimate effect would be to reduce the probability of an individual scoring high on both, for example, quality of work and relationship to clients. Furthermore, it would tend to increase the number of negative correlations; it would seem to affect the results of the leadership sample

comparisons. Since the cell numbers for the Fisher's Exact Test were determined by whether the staff members of a sample fell above or below the median, and since this job performance instrument reduced the probability of anyone being high on multiple items, then, the arrangement of scores for the various variables would be different reducing the opportunity for any one sample of leadership behaviors to be significantly related to multiple variables.

Another factor to be considered in relation to the job performance instrument is the heavy weighting toward efficiency measures—order, enthusiasm, persistance, loyalty, quality of work, and possibly relationship to colleagues—as opposed to effectiveness measures—relationship to clients. While the conceptual problem involved is directed toward the ascertainment of the nature of performance in a mental health center to be dealt with in the following chapter, the central point is that considerate leader behavior is significantly related to the main effectiveness measure.

Furthermore, the possibility exists that there were interactional effects between the leader behaviors and some of the job performance variables. Making some inferences from Fiedler's research, one might assume that considerate leaders would tend to rate their staff members high on those job performance variables most valued by the leaders, i.e., relationships with clients and colleagues while
placing little emphasis on production.8

Another methodological factor which must be considered is the effect of sample size. With a total sample of 80, 72 of whom were used in the product-moment correlations, two major affects on the results of the study might be inferred. First, since there were only 17 mental health center directors, division of these into samples based on their scores on the two leadership variables resulted in samples ranging from three to five in number. While the number of staff represented was much larger, the actual sample of leader behaviors was small.

This factor was especially apparent in relation to the testing of Hypothesis 3—the job satisfaction comparison between leaders and staff within sample. Since this particular hypothesis dealt with intrasample comparisons, the marginal and cell numbers employed were extremely small. The Fisher's Exact Probability Test used for the statistical analysis was specifically designed for use with 2 x 2 tables having small numbers; however, the precision of the instrument does not obviate the fact that the size of the samples greatly reduces the confidence in the findings. Consequently, because of methodological problems, one must be cautious in

__________

making generalizations from the results of this study to other population groups.

Secondly, the use of a larger sample would have facilitated the division of the scores for each variable at the highest and lowest quartile rather than at the median. With several of the variables, the median score was also the mode resulting in little distinction between the highs and lows. Use of the quartiles would allow for greater separation of scores.

Essentially, the use of a small sample size limits the ability to make generalizations from the study, and it leaves doubt about the findings for Hypothesis 3.

In summary, this study has confirmed that the leader behaviors of initiation of structure and consideration are highly and positively correlated with extrinsic and, under specific conditions, general job satisfaction of professional mental health workers. Furthermore, considerate leader behaviors are significantly related to the job performance variables of relationship to clients and relationship to colleagues. Age and tenure appeared to influence all major study variables with the exception of job satisfaction.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The original impetus for this study came from a concern to better understand the factors operating in social welfare organizations which influence service delivery to clients. A perusal of the literature indicated that leadership behaviors were a major contributing factor, and the study of these behaviors had been relatively ignored in the research of social welfare institutions. Leadership behaviors which impact on the job satisfaction and job performance of professional workers appeared to be an important area of exploration and concern.

This study, then, examined the effects of initiation of structure and consideration upon three dimensions of job satisfaction and eight dimensions of job performance among mental health professionals. Relationships were hypothesized between all of the major study variables. Job satisfaction was hypothesized to function as an intervening variable between the independent variable, leadership behaviors, and the dependent variable, job performance. Essentially, those leaders who demonstrated the highest levels of both initiation of structure and considerate behaviors would have followers.
with the highest satisfaction, and those followers who were most satisfied would have the highest job performance rating. These relationships were hypothesized to hold true across two levels of administrative leadership.

The study sample consisted of 80 professional mental health workers, mental health center directors, and mental health area executive directors from the state of Ohio. Data were gathered by means of a mail questionnaire consisting of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, a job performance rating instrument, and a personal information questionnaire. Statistical analysis was by use of the Pearson product-moment correlation technique and the Fisher's Exact Probability Test.

In general, the major hypotheses were not supported by the data. Specifically, initiation of structure and consideration leader behaviors were highly correlated (.025 and .005 level of significance) with extrinsic job satisfaction, considerate leader behaviors were highly and positively correlated (.005 and .025) with the job performance variables of relationship with clients and relationship with colleagues, and mental health professional's perception of their leaders as considerate decreases with experience. Time has an affect on the job performance variables. None of the job satisfaction variables were affected by the measured demographic variables. Neither was there any significant
interaction between the job satisfaction variables and the job performance variables. Consequently, job satisfaction was not supported as an intervening variable between leader behaviors and job performance. Although, to some extent, both job satisfaction and job performance appear to be dependent variables of leader behaviors.

**Conclusions**

The findings of this study have suggested a number of implications and considerations in relation to other studies, to the theoretical bases of this study, for social welfare organization administration, for social work education, and for future research in this area.

Essentially, the findings only partially confirmed those of Sindwani and Stogdill. Sindwani’s study, reported in chapter two, found multiple intercorrelations between leader behavior, job satisfaction, and job performance among the professional staff of Family Service Agencies. General job satisfaction was more highly correlated than either intrinsic or extrinsic with leadership and job performance and job satisfaction demonstrated multiple significant relationships with job performance. While the present study

---


confirmed the relationships between initiation of structure and consideration leader behaviors and extrinsic job satisfaction, the relationship between intrinsic and general job satisfaction were not confirmed. Neither were the relationships between job satisfaction and job performance confirmed.

While there are some similarities between the Sindwani and the current study, there are some differences. Sindwani utilized a multivariate measure of job satisfaction designed by the Ohio Bureau of Business Research and differed from the one utilized in this study. Secondly, Sindwani relied entirely upon the Pearson product-moment correlation as the statistical analysis procedure whereas the current study attempted to confirm the correlational findings with the non-parametric Fisher's Exact Probability Test. These differences, however, might not be as primary as the questions raised by the differences in study populations and organizational structures.

Whereas the Sindwani study was conducted in four Family Service Agencies, among social workers, this study was conducted in seventeen mental health centers with interdisciplinary staff and among different levels of administrators. One question which is apparent is whether there are differences between the organizational structures of family service agencies and mental health centers which would affect the impact of leader behaviors. Do social workers who might be more attuned to bureaucratic organizations—public welfare
organizations, correctional institutions—tend to institute these same organizational forms in their own organizations? Furthermore, does bureaucratic organizational structure increase or attenuate the impact of leader behaviors? While at this point there seems to be no definitive answers to these questions, in consideration of the extensive history in social work of the use of close supervision, as contrasted to other mental health professionals, the hypothesis might be advanced that "pure" social work organizations might more closely follow the classical bureaucratic organizational form and the impact of leadership behaviors be increased.

The preceding consideration is also related to differences which might exist between a population of social workers and an interdisciplinary population. While the inter-correlations obtained in this study did not support professional identity as influencing any of the major study variables, the ranks used for measurement were arbitrary, and the results must be viewed with caution. Future research would seem necessary in this area since it seems to have implications both for organizational management and education of social workers for practice.

Differences were also found between the results of this study and Stogdill's summary of research on the initiation of structure and consideration leader behaviors, job satisfaction, and job performance. Initiation of structure was the only measured leader variable, in Stogdill's conclusion, which
demonstrate positive effects on satisfaction, cohesion, and production of workers. While this study confirmed the relationship between initiation of structure and satisfaction, it did not confirm the relationship between initiation of structure and performance. Consideration, according to Stogdill, is more highly related to satisfaction than performance. Yet, in this study, consideration was related to two important aspects of job performance. One implication of this finding might be that mental health professionals are responsive to a different set of leader behaviors than those measured or from those found to be influential in industrial, military, and educational settings. Productivity in mental health centers might not be related so clearly to leadership behavior since the actual practice of mental health professionals tends to be independent (autonomous), and since there are no standard units of production rather only effectiveness in relation to each individual case.

Given the confirmation of some aspects of those reported by Sindwani and Stogdill by this study, some implications of the variables, initiation of structure and consideration, must be examined. Initiation of structure is defined by those acts by a leader which tends to initiate and maintain interaction and expectation among followers. These behaviors are not the same as autocratic, restrictive, or directive patterns of behavior. Rather, initiation of

\[3\] Stogdill, ibid.
structure is focused upon the clarification roles, meeting of expectations, and promotion of follower interaction. In organizations, role ambiguity and lack of clear task definition are associated with lowered job satisfaction and reluctance to initiate action. \(^4\)

In organizations, then, leaders seem to need to devote considerable effort to the clarification of roles, promotion of interactions, and provision of opportunities for the meeting of expectations. Among mental health professionals, these expectations might include such factors as freedom of action in the exercise of professional judgement, support for professional activities, sanctions of the community, ethical conduct, policy-making input, and some determination of accountability measures.

The concept of considerate leader behaviors also has implications for organizations. Considerate leader behaviors are not the same as permissive or follower-oriented behaviors, but rather, they are focused on the demonstration of respectful, genuine, empathic concern for the followers. The results of this study seem to indicate that perception of this factor either decreases with experience or, in fact, does decrease with an increase in status. Consequently, age and experience are dubious factors in the selection of supervisors, or increased attention should be paid to this variable in the selection of directors. In-service training

\(^{4}\)Stogdill, p. 323.
for directors would seem to need to emphasize continued attention to the consideration behaviors.

While this study produced only limited findings, these findings appear to have implications for the administration of mental health centers and, perhaps, other social welfare organizations. These implications are set forth with the normal cautions exercised in regards to data from correlative studies with limited samples.

Mental health center administrators as well as administrators of other social welfare organizations have in recent years become increasingly concerned with the application of modern managerial techniques to these human services organizations. Management by objectives, pert charting, key factor analysis, and other techniques have become a part of the armament of social welfare administrators. Relatively little attention seems to have been paid to the variable of leadership which can be assumed to either enhance or mitigate against the effectiveness of these other techniques.

As was demonstrated in this study, certain leadership behaviors are highly correlated with extrinsic job satisfaction and certain job performance variables—relationship with clients and colleagues. The study by Ryan established a relationship between tenure and job satisfaction;
however, this finding was not supported by the present study.\textsuperscript{5} Given the fact that the evidence is inconclusive, there is some suggestion that tenure might be related to job satisfaction. Mental health and other social welfare agencies have experienced major problems with personnel turn-over. In general, a high rate of turn-over can be assumed to reduce organizational effectiveness and efficiency by requiring a high investment of scarce resources in the maintenance of the organization itself. Therefore, leadership behaviors impacting on job satisfaction become of major importance to mental health administrators.

Found in this study, also, was a relationship between the selected leadership behaviors and the relationship to clients and relationship to colleagues job performance variables. Since these two variables are the critical ones impacting upon mental health center service delivery, those factors affecting these variables must rate high in the priorities of the administrators of these agencies.

The preceding considerations for social welfare organization administration seem to also have implications for the education of social work practitioners. Since master degreed social workers tend to gravitate toward leadership positions, it would seem imperative that schools

of social work provide learning opportunities in leadership theory and practice along with other modern organizational theory. While Stogdill's summary of research on leadership training seems to indicate that the "sensitivity training" approach improved the consideration dimension, more effort needs to be devoted to the understanding and development of training in the initiation of structure dimension. Social work education should assume the responsibility for researching and developing training programs in leadership both for regular students as well as the provision of continuing education programs for social workers in leadership positions.

If social work education is to continue research in leadership, a number of conceptual and methodological problems raised by this study must be addressed. One of these problems concerns the idiosyncratic structure and tasks of a mental health center which might differentiate research in this area from leadership research in other areas. In a discussion of the structure of organizations and the nature of the tasks for which they were appropriate, Litwak posited an organizational continuum moving from the bureaucracy through the collegial bureaucracy to primary groups. Furthermore, the tasks for which each organizational form was most appropriate could be classified in terms of its mixture of uniformity.

\footnote{Stogdill, \textit{Handbook}, p. 198.}
or nonuniform tasks. Mental health centers, in Litwak's opinion, are essentially collegial bureaucracies with a great mixture of uniform and nonuniform tasks. With the assumptions that relations within a mental health center are based on professional, collegial relations rather than authority and that the nature of the tasks involved are complex and difficult to measure, then, the implication for research appears to be that any assessment of leadership behavior or job performance in a mental health center would need to account for these idiosyncrasies. Direct translation of research findings from more formal organizations might not be valid.

Given this perspective, this study was further complicated by the equation of position with leadership—an old and well discussed problem in leadership research. In research on leadership in mental health centers, however, the problem appears to be particularly relevant because of the assumed nature of relationships among professional workers, particularly with regards to the variable of autonomy. If leadership is viewed as the execution of a particular kind of role within an organized group, studies limited to occupants of positions obscure who influences the decision making, the

8 Ibid., p. 53.
processes in that group, how they develop, and with what consequences. Using position as the criteria for measurement tends to introduce the variable of power which appears to obscure the focus on the leadership variables utilized in this study.

Of the five sources of power available to a leader, as described by Raven and French, only legitimate power is considered if position is equated with leadership. Consequently, the most influential forms of power are neglected. Furthermore, as suggested by Cartwright and Zander, since norms differ greatly from one group to another, the expectation is that there will be corresponding differences among groups in their prevailing methods of influence. Mental health professionals with their commitment to professional ideals and drive toward the satisfaction of higher order needs might well be responding to difference sources of influence and leadership behaviors.

---


11 Ibid.

12 Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander, eds. Group Dynamics, p. 224.
In addition, according to Tannenbaum, et al., all leadership acts are intertwined with numerous nonleadership acts. This factor has particular relevance to the current study and its attempt to measure the 648 executives' influence when, in fact, the 648 executives have no direct supervision of the mental health center directors.

Finally, there is the very difficult problem of the definition of "job performance" in a community mental health center. Stogdill has asserted that organizational outputs are integration, production, and morale. While integration and morale seem to be related to organizational efficiency, production is an effectiveness measure which, at the present time, remains vague and ill-defined in community mental health.

Part of performance is related to the individual's relationships with clients; however, in light of the essential service components of a mental health center as well as the demands of professionalism, this is only one small part of the total professional performance required. Much work remains to be done on defining this variable.

The major implication of these problem areas for


future research in leadership, job satisfaction, and job performance in community mental health centers is that any research design utilized must of necessity deal with a highly complex set of variables. Concomitantly, the demand for a large sample is imperative.

Research on leadership must include not only the variables utilized in this study but also the variables of expectations, values, norm conformity, and power usage.

Job satisfaction as a study variable seems to also need further elaboration. While the variables of intrinsic, extrinsic and general job satisfaction appear to be major relevant dimensions for study, there are several factors impacting upon these variables which were not accounted for in this study. Each of these additional variables would need to be correlated with leadership behaviors and job performance.

Ryan found that job satisfaction is correlated with the organizational support of professional behavior, perception of conflict between professional norms and organizational norms, and the professionals' perception of their autonomy.15 In another study, Weinberger discovered a positive correlation between the professional climate of the agency

the professional's assessment of autonomy in the work situation, and job satisfaction. In addition, job satisfaction was negatively correlated with agency size.\textsuperscript{16} Slocum researched job satisfaction and higher order needs and found that performance and satisfaction were more closely related for higher than for lower need levels.\textsuperscript{17}

Further research, then, needs to correlate job satisfaction with organizational support for professional behavior, perceived conflicts in norms, autonomy, agency size, and higher order need satisfaction.

This study failed to support either the view that the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance is cyclic in nature or the view that performance leads to satisfaction. In general, March and Simon's assertion that both job satisfaction and job performance are dependent variables seems to have some inferential support.\textsuperscript{18} However, the view of the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance which asserts a possible number of intervening


variables needs to be further studied.\(^{19}\) This direction for future research seems to be particularly relevant in light of the number of variables which have demonstrated a relationship with job satisfaction.

Any future research on job performance in mental health settings will need to be cognizant of the idiosyncrasies of the tasks involved. While certain functions of mental health centers are similar to those of any organizations, i.e., integration and morale, the special nature of production or performance seems to require the development of effectiveness measures which are oriented toward these differences.

In conclusion, this study supported those theories positing a relationship between leadership behaviors and job satisfaction and, in part, between leadership behaviors and job performance. While the specific hypothesis of this study were rejected, several implications for future research, for the administration of mental health centers, and for social work education were suggested. It is hoped that this study will emphasize the need for further exploration of this highly important aspect of agency administration and service delivery.
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Dear

In accordance with our telephone conversation of last week, this letter is to further elaborate upon the nature of my research and hopefully, to elicit your help. This project has been approved by Dr. Paul McAvoy who feels that the findings might add to the Department of Mental Health's knowledge about the functioning of the mental health centers and clinics in the state.

The major purpose of the study is to gain a better understanding of the effects of leadership behavior on the job satisfaction and job performance of mental health professionals. While a great deal of research has been done in this general area, very little research has been attempted on professional workers, and particularly, human service professionals. Theoretically, there is reason to hypothesize that mental health professionals are more sensitive to leadership behaviors than production workers because of their professional standards of autonomy and freedom and, possibly, higher order achievement needs. Essentially, this study does not hypothesize that any form of leadership behavior is better than others; rather, the major hypothesis is that various dimensions of leadership behaviors are correlated with various dimensions of job satisfaction and job performance in differing situations. This study will examine these correlations and their implications for service delivery.

Of the fifty-three 648 Board areas in Ohio, nine were chosen as a sample based on the criteria of having at least three mental health clinics or centers within the area. Procedure for the study requires the cooperation of the 648 executive directors, at least three mental health clinic directors, and four staff members of each clinic. The 648 executive director will rate the job performance of the clinic directors. Each clinic director will describe on a standardized instrument the leadership behaviors of the 648 executive director, rate the job performance of each staff member participating, and complete a job satisfaction questionnaire. Staff members of the clinic will rate the leadership behaviors of the clinic director, and complete a job satisfaction instrument. While
this might appear to be a formidable array of instruments, the time requirements are minimal. Approximately, thirty minutes will be required from the 648 executive director, one hour from the clinic director, and thirty to forty minutes from the clinic staff. Six items of personal information are requested for correlation purposes, but, as with all information, it will be seen only by me and will be held in the strictest confidence. After correlation, generalized findings will be available to the Department of Mental Health and any interested participant.

All of the instruments to be used are quite short with the exception of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Each of these instruments are the results of several years of research at the Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research and the University of Minnesota Vocational Rehabilitation Studies, and they have met established standards of reliability and validity. After my initial contact with each center, complete packets of instruments and self-addressed, stamped envelopes will be sent to the center. However, if the centers prefer that I come to their facility for further explanation and test administration, I will be happy to do so.

I would like to elicit your cooperation and help in this project. A letter of support from you to the center directors would be greatly appreciated. If for any reason you feel that more information is needed, I can be contacted by telephone at __________ or by letter.

Roy T. Denton
July 9, 1974

Dear Director:

I appreciate the consideration which you have given to my research on the effects of leadership behavior on job satisfaction and performance in community mental health centers. As you are aware from the previous information sent, it is essential to the study that all three levels of mental health personnel be represented in the study. For this reason, it is very important that the test instruments are completed by the mental health center directors. In fact, the center directors are the key persons in the study. Your attention to this matter will, indeed, be greatly appreciated.

Unfortunately, I have been unable to contact many of the directors by telephone; however, if you have any questions, I can be reached by telephone at __________, collect.

Roy T. Denton
INSTRUCTIONS: (Center Directors)

The purpose of the enclosed instruments is to gain your evaluation of certain dimensions of the leadership behavior of the 648 executive director in your area, to gain your assessment of certain characteristics of the job performance of four of your staff members, and to gain some understanding of your satisfaction with your job. While this might appear to be a lengthy task, the time required is approximately one hour. It is your responses which will determine the success or failure of this project. All materials will be seen only by me, and they will be held in the strictest confidence.

The procedure for the study requires that four staff members (three are sufficient if four are not available) agree to participate by completing the leader behavior instrument and the job satisfaction scale. Time requirement for the staff members is approximately thirty-five minutes. Selection of staff members to request to participate ideally should be at random; however, the pragmatics of scheduling and time requirements must be taken into account. If at all possible, more than one discipline should be represented and all of whom are "professionals." The packets marked "staff" should be distributed to these staff members. For correlational purposes, it is important that we receive the names of the staff members on the "job performance" instrument. Once again, the information gained will be kept confidential. After initial coding, specific names will not be used in the analysis of the data.

The instruments for your completion consist of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and the Job Performance instrument for the staff members. Each of these instruments is the results of several years of research and have met established standards of reliability and validity. Instructions on the instruments are self-explanatory. A self-addressed stamped envelope is provided with the instruments.

I will be contacting you to answer any questions which you might have concerning the research. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.
INSTRUCTIONS: (Staff Members)

The purpose of the enclosed questionnaires is to obtain your responses to the climate of the agency that employs you at the present time. While there are a number of possible dimensions to the work environment, this study is concerned with three—the leadership behavior of the agency director, your job satisfaction, and your performance as seen by your director. All responses will be kept strictly confidential.

The first section requires personal identification and demographic data. After the initial coding process, these will not be used; however, this information is initially very important for correlation purposes.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) is intended to obtain your responses to certain dimensions of your clinic director's leadership style. While it appears lengthy, the average completion time is approximately twenty minutes.

Job satisfaction is measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Like the LBDQ, this instrument is the result of many years of refinement, and it appears to accurately assess certain dimensions of worker job satisfaction.

By reading each question carefully and giving an immediate response, you should complete all the instruments in approximately thirty minutes. Please place them in the original envelope, seal and mail. Your cooperation is, indeed, greatly appreciated.
INSTRUCTIONS: (Staff Members)

The purpose of the enclosed questionnaires is to obtain your responses to the climate of the agency that employs you at the present time. While there are a number of possible dimensions to the work environment, this study is concerned with three—the leadership behavior of the agency director, your job satisfaction, and your performance as seen by your director. All responses will be kept strictly confidential.

The first section requires personal identification and demographic data. After the initial coding process, these will not be used; however, this information is initially very important for correlation purposes.

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) is intended to obtain your responses to certain dimensions of your clinic director's leadership style. While it appears lengthy, the average completion time is approximately twenty minutes.

Job satisfaction is measured by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Like the LBDQ, this instrument is the result of many years of refinement, and it appears to accurately assess certain dimensions of worker job satisfaction.

By reading each question carefully and giving an immediate response, you should complete all the instruments in approximately thirty minutes. Please place them in the original envelope, seal and mail. Your cooperation is, indeed, greatly appreciated.
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PERSONAL INFORMATION

All information on this form will be used for correlational purposes only. It will be seen only by the researcher and will be held in the strictest confidence.

NAME _____________________________________________________________

PRESENT JOB TITLE _________________________________________________

YEARS AND MONTHS IN THIS ORGANIZATION _____________________________

YEARS AND MONTHS IN THIS JOB ______________________________________

PROFESSIONAL IDENTIFICATION ____________________________________

YEARS AND MONTHS AS A PROFESSIONAL _______________________________

AGE __________________________ SEX ________________________________
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE—FORM XII

Originated by staff members of
The Ohio State Leadership Studies
and revised by the
Bureau of Business Research

Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

Note: The term, "group", as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division or other unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.

The term "members", refers to all the people in the unit of organization that is supervised by the person being described.
DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each item carefully

b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.

c. DECIDE whether he (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never acts as described by the item.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A = Always
B = Often
C = Occasionally
D = Seldom
E = Never

1. He acts as the spokesman of the group . . . A B C D E

2. He waits patiently for the results of a decision . . . . . . . . . . . . A B C D E

3. He lets group members know what is expected of them . . . . . . . . . . . . A B C D E

4. He allows the members complete freedom in their work . . . . . . . . . . . . A B C D E

5. He is hesitant about taking initiative in the group . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A B C D E

6. He is friendly and approachable . . . . . A B C D E

7. He encourages overtime work . . . . . A B C D E

8. He gets along well with the people above him . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A B C D E

9. He publicizes the activities of the group . A B C D E

10. He becomes anxious when he cannot find out what is coming next . . . . . . A B C D E

11. He encourages the use of uniform procedures A B C D E
12. He permits the members to use their own judgment in solving problems.

13. He fails to take necessary action.

14. He does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.

15. He stresses being ahead of competing groups.

16. He keeps the group in good standing with higher authority.

17. He speaks as the representative of the group.

18. He accepts defeat in stride.

19. He tries out his ideas in the group.

20. He encourages initiative in the group members.

21. He lets others take away his leadership in the group.

22. He puts suggestions made by the group into operation.

23. He needs members for greater effort.

24. He is working hard for a promotion.

25. He speaks for the group when visitors are present.

26. He accepts delays without becoming upset.

27. He makes his attitudes clear to the group.

28. He lets the members do their work the way they think is best.

29. He lets members take advantage of him.

30. He treats all group members as his equals.

31. He keeps the work moving at a rapid pace.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>His superiors act favorably on most of his suggestions</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>He represents the group at most outside meetings</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>He becomes anxious when waiting for new developments</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>He decides what shall be done and how it shall be done</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>He assigns a task, then lets the member handle it</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>He is the leader of the group in name only</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>He gives advance notice of changes</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>He pushes for increased production</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>He enjoys the privileges of his position</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>He handles complex problems efficiently</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>He is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>He assigns group members to particular tasks</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>He turns the members loose on a job, and lets them go to it</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>He backs down when he ought to stand firm</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>He keeps to himself</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>He asks the members to work harder</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>He gets his superiors to act for the welfare of the group members</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>He gets swamped by details</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>He can wait just so long, then blows up</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>He makes sure that his part in the group is understood by the group members</td>
<td>A B C D E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. He is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. He lets some members have authority that he should keep.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. He looks out for the personal welfare of group members.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. He permits the members to take it easy in their work.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. His word carries weight with his superiors.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. He gets things all tangled up.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. He remains calm when uncertain about coming events.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. He schedules the work to be done.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. He allows the group a high degree of initiative.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. He takes full charge when emergencies arise.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. He is willing to make changes.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. He drives hard when there is a job to be done.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. He gets what he asks for from his superiors.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. He can reduce a madhouse to system and order.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. He is able to delay action until the proper time occurs.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. He maintains definite standards of performance.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. He trusts the members to exercise good judgment.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. He overcomes attempts to challenge his leadership.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
70. He refuses to explain his actions .... A B C D E
71. He urges the group to beat its previous record .......... A B C D E
72. He is working his way to the top .... A B C D E
73. He gets confused when too many demands are made of him .... A B C D E
74. He worries about the outcome of any new procedure .... A B C D E
75. He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations .... A B C D E
76. He permits the group to set its own pace A B C D E
77. He is easily recognized as the leader of the group .... A B C D E
78. He acts without consulting the group .. A B C D E
79. He keeps the group working up to capacity .... A B C D E
80. He maintains cordial relations with superiors .... A B C D E
MINNESOTA SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE

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

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

VS means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.
S means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.
N means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.
DS means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.
VDS means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

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

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

DIRECTIONS: Please consider the professional named above. Rank and rate the performance of the worker, using the eight items below.

1. Which of the eight characteristics of performance does the worker do best? Which does he do poorest? Rank the different characteristics in order from 1 to 8 in the brackets at the left of the items. A rank of (1) means that the worker does better in this than in the other seven performances. A rank of (2) means that he does next best in this performance. A rank of (8) means that more poorly in this than in the other 7 performances.

2. Decide how this worker stands in relation to the agency average on each performance. Mark an X on the rating scale after each item to show how this worker compares with the agency average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Characteristics of Workers</th>
<th>How does this worker compare with the agency average?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Work</td>
<td>LOW AVERAGE HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volume of Work Produced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Order and System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enthusiastic Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persistence against obstacles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyalty to the Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship with Clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship with Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

142
BIBLIOGRAPHY
BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS


Herzberg, Fredrick; Mausner, Bernard; and Snyderman, Barbara. The Motivation to Work. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.


MONOGRAPHS


JOURNALS


UNPUBLISHED

