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Public human service settings are highly bureaucratic organizations with tight centralization of policy and decision-making. They can be inhospitable places for conducting professional work and most appropriate for performing routine tasks based on standardized procedures. Against this backdrop of control, human service workers are asked to respond to the unique and unpredictable problems of people struggling unsuccessfully in society. The inconsistency between work structure and professional responsibility can generate value conflict for public human service employees. There are conflicts of loyalty to employers, laws, clients, colleagues, funding sources, regulations, and the community at large. These conflicts can have profound implications for the well-being of public human service personnel and the effectiveness of service delivery.

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the relationship among the variables of value conflict, job satisfaction, quality of worklife (QWL), and desire to leave the job among direct service workers employed by county Department of Human Service (DHS) offices. The primary objective was to investigate the degree to which value conflict impacts quality of worklife, job satisfaction, and desire to leave the job. A significant part of this study, specifically the examination of value conflict factors, represents new research and adds a new dimension to the social work and organization literature.

The study was designed as a stratified random single stage cluster sample of
urban and rural county human service departments in the State of Ohio. Statistically significant relationships between value conflict, job satisfaction, quality of worklife and desire to leave the job were established from the sample of 967 county human service employees with direct client contact. The urban/rural location of the work setting and academic field of study did not moderate the relationship between value conflict and quality of worklife or between value conflict and job satisfaction. Academic degree level significantly moderated the relationship between value conflict and quality of worklife, but did not moderate the relationship between value conflict and job satisfaction.

Understanding the value conflict factors experienced by public human service employees can provide useful insights into improving their work environment, enhancing work productivity, and improving client outcomes.
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CHAPTER I

THE STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Centralized bureaucratic organizations tend to be inhospitable places for conducting professional work. They are most appropriate for performing routine tasks based on standardized procedures that can be objectively monitored and controlled by a supervisor external to the work process (Martin, 1980). Against this backdrop of control, human service providers are asked to respond to the unique and unpredictable problems of people struggling unsuccessfully in society (Gruber, 1986). The inconsistency between work structure and professional responsibility can generate value conflict for public human service employees (Reamer, 1982). There are conflicts of loyalty to employers, laws, clients, colleagues, funding sources, regulations, communities, and third parties (Abramson, 1983; Prottas, 1979; Timms, 1983). These conflicts can have profound implications for the well-being of public human service personnel and the effectiveness of service delivery (Stout & Posner, 1984).

Examples of highly centralized bureaucratic organizations are public human service agencies which traditionally operate as monolithic bureaucracies with rigid lines of authority and centralized decision making. Thomas (1990) asserts that
such structures are a "disempowering force in the lives of those who must deal with them, public welfare workers, as well as clients" (p. 500). The negative impact on public human service employees of overly bureaucratic structures is compounded by conditions that adversely affect the work environment including excessive caseloads, inadequate facilities and equipment, insufficient support services and excessive paperwork (Daley, 1979). It is hardly surprising, therefore, that job satisfaction and quality of worklife are negatively associated to the recruitment and retention of public human service employees. For example, staff turnover rates in the public children’s welfare system have been estimated at 30% and are higher yet in big cities, in states without degree requirements, and in localities that do not engage in professionally oriented recruitment and retention activities (Hutchinson, 1988; Russell, 1987).

Bureaucratic structures, while they promote efficient production of repetitive, standardized processes, have side effects that may disrupt the emotional climate necessary for the development of sensitive interpersonal relationships between public human service employees and the clients they serve. The division of labor is clearly described. Client workloads are ascribed through formulas and job requirements, and functions are uniform (Bernard, Butler, & Eisenberg, 1979). Formal policies and procedures abound and workers are given little discretionary decision making power (Barber, 1986). One study found that eligibility workers are expected to use over 2,000 pages of information, and in one year they received over 1,100 new pages of new information and directives. This situation
created a "policy overload" and accounted for many of the errors in the eligibility determination process (Bernard, et al., 1979). Control structures are centralized and error rates, productivity data, policy changes and interpretations are usually handled by a central office. Work goals are also prescribed either through policies or central office staff (Lipsky, 1980). Consequently, centralization of power and authority in public human service agencies for the purpose of high productivity and efficiency leads, as Glisson and Durick (1988) pointed out,

> to staff dissatisfaction..., a lower quality of client service..., and a diminished level of worker and organization-level development... To the extent that a centralized power structure stifles worker experimentation, innovation, and openness to change, the chances for discovery of new and better methods appear minimal (p. 34).

The social work profession is ideologically grounded in a value structure that honors client self-determination, self-actualization and basic human rights (Reynolds, 1934). However, social workers and public human service employees are faced with a fundamental paradox when trying to serve the needs of their clients effectively while also responding to the demands of a bureaucratic organization and the community power structure to which the organization is accountable. Providing social services in highly centralized, bureaucratic departments of human services poses a number of demonstrable ethical, professional, and moral constraints involving the conscious manipulation of information, people, events, organization and political elements. These conflicts may lead to the substitution of self-interest and organizational aggrandizement for the intended social purposes, e.g.,
client self-determination, self-actualization (Prottas, 1979). This conflict between organizational structure and the social work profession is further complicated by a Code of Ethics committing the profession to the needs of clients (Loewenburg, 1985). Reynolds (1934) called for formal exploration of the fundamental value and role conflicts faced by public human service employees when trying to serve "client and community." Although the social work profession has given considerable attention to the ethics of practice (Loewenberg & Dolgoff, 1982; Reamer, 1983), most of this attention has been directed at the ethical dimensions of work with clients with only passing mention of the value conflicts and ethical issues that stem from the public human service worker's role in the organization. Studies linking specific value conflicts and dilemmas to job satisfaction and quality of worklife have largely escaped critical analysis. Measurements of job satisfaction, however, may provide a useful vehicle for exploring these perceived conflicts.

OBJECTIVE OF STUDY

The primary purpose of the dissertation study was to examine the relationship among the variables of value conflict, job satisfaction, quality of worklife (QWL) and desire to leave the job among direct service workers employed by county by Department of Human Service (DHS) offices in the State of Ohio. As depicted in the following model, the primary objective of the study was to investigate the degree to which value conflict impacts quality of worklife, job satisfaction and desire to leave the job.
A significant part of this dissertation study, specifically the examination of value conflict factors, represents new research and adds a new dimension to the social work literature. Understanding the value conflict factors experienced by public human service employees can provide useful insights into improving their work environment which ultimately can lead to enhanced work productivity and improved client outcomes.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Preparation of the theoretical basis for the study required a thorough review and focused compilation of the existing literature to establish the current levels of knowledge and understanding in the areas of job satisfaction, quality of worklife, organization theory, value and role conflict, and ethical decision making.

JOB SATISFACTION RESEARCH

During the past 30 years, considerable attention has been directed to measuring job satisfaction and identifying its predictors. As mentioned earlier, this research focus is of particular importance to the public human service sector, which has long been plagued by reports of low staff satisfaction and high turnover.

The literature indicated that at least twelve major factors influence worker satisfaction. These factors were taken from studies conducted in a broad range of settings, only a few of which were human service agencies. The first factor is work itself. This factor either reflects the degree of interest or enjoyment one derives from work or some particular attribute about work such as variety, complexity, difficulty, opportunity for new learning, etc. (Hackman & Lawler, 1971). A related factor influencing work satisfaction is the sense of achievement a worker
derives from his or her job. Jayaratne and Chess (1983) found that job challenge was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction for administrators. This is similar to achievement in that the administrators did not find challenges satisfying if they could not successfully meet them.

Related closely to achievement is responsibility. Both achievement and responsibility were found to be related to job satisfaction by Herzberg (1966), who argued that workers feel greater satisfaction when they are able to learn, grow and achieve through challenging work for which they are responsible. Herzberg incorporated Maslow's (1943) need hierarchy theory which argued that self-actualization (the drive to become everything one is capable of becoming) is a person's highest need. In order for this highest need to be met, physiological and safety needs must be met first, which are followed by belonging and love needs and then by esteem needs. Maslow argued that there is a hierarchal ordering to these needs and higher order needs are neither desired or sought until the more basic needs are met.

An additional factor related to job satisfaction is recognition. Praise is a frequent response for recognizing good work. A variation of this is approval of others, which Maslow argued is important for meeting our esteem needs. Locke (1973) found recognition to be an important factor related to job satisfaction, especially among blue collar workers. Another separate but related factor is advancement or promotion. Promotion to higher pay or more responsibility is a very significant means for recognizing a worker's accomplishment, particularly for higher
level managers. Pay or salary level has also been associated with general worker satisfaction (Lawler, 1971). However, the findings on salary and benefit levels are mixed.

Job security is another factor that has been related to job satisfaction. Because the fear of termination or job reduction is very strong for some individuals, they value job security more than other aspects of their job. Rubin (1976) found security to be very important among blue collar workers. He found that some workers are willing to sacrifice lower pay or poor work conditions in order to avoid the pain of unemployment or shifting from job to job. Weatherby et al. (1980) found that front-line workers valued job security highly, partly because of the limited alternatives available to them. Fine (1976) argued that:

it is only because workers choose not to find fulfillment in their work that they are able to function as healthy human beings.... Workers would indeed become mentally ill, if they took the behaviorists' proposal to heart.... By rejecting involvement in work which cannot be fulfilling, workers save their sanity (p. 493).

Three other factors frequently discussed in the literature, the technical quality of supervision, the human dimensions of the supervisory relationship, and the nature of the organization itself are identified as strong influences on job satisfaction. Locke (1976) argued that separating these factors from other events and conditions allowed for the study of causal attribution and suggested a method of determining the reasons for employee attitudes toward various job attributes and factors. Three principle factors are referred to in the literature.

One of the most frequent factors is the supervisor. It is generally recog-
nized that the quality of supervision can influence a worker's degree of job satisfaction. Two aspects of the supervisory relationship are frequently cited. The first refers to the technical supervision or functional aspects of the supervisor function (Locke, 1976); the second identifies the human relationships of the supervision dimension (Fleishman, 1972). This second supervisory dimension deals with the friendliness, empathy, etc., which the supervisor brings to the relationship. Haynes (1979) argued that the supervisor's planning skills, which were viewed as a more technical skill area, were perhaps a key function for supervisors and that their ability to function in this area may increase job satisfaction significantly for those they supervise.

The last variable related to job satisfaction frequently cited in the literature is that of the company or organization. The literature refers to either organizational policies or conflict and/or ambiguity in role expectations as primary areas which influence job satisfaction. The type of policies that are usually discussed pertain to personnel (e.g. hiring, firing, sick leave, etc.). Role conflict generally pertains to the degree to which role expectations are incompatible or contradictory and role ambiguity relates to the vagueness or lack of clarity in role expectations (House & Rizzo, 1972; Haynes, 1979). Haynes found that the commitment of managers to organizational goals and policies was related to their job satisfaction and potential for growth. Further, it was found that the more managers identified with agency policies and goals, the more satisfied they were with their jobs and the greater they perceived potential for career development. Haynes reported that
role conflict, which could be reduced through clear specification of tasks and responsibilities and good working conditions, could reduce job satisfaction. The latter two are more related to daily work situations and the former to managerial leadership.

Co-workers are also categorized in the literature as influencing job satisfaction. Macarov (1982) found that the greater the similarity in attitudes, values and philosophy, the greater the cohesiveness and group support among workers. Further, he found that the role one plays among co-workers and the extent it is compatible with one's interest and skills is also an important influence on worker job satisfaction.

Sebriesheim & Murphy (1976) found that role stress influences the relationship between a supervisor's behavior and subordinate's job satisfaction. In low stress jobs the increases in supervisor support enhances job satisfaction and performance, whereas in high stress jobs organizational structure is as significant as supervisor support in moderating work satisfaction.

Grinnel and Hill (1979) reported that communications is another area controlled by organizations which influence workers effectiveness and efficiency although what type of communication problem is unclear from their study. Clearly, communication is a very complex concept and it is not at all clear from the literature how it influences job satisfaction.
Job Satisfaction Measurement

Job satisfaction has generally been conceptualized and measured as a multidimensional construct, composed of facets or distinguishable elements toward which a worker makes an evaluative response (Locke, 1983; Vroom, 1964; Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959; and Locke, 1973). One particular advantage of this approach is that very specific facets can be organized into dimensions or subscales such as intrinsic or extrinsic scales. An intrinsic-extrinsic division measures satisfaction with the content as well as the contextual aspects of the job. These two dimensions are theorized to be critical in determining satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959).

Another method of measuring job satisfaction uses a unidimensional or global approach. Generally, this involves one or two questions about the employee's overall, affective reaction to the job. A drawback to this approach is that summational compiled facets do not always account for the majority of the variance in the global measures of job satisfaction. Therefore, it is recommended that job satisfaction be measured using the facet and a facet-free question approach which measures a general response to the job (Quinn & Staines, 1979).

Job Satisfaction Research in Social Work

Although the social work research having to do with job satisfaction has grown steadily (Berg, 1980; Glisson & Durick, 1988; McNeely, 1984; Olmstead & Christensen, 1973; Schwartz & Sample, 1972), much of this work suffers from
methodological and theoretical weaknesses (Taylor, 1978). A number of studies have examined factors associated with social worker's job satisfaction. Some of the work attributes that have been found to be related to satisfaction include: opportunity to use one's own skills and abilities, variety, opportunity for new learning, creativity, workload, role conflict, salary and promotion, and control over the workplace (Hackman & Lawler, 1971; Hackman, 1969).

Some studies have found associations between the personal characteristics of workers and job satisfaction (Himmle, Jayaratne & Chess, 1987; Poulin and Walter, 1992). However, Archer (1991) asserted that attempts to understand job satisfaction by focusing upon the individual worker or upon the inherent nature of the client-worker relationship lead to a "blame the victim" position. He argued that focusing on worker characteristics shifts the burden away from the organization to the worker rather than identifying ways to improve job task and organizational factors that negatively affect job satisfaction. Archer contended that since changing personal characteristics of the worker is difficult and not amenable to policy changes from within the organization, job task and organizational characteristics are the proper focus of change.

The research literature establishes a number of associations between various job tasks and job satisfaction among social workers. Job autonomy has been found to be correlated consistently with job satisfaction. As with general job satisfaction, research in social work shows that workers who experience greater work autonomy and have greater control over their jobs have higher levels of job satis-
faction than those with less autonomy (Fawzy, Wellisch, Pasnau & Leibowitz, 1983; Kafry & Pines, 1980; McCulloch & O'Brien, 1986; Poulin & Walter, 1992). Role ambiguity and skill variety are also significant predictors of job satisfaction for social workers, as are role conflict, task identity, and task significance (Haynes, 1979; Rizzo, House & Lirtzman, 1970).

The findings on salary and benefit levels are mixed. Vinokur-Kaplan (1991) found a significant association between satisfaction with salary and job satisfaction in a study of child welfare social workers, but the relationship varied with organizational auspices. Further, it was not a significant factor for social workers in higher paying public agencies. It was a strong predictor of job satisfaction, however, among those in the lower paying private, non-profit sector. Similarly, Jayaratne and Chess (1984) found that financial reward was related to job satisfaction among community mental health workers, but not related among family service and child welfare workers. Interestingly, they also found that financial reward was associated negatively with the intent to change jobs among community mental health and child welfare workers.

Attempts to view job satisfaction in the overall work context are minimal, although some studies have made important conceptual links. For example, Rousseau's (1977) model of job satisfaction depicts the organization as a work system of interrelated components. This model emphasizes the multidimensional context of work attitudes. Organizational characteristics, job tasks and worker characteristics are inter-related components of worker job satisfaction. Bunker
and Wijinberg (1985) noted the impact of supervisory style and behavior motivation on performance. Barber (1986) in a study of job satisfaction in a state social service agency, suggested greater involvement of direct service workers and supervisors in policy formulation and implementation. In a similar vein, Buffum and Ritvo (1984) identified decentralized decision making as one strategy to increase job satisfaction. Beck (1987) found that the adequacy of organizational resources has an effect on social worker’s job satisfaction. Poulin and Walter (1992) found that social workers in organizations with adequate resources and professional support staff are more satisfied with their jobs than those working in organizations that do not have adequate resources.

Typically, the social work job satisfaction research distinguishes global job satisfaction from an employee’s commitment to an organization’s goals and values and their intention to stay employed in the organization. The need to separate these two concepts stems from the emphasis on job satisfaction being on the specific task environment where an employee performs his or her duties, whereas organizational commitment emphasizes attachment to an employing organization including its goals and values (Glisson & Durick, 1988; Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979). In public human service settings more research is needed relating to the organizational commitment variables especially in relationship to value conflict as it relates to general job satisfaction. Although organizational commitment factors have been studied, virtually none specifically relate to the unique value conflicts and resulting ethical dilemmas that public human service workers encounter.
QUALITY OF WORKLIFE

The concept of job satisfaction has been an elusive concept and researchers have questioned not only the validity of its measurements, but also its conceptual utility (Taylor, 1978). As an alternative to the narrow concept of job satisfaction, Davis and Trist (1977) have proposed a broader term, the quality of working life (QWL), which refers to the relationship between a worker and his or her work environment as a whole, with an emphasis on human dimensions. Of particular significance is the notion that QWL includes a focus on not only the worker but also on organizational effectiveness (Gummer, 1985). Gowdy (1988) points out that the most important participation benefits for clients result directly from human interaction between clients and workers. She asserted that clients and workers are more critical resources to performance in human service organizations than are public support, funding, policies, or facilities.

Unfortunately, in contrast to the abundance of QWL studies done in the private sector, a paucity of research relating to human services is available and none was found specifically relating to state or county department of human services. It seems ironic that the broad-based, general business movement toward humanizing work conditions, founded on values central to those of social work have so far been fundamentally ignored by human service professions. Interestingly, the human service literature that does examine QWL factors virtually ignores the unique value, role, and ethical dilemmas workers in such settings face and reinforces the need for such variables to be considered and researched.
In defining QWL conceptually, a review of the literature reveals general consensus that managerial values play a key role. Kanter (1983) cautioned against the temptation to segment the idea into "a special quality-of-worklife program to be nice to workers" without including it in broader change strategies (p. 181). He also emphasized the importance of viewing QWL efforts as a major factor in organizational design innovations, underscoring the need to define QWL as a process as well as an integrated organizational performance and effectiveness effort.

In the United States, QWL definitions contain a dual focus of improving outcomes for both workers and organizations. Camman (1984) defines QWL as a type of organizational change program whose prime objective is to create organizations that more effectively deliver services and products valued by society while simultaneously being rewarding, stimulating places for employees to work.

Robert Guest (1979) contended that the term “quality of worklife” is a general description that relates to an individual’s feelings about every dimension of work including economic rewards and benefits, security, working conditions, and organizational and interpersonal relationships. It is interesting to note that in light of the growing focus on outcomes, nothing regarding a worker’s ability to most effectively serve his/her clients or customers was included in this list. Guest views QWL as a process by which an organization can attempt to access employee creativity through direct involvement with the decisions that affect their working lives. He postulated that an important characteristic of the QWL process is the emphasis...
placed on both extrinsic and intrinsic factors. While the extrinsic factors of productivity and efficiency are acknowledged, the intrinsic aspects of worker perceptions are stressed as having important implications affecting overall organizational goals. Trist (1978) identified these extrinsic features of work as fair pay, job security, benefits, safety, health, and due process. Trist's intrinsic factors relate to job variety and challenge, opportunity to learn, autonomy, recognition, support, meaningful social contributions, and workplace conditions that enable the development of greater skill and enhanced responsibility.

The work developed by Lippitt and Rumbey (1977) approached QWL from a broad perspective in which work provides an opportunity for an individual to satisfy a wide variety of personal needs. These needs include job security, interaction with others, a sense of personal usefulness, recognized achievement and the opportunity to improve skills and knowledge. Nadler (1978), emphasized the structural aspect of the process, suggesting these structural aspects establish a framework for integrative bargaining where both labor and management work cooperatively in a problem-solving mode.

The American Society of Training and Development (ASTD) portrayed QWL as a process to be utilized by organizations to enable members at all levels to actively participate in shaping the organization's environment, methods, and outcomes. This value-based process aimed at meeting the dual goals of enhanced organizational effectiveness and improved quality of worklife for employees (ASTD, 1983).
In order to more clearly relate these commonalities directly to the workplace, Stein (1983) formulated the following set of fundamental assumptions which are basic to the QWL process: 1) Control or Autonomy: This aspect assumes the individual has the capacity to affect the work environment through a reasonable amount of freedom of action. 2) Recognition: This assumption deals with the realization that persons within the workplace are to be treated as individuals as well as contributors. 3) Inclusion: This premise recognizes the individual’s need to be a part of a social unit with shared goals and values. 4) Progress and Development: This aspect of the QWL process assumes that benefits derived from work should include intrinsic rewards from the organization (e.g., challenge, professional development, and recognition for accomplishment). 5) Extrinsic Rewards: This component addresses the usual benefits that come from work such as pay, promotion, and other highly visible rewards. 6) Acceptable Working Conditions: This basic premise recognizes the need for a work environment that provides satisfactory standards of space, cleanliness and privacy, as well as adequate material support and safety. 7) Dignity: This aspect of the QWL deals with the individual’s need to be treated with respect under all circumstances and the need for the resolution of problems and conflict to be resolved in ways that avoid professional embarrassment. (p. 18)

Peters and Waterman (1982) contended that QWL characteristics are driven by a core set of values within an organization that values and treats employees and individuals with respect and dignity, regards them as valuable resources, places a high priority on employee training, sponsors a large number and wide variety of employee recognition and reward programs, and encourages innovation, autonomy, and participative decision-making within the workplace.

Other efforts to understand and define QWL have used empirical approaches. For example, Taylor (1978) used factor analysis to identify five QWL dimensions: current issues (e.g., sex discrimination, safety, due processes), social work environment (e.g., trust, honest communication, self-esteem, free speech).
growth and development (e.g., career opportunities, chances to grow and learn, choices between challenging jobs), organization improvement (e.g., productivity, loyalty, motivation), and improving society (e.g., low unemployment, promoting effective unions, chance to enjoy life off the job). Nachmias (1988) used a multidimensional questionnaire to explore the subjective experiences of a large sample of federal employees. A two-stage factor analysis revealed five fairly distinct QWL dimensions important to this group. Supervision, especially clarifying goals and performance criteria, made up the most relevant factor. Relationships with co-workers and job attributes (e.g., degree of meaning, challenge, and satisfaction) were the second and third most important factors respectively. Work group relationships ranked fourth and, lastly, economic dimensions of work.

On a conceptual level it should be remembered that it is crucial to the effectiveness of QWL improvement efforts in public human service settings to go beyond a simplistic, mechanistic definition to one that recognizes and values the interrelationships and the resulting conflicts between the values, roles and goals of workers, organizations, interest groups and the community power structure at large. Paying attention to each dynamic of this process as it impacts and unfolds over time in system-wide change strategies is of paramount concern and QWL improvement strategies.
THEORETICAL CONTEXT OF JOB SATISFACTION AND QWL

The theoretical linkage of the concepts of job satisfaction and QWL has evolved from the organizational behavior research conducted in the areas of management styles, motivation, and work groups. Research in these areas was initiated in response to models and theories popular in the 1920's, such as Frederick Taylor's school of scientific management (Simmons & Mares, 1983; Zager & Rosow, 1982). Taylor's theory of scientific management indicated that it was the duty of employees to do the work and the duty of the managers to think. He asserted that all aspects of planning, directing, coordinating, and evaluating should be done by management. Taylor believed that employees were only interested in money and were incapable of thinking beyond their next paycheck. In an effort to get more work out of the employee, Taylor's solution was to "scientifically" measure and time all components of each job to come up with the "one best way" to get the job done (Simmons & Mares, 1983). Taylor advocated the subdivision of labor into its smallest parts. He claimed that an employee should only be given the knowledge needed for the mechanical performance of a particular, minute task.

The legitimacy of Taylor's scientific management theory has been sharply and effectively challenged over the last 70 years. Elton Mayo (1933) was one of the first researchers to investigate some of the problems associated with the scientific management method (e.g., increased absenteeism, lower worker morale, and lower production). Mayo and his associates conducted their studies at the
Western Electric Plant at Hawthorne, Illinois. The studies begun in the late 1920's were based on the scientific management premise that if various adjustments were made in working conditions, management could determine the "one best way" for doing each job. Mayo and his associates studied two groups of women to determine the effects of different levels of illumination on worker performance. The level of illumination was changed in one group but not in the other. Findings from this study showed that when illumination was increased, the level of performance increased, however productivity also increased in the control group. Unexpectedly, productivity was also increased when modifications were made in seating positions and break times. This unanticipated effect has become known as the "Hawthorne Effect".

The results of the illumination studies led to further investigations of the working environment in the women's relay assembly test room. The researchers concluded that productivity increased not because of mechanical changes or improvements in working conditions, but because researchers and managers paid personal attention to employees. The workers in the study were consulted about many aspects of the changes and were able to veto those that were objectionable. Mayo observed that the group developed a sense of participation in the critical determinations and became a social unit. He noted that the social unit considerably influenced worker behavior. The supervisor became less of an order-giver and disciplinarian and more of a facilitator and coach helping the group understand its responsibility to establish its working conditions. Mayo suggested that
management and administration encourage employees to form stable work groups with specific goals, whose attainment could benefit the entire group.

The research conducted at Hawthorne and elsewhere during that time provided the impetus for critics of the scientific management school to argue that the human factor must be considered when management makes changes in the workplace. Researchers indicated that rigid job specifications, rules, and policies stifle the creativity, growth, development and the general effectiveness of the human side of the organization (Carroll & Tosi, 1977; Driscoll, 1978; Elizur & Tziner, 1977).

Argyris (1957) made a strong case for reducing the amount of "scientific management" in traditional organizational control structures. He asserted that constraints placed on employees by the organization are self-defeating to the organization's goals of efficiency and effectiveness. He postulated that the bureaucratic form of organizations was incongruent with the basic needs of the healthy individual and claimed it treated the lower ranked members of an organization like children. Further, he asserted that excessive bureaucracy fostered dependence among employees and led to frustration of their higher-order human needs for self-esteem and self-actualization as defined by Maslow (1943).

McGregor (1960) rephrased this argument identifying two sharply contrast-ing management styles labeled "Theory X and Theory Y". He claimed that the Theory X style of management assumes that people are basically lazy, dislike work, and have goals that run counter to those of the organization. As a result,
the manager or supervisor must provide close supervision and guidance to insure higher performance. In contrast, Theory Y contends that people want to work and that they are mature, self-motivated, and self-controlled. Theory Y holds that a manager can encourage the individual’s basic desire to work through trust and cooperation with little need for either rigid organizational or interpersonal control. McGregor suggested that the capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population. Marsteller (1992) concluded that McGregor's delineation of Theory X and Theory Y helped to clarify and popularize the distinction between authoritarian and participatory management but failed to indicate how organizational management could shift from the X to Y approach.

Addressing the need for structural changes in organizations to facilitate better interpersonal relations, Likert (1961) proposed a system of participative management based on his “linking pin” theory. The “linking pin” model suggests that organizations should consist of “families” that are connected through their common members or “linking pins”. Likert’s “families” consisted of a supervisor and the people who report directly to that supervisor. The group as a whole takes responsibility for its work and for making decisions regarding its tasks. The supervisor (or formal leader) in each group serves as a “linking pin” since he or she belongs to two organizational families as head of a group of employees and also a member of a group of peers who meet with their own supervisor. Likert postulated
that every member of the organization (except those at the very bottom or top) served as a “linking pin”.

Katz & Kahn (1978) reported that in the “linking pin” system, decisions tended to be made at the most appropriate level in the organization. Consequently, top management was relieved of smaller decisions that could be made by those most directly involved. Further, in this system, every group within the organizational structure had a voice in decision-making and implementation. Likert (1961, 1967) asserted that the most valuable resources of the organization are the skills and motivation of its members whose involvement enhances decision-making and implementation.

The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations (London) influenced current QWL thinking heavily through its notion of the organization as a "socio-technical system" encompassing the structure of jobs, the people performing them, the technology, and the interactions between various parts of the organization and supervision/management roles (Jenkins, 1983). According to Davis and Trist (1974), socio-technical theory is based on two premises. First, in any purposeful organization in which people are required to perform activities, the desired output is achieved through the actions of the social as well as a technical system. Output, then, is the function of their joint operation. Second, every socio-technical system is embedded in the environment heavily influenced by the values and generally accepted principles of that culture.

The Tavistock socio-technical system theory stresses that there should be
a balance between the technological and social factors in the workplace. Katz & Kahn (1978), building on the Tavistock studies on primary work group units, argued that the need for fulfillment and autonomy can be achieved in groups with strong decision-making authority. Emery Trist (1978) and his colleagues at the Tavistock Institute focused on the primary workgroup. The researchers assumed that there were three major needs for which people seek gratification in the workplace: a sense of fulfillment in completing a meaningful task, some autonomy in completing the task and good relationships with co-workers performing similar tasks.

The linkage of job satisfaction and the QWL issues is supported by a complex set of interrelated psychological theories. The work of Maslow, Herzberg, and Vroom have provided important contributions to this movement. Brayfield and Crockett (1955) and the further work by Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson and Capwell (1957), created uncertainty concerning the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation. These studies failed to demonstrate a high correlation between high worker satisfaction and motivation and, thus, generated considerable interest in theories of motivation.

The most widely utilized model is the previously described theory developed by Abraham Maslow (1943) which identifies the existence of five levels of human needs. The highest level of Maslow's model addresses the individual's need for self-development, which he termed the need for "self-actualization." Alderfer (1969) gave similar constructs such labels as "growth" and the "need for
Strongly influenced by the work of Maslow, Herzberg (1966) approached workplace satisfaction through an analysis of specific job factors that influence an individual's perception of worklife. His approach maintained that all humans have two basic types of needs they seek to fulfill at work as well as in other settings. Herzberg identified these basic requirements as the need to avoid pain and the need for psychological growth. He contended that both types of needs are gratified to varying degrees depending on specific job tasks and the work environment. He divided these inputs or job factors into two basic groups: those issues and activities that prevent job dissatisfaction but do not promote employee growth, and those factors that directly promote employee motivation and growth. Herzberg contended that attention to the factors that directly interface with job satisfaction promote psychological growth. He claimed that the fulfillment of job satisfaction factors is a pain avoidance behavior which generates neither feelings of satisfaction nor motivation to work harder. Herzberg termed the growth-enhancing aspects of work "motivation factors" and the pain avoidance aspects "hygiene factors". Herzberg found motivation factors intrinsic to work itself by rendering tasks more enjoyable, interesting, and psychologically rewarding. Specific factors associated with this aspect of Herzberg's theory include recognition, responsibility, advancement, achievement, and growth potential. "Hygiene factors", on the other hand, are generally extrinsic to the work situation and are associated with the context in which work is performed (e.g., supervision, salary, working conditions,
In order to redress the problems of previous motivational theories, Vroom (1964) developed a model that is generally referred to as "expectancy theory". The major component of the expectancy model deals with an individual's subjective assessment of the probability of certain outcomes. The perceived relationship between direct outcomes and indirect outcomes, the cornerstones of "expectancy theory", is termed "instrumentality". Instrumentality, therefore, refers to the subjective link between accomplishing an immediate outcome and the ability to reach other, related goals. The second major component relates to an individual's perception of the likelihood that the desired outcome is achievable. This component is termed "expectancy" and is utilized as an indication of the effort-performance relationship. Thus, expectancy is the extent to which people subjectively link their behavior to an immediate outcome or goal.

In order to gain a more complete description of individual motivational behavior, the expectancy model also focused on the attractiveness of possible indirect outcomes. This attractiveness component is termed "valance." Valance is the measure of the relative importance of outcomes or goals to the individual. Vroom contended that discovering what is important to particular individuals would aid in motivation and improving job satisfaction.

Expectancy theory has served as a basis for several research studies relative to job satisfaction. In general, findings indicate that the quality of an individ-
ual's work is a function of the desirability of the possible outcomes and utility of work for attaining possible outcomes (Hackman & Porter, 1968; Lawler & Porter, 1967). In all these studies it was determined that the valance-instrumentality function was a reliable predictor of performance and workplace satisfaction (Lawler & Porter, 1967). This finding is supported by the characteristics that comprise inner-directed individuals, who hold strong beliefs that outcomes can be affected through other actions, thus creating a higher expectancy of success.

Research conducted relative to expectancy theory clearly and consistently indicates that individuals select occupations (Mitchell & Knudson, 1973; Wanous, 1972) and specific work tasks (Vroom, 1968) based on the perceived valence of the indirect outcomes as well as the instrumentalities of the various options for affecting these outcomes. In general, expectancy theory indicates that an individual's choices and actions within the workplace are influenced by both the degree of attractiveness (valence) of the indirect outcome and the instrumentality of these choices or actions relative to achieving desirable goals. Thus, Vroom's work provided a foundation from which to examine the factors that contribute to job satisfaction, motivation, and quality of worklife in general. In order to more fully understand the theoretical foundation of job satisfaction and especially the QWL process, two additional considerations must be examined. These additional factors are attribution theory and the concept of extrinsic and intrinsic rewards.

Attribution theory is a method of problem-solving in which the perceived causal links between antecedent conditions and factors are analyzed in an at-
tempt to account for subsequent observed behavior. Briefly, attribution theory is applied first through the observation of behavior. The behavior is then judged to be intentional or accidental (Bartunek, 1979). If the behavior is judged intentional, then an attempt is made to determine whether the action was caused by a situational factor or by the individual's personality. For example, if behavior for the same employee over different job tasks is similar when other employee behavior differs for each task, then it is highly reasonable to attribute that person's behavior to personality traits instead of job related characteristics. Thus, the attribution model deals with factors that have input into the reasons why a particular individual acted in a certain way. According to attribution theory, when an organization is experiencing difficulty or individuals are demoralized, available information is analyzed in such a way that an employee's behavior or attitudes are attributed to either personality or situational factors.

The final consideration relative to understanding motivation and its function as a part of the job satisfaction and especially the QWL process is the concept of extrinsic and intrinsic rewards. As previously mentioned, extrinsic rewards are thought of as more traditional workplace rewards, such as pay, fringe benefits, and working conditions. In contrast, intrinsic rewards are less tangible, such as growth on the job, status, and outlets for creativity. These types of rewards are ultimately related to the nature of the work experience while extrinsic rewards are related to the context and material aspects of the work itself (Deming, 1986; Porter & Steers, 1973).
Although both of these factors seem to have important input to workplace satisfaction, the research emphasizes that they do not function in an additive or cumulative manner (Staw, 1976). Research suggests that adding extrinsic rewards to an already intrinsically rewarding job is redundant and does not necessarily increase an individual's motivation, performance, or satisfaction (Porter & Steers, 1973; Staw, 1976).

The potential of employee motivation, extended ownership, and decentralized responsibility inherent in the quality of worklife paradigm must be considered within the context of problems inherent to public human service settings and the public sector, as well as the specific organizational context (Cummings & Molloy, 1977). These possibilities are contingent upon particulars that relate to agency function and worker conflicts as well as to significant variations in organizational membership (Glisson & Durick, 1988). Researchers arguing that organizations are complex and paradoxical, rather than simple, can look to public human service organization bureaucracies to substantiate their argument (Heffron, 1989; Kerce & Booth-Kewley, 1993; Levine, 1975; Nachmias, 1988). In order to more fully explore these issues, the job satisfaction, QWL and organizational theoretical contexts should be expanded to include information relevant to public human service settings.
JOB SATISFACTION AND QWL: CONSIDERATIONS FOR PUBLIC HUMAN SERVICE SETTINGS

As a traditional theme in organization literature, the development of management theory has been closely wedded to the overall perspectives on the nature of organizational evolution over the years. Certainly, Taylor’s "scientific management" theory is based upon the imagery of organizations as machines that can produce a tangible product efficiently. Such classical views have obvious implications regarding the nature of organizational performance that reinforce conventional views about how to motivate and promote job satisfaction. Specifically, the traditional literature argues that bureaucratic structures are well-suited to standard operating procedures. Such routines apply to agency situations which are generic in nature. "Scientific management" assumes the ability to analyze the nature of specific tasks needed to produce a standard output efficiently. Only after this "engineering" function is accomplished, can management determine appropriate positive or negative sanctions to "motivate" employees.

Public sector bureaucracies such as public human service organizations are service-oriented rather than producers of tangible products. Public sector performance often requires an appropriate response to a non-generic situation, a "problem", rather than meeting the performance quota of a generic production process (Glisson, 1978; Mohrman, 1983). Nonetheless, the public administration literature (including public welfare) generally subscribes to an activist "organization design" approach to problem-solving that assumes that organizations can utilize
formal control as a means of resolving nonspecific problems (Levine, 1975).

The term "organization design" refers to managerial applications of organization theory to bring about desired changes. As Levine and others suggest, "organization design" literature emerged in the late 1960's offering administrators of public organizations methods for both diagnosing problems and inducing desired changes that effectively respond to those problems. The term "organization design" generally incorporates the "scientific" approach to organizations, relying upon an accumulated body of research knowledge about particular organizational issues and then utilizing that knowledge to predict the outcomes of various intervention strategies inducing desired change (Triandis, 1966). Subsequently, the logic of "organization design" provided the basis for growing attention to program evaluation methods to ascertain the effectiveness of a range of social programs initiated in prior years.

Levine suggested that the logic of "organization design" is based upon tenuous assumptions about the nature of public sector problems. He argued that "organization design" assumes problems are "well-structured"; that the practitioner can effectively ascertain and control the environmental conditions at issue and that the organization can exert the appropriate control to induce change. While conceding that some problems are repetitive and generic (and amenable to "structured" definition), Levine argued that public service administrators and employees cope with a range of issues or "ill-structured problems" that cannot be clearly understood. He defined ill-structured problems as those that elude definitive courses
of a managerial action and those whose environmental contexts are not well-un-
derstood, much less controlled.

As previously mentioned, Herzberg (1968) provided the conceptual connec-
tion between motivation and classical management theory. The underlying clas-
sical theory assumes that management can identify and specify the hygiene func-
tion levels such as raises or benefits necessary to achieve job satisfaction and
performance goals. Clearly, the notion of "ill-structured" public agency situations
(especially those that occur in public human service organizations) undermines
classical thinking about how to motivate and enhance job satisfaction and the
quality of worklife. But motivation, using Herzberg's concepts of job enrichment,
seems to raise even more problematic questions given the difficulties of "design-
ing" answers to "ill-structured" problems. With regard to motivation, a fundamental
question arises as to how managers can enrich jobs and enhance the quality of
worklife (in ways that offer greater responsibility, achievement, and recognition) in
public human service settings where performance standards and expectations are
illusive (Cummings & Huse, 1989; Golembiewski, Proehl & Sink, 1981; McConkie,
1989) and often contradictory due to the demands of multiple constituencies and
interest groups which force employees to lie, break rules and policies as they try
to most effectively meet the needs of their clients (Prottas, 1979; Lipsky, 1980).

Todd LaPorte (1971) asserted that the prevalence of management science
poses a fundamental threat to the democratic characteristics and quality of work-
life of public organizations. He contended that there is little doubt that the classi-
cal strategies of motivating. (e.g., the issuance of positive and negative sanctions) imply clear ownership by a managerial elite. To the extent that his concept of job enrichment extends responsibility throughout the organization, Herzberg's approach to motivation infers a broadening of ownership similar to that found in the recent motivation, quality of worklife, and "excellence" literature, but quite foreign to the traditional public human service setting.

As previously mentioned, research indicates that most public managers and human service administrators rely on the control orientation of classical management as they employ purposeful, rational action in trying to control the uncontrollable (e.g., "ill-structured" situations). The argument is that public organizations rely upon regulatory procedures in attempting to establish order of unpredictable environmental circumstances and more generally upon society as a whole (Beer, Eisenstat, & Spector, 1990; Cummings & Huse, 1989; McConkie, 1989). This observation parallels Michael Smith's (1978) argument that bureaucratic inertia poses a number of formidable barriers to organizational democracy that ultimately relate to environmental uncertainty and value conflict. William Eddy (1981) elaborated upon many of these barriers such as hostile environments, poor intra-agency communication, conflicting expectations and heavy reliance on the use of policy manuals and rigid hierarchal structures.

Even amidst the current popularity of the "excellence" and QWL literature, the issue of ownership in public human service agencies becomes clouded by the relationships among elected office holders (e.g. county commissioners), appointed
professional managers, employees, clients, funding sources and citizenry. Weberian bureaucracy separates management from owners and classical public administration separates a professional administrative structure from the policy-making realm of the elected and the control of the power structure to which public human service workers are held accountable. Decentralizing responsibility in public sector agencies implies that top-level managers are indeed the elite who manipulate values so as to extend ownership (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Chisolm, 1983; Savas, 1982).

By its nature, the issues of employee motivation, job satisfaction and QWL involve managerial decisions concerning particular combinations of resources in pursuit of particular organizational goals. For example, Taylor’s “scientific management” implies a fairly simple trade-off of monetary resources (salary incentives) for enhanced human efforts and increased productivity.

Much has been made about the financial restrictions placed upon public management systems to offer significant incentives linking monetary rewards to increased performance. Barbara Romzek’s (1985) survey of 483 federal, state, and local employees (which included those working in public human service agencies) in Kansas and Missouri offers encouraging findings. Parallel with Herzberg’s (1968) concept of employee enrichment, Romzek’s research indicates that intrinsic rewards such as recognition are more important factors enhancing employee motivation than the extrinsic rewards in public service settings. In her study, she found that recognition brought about much stronger employee identification with
the agency which, in turn, positively affected service attitudes. But Romzek cautioned that the relative strength of the intrinsic motivators is greatest at higher management levels (suggestive of Abraham Maslow's well-known hierarchy of needs theory). However, her study does not address the particular issues related to the inherent value conflicts experienced by public human service employees. The extent to which recognition and extended ownership can be effective motivators in light of conflicting goals and values apparent at all levels of the hierarchy in public human service organizations remains an open question and ripe for study.

ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY IN THE PUBLIC HUMAN SERVICE CONTEXT

Much of the aforementioned theoretical foundations are predicated on a harmony of interests and a unity of purpose of the organization as a whole (Barfield, 1981). This orientation emphasizes broad-based understanding and acceptance of organizational goals, task interdependence, integration of functions, and views organizations as essentially cooperative systems. This is hardly the case in public human service settings because of the demands, policies, and power structure of the multiple constituencies impacting these organizations.

The idea of the organization as a single-purpose, integrated system has its roots. Mintzberg (1983) suggested, in early economic theory which depicted the organization as consisting of one actor/one goal. The organization was synonymous with a single entrepreneur whose only goal was to maximize profits. The
one actor/one goal model was outside the economic sphere. The entrepreneur was replaced by elected officials in the public sector and community elites in the private sector. Administrative organizations were treated as neutral instruments for implementing policy. The early history of non-governmental social agencies was characterized by the powerful role of business and community elites, acting through agency boards, and establishing policies and procedures to be carried out by paid staff.

As the study of organizations progressed, weaknesses emerged in the assumptions behind the one actor/one goal model. The first tenet to be challenged was the idea that organizations have only one goal. Studies of business firms showed that the firms were often systems with multiple goals imposed from the outside. The role of the chief executive or administrator, moreover, evolved from the command and control style of the early entrepreneurs to that of "peak coordinator" with responsibility for establishing priorities among competing goals. This change in roles gave rise to a single actor/multiple goals model (Mintzberg, 1983).

Discussions of multiple goals related to the multiple constituencies within social service organizations began in earnest in the 1960’s with the appearance of a number of studies in which the authors argued that the stated goal of services for clients was only one of several goals (Lipsky, 1980; Martin, 1980; Patti, 1985; Perrow, 1978). Martin included other unstated goals as the:

- maintenance and enhancement of the agency’s social control such as isolation and control of people deemed deviant or disruptive to the social order; diffusion of resentment against the established so-
cial, economic and political systems: diversion of the dispossessed from taking political action; and provision of career opportunities for the growing number of human service professionals (p. 19).

As the work of organizations became technologically more sophisticated and the degree of task interdependence intensified, multiple centers of power emerged and the number of people involved in key organizational decisions increased. A multiple actors/multiple goals conception of the organization was first discussed in Cyert and March's (1963) theory of the business firm as a coalition of actors who bargained among themselves to set organizational goals. This theory replaced central authority with multiple authorities. Participants who were previously outside of the decision-making system, "negotiating with the peak coordinator for inducements and contributions, now became inside actors bargaining to determine outcomes and thereby to establish the organization's goal" (Gruber, 1986; p. 13). The idea of multiple actors within social service organizations gained impetus through studies of the decision-making engaged in by lower-level staff. In her research on state mental hospitals, Smith identified what she called the "front-line organization" (Smith, 1965). This type of organization deviates from the model of hierarchal control of lower-level employees because the locus of organizational initiative is with front-line units. Smith contends that each unit's task is performed independently of other units making direct supervision of unit activities impractical. These characteristics enable line workers to exercise considerable power over individual clients and allows them to pursue practices which may be at odds with official organizational policy. Although such arrangements
are frequently justified on the grounds that they allow workers to be responsible to
the special circumstances and needs of clients. Smith contends that they can also
lead to pockets of arbitrary and unchecked power which can burden decision mak-
ing and create conflicts for workers.

Social work is infused with values, both those imposed by society and those
that emanate from the profession’s philosophical orientation. Prottas (1979) as-
serted that the value-laden nature of the profession produced the multitude of
purposes that characterizes many social service organizations. Further, he
claimed that public organizations were created and structured to fulfill public pur-
poses in the interest of society. These purposes are determined, however
broadly, by external organizations possessing oversight power. Donnison (1955)
contended that all social services involve some conception of social health that
social workers seek to help their clients attain, but argued "there is no generally
understood state of 'social health' toward which all people strive." He argued that
social service agencies, particularly public agencies, have become arenas where
competing values and beliefs clash. Lipsky (1968) reported that when there is
agreement about goals, it is usually an uneasy one and the result of one group's
ability to gain temporary hegemony over others. Further, he stated that these goal
conflicts are often avoided by allowing the different organizational and profes-
sional factions to independently pursue their own goals. This can lead to workers
being confronted with value and ethical dilemmas over how to best meet client
needs.
ROLE, VALUE AND ETHICAL CONFLICTS IN SOCIAL WORK

Having reviewed the literature to systematize what is known about the impact of the organization on performance and job satisfaction, it is important to examine the literature relating to role and value conflicts and the resulting ethical dilemmas that inevitably arise at the point where the public human service professional meets the constraints of the organization.

Role Conflict

A review of the literature related to role conflict is the necessary first step to more fully understanding the impact of value conflict among public human service workers. Kahn, et al. (1964) have provided a view of role theory which focuses on the nature and effects of rapidly changing role expectations familiar to public human service workers. The theory holds that conflicting, incompatible or unclear expectations about one’s professional or occupational role leads to personal stress and a low degree of job satisfaction. Role conflict results when incompatible or tenuously compatible demands or expectations are placed upon the worker. Role ambiguity is a lack of clarity as to what is the expected, appropriate, or effective behavior. All appear as common problem areas in public human services (Billingsley 1964).

Much of the role strain leading to value conflicts associated with public human service work appears to originate at the interface of the general social work roles of advocate, broker, and enabler and the specific demands of the work set-
ting with its legal constraints, rigid policies and stringent rules and regulations (Harrison, 1980; Friedson, 1970; Prattas, 1979; Wasserman, 1970). Prattas (1979) asserted that this integration of demands is theoretically possible, but that workers often find they are expected to simultaneously fulfill a set of contradictory expectations and policies developed by law and human service agencies. Many practitioners might see the problem of integrating these demands as an example of role conflict and the lack of clarity as to just what they are supposed to be integrating as a matter of role ambiguity.

In classical organization theory the principle of chain of command and the principle of unity of command and direction have implications for role conflict in complex organizations (Kahn, et al., 1964). According to the chain of command principle, organizations set up on the basis of hierarchical relationships with a clear and single flow of authority from the top to the bottom should be more satisfying to members and should result in more effective economic performance and goal achievement than organizations set up without such authority flow. The principle of unity of command states that for any action an employee should receive orders from one superior only and that there should be only one leader and one plan for a group of activities having the same objectives. The essence of this principle is that the structure of an organization should keep a member from being caught in the crossfire of incompatible orders or incompatible expectations from more than one superior. Social service organizations frequently violate the chain of com-
mand principle. Blau and Scott (1962) pointed out that:

two sources of authority exists when organizational discipline is based not only on position power, supported by formal sanctions, and derived from the legal contract governing employment of the organizational member and the formal sanctions vested in the superior's position—but also on professional expertise which is enforced by collegial authority (p. 74).

Along that theme, several studies have shown that: 1) multiple authority disrupts a worker's orientation to his/her organization or to his or her profession by requiring him/her to choose between the two (Etzioni, 1959; Evans, 1962; Gouldner, 1958 a: 1958 b; Kaplan, 1959; LaPorte, 1965; Lipsky, 1980: Pottas, 1979), 2) workers oriented primarily toward their professional norms are more critical of the organization and more likely to ignore administrative details (Blau & Scott, 1962), and 3) professionals in such organizations frequently experience stress as a result of being caught in the middle (Evans, 1962; Kaplan, 1959; LaPorte, 1965; Pottas, 1979). Reinforcing the theme of the dissertation study, this evidence seems to indicate that multiple lines of authority and varying values, norms and priorities are accompanied by role conflict and dissatisfaction for workers as well as loss of organizational efficiency and effectiveness.

The research of Kahn, et al. (1964) and a number of subsequent studies has supported the general hypothesis that role conflict and role ambiguity are associated with lower levels of job satisfaction. One of the most pertinent studies was done by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) which provided both an extensive review of the literature and psychometric scales to measure the role variables. In
some studies based on the Kahn, et al. theory, role conflict was found to be more closely associated with job satisfaction than was role ambiguity. In other studies, role ambiguity was the better predictor. Kahn, et al. contend that since a variety of settings have been used in research, it is likely that the specific type of work or organization determines the relative importance of the variables studied.

As mentioned earlier, one of the most popular measures of role conflict and role ambiguity is the instrument developed by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970). Use of this scale has consistently shown high correlation between various measures of dissatisfaction and role ambiguity, but less with role conflict (Harrison, 1980; Rizzo et al., 1970). For example, Harrison's study of child protective services employees used this scale and found that "workers need to be fairly clear about what is expected of them in fulfilling their role in order for them to feel good about their work" (p. 41). while role conflict was not as significant.

A major question in the role conflict literature has to do with the effects of role conflict on individuals. The general consensus has been that role conflict has negative results on people. For example, Fisher and Geitelson (1983) conducted a metaanalysis of 43 studies on role conflict and role ambiguity and found that "conflict is... negatively related to commitment, involvement, satisfaction with pay, co-workers and supervisors, and to supervision and participation in decision-making" (p. 330).

Several researchers have suggested that role conflict actually contributed to positive outcomes for individuals and their organizations. For example, Stout &
Posner (1984) propose that role conflicts might be "more amenable to problem-solving or coping behavior because of the options and diversity it provides for the worker" resulting in less stress and less impact on job satisfaction (p. 752). Likewise, Van Fell et al. (1981), in recommending future research, noted that "little attention has focused on the possibility that ambiguity or conflicting roles may contribute to organization effectiveness and may, in fact, be necessary if organizations are to adapt to changes in their environment" (p. 61). Several other authors have been more adamant in their assertion that role conflict can have positive effects. Goode (1960) proposed that individuals are often confronted with both role conflict and role strain and suggest that this may be the norm. Seiber (1974), building on Goode's position, suggested that role conflict or "discrepant expectations" (p. 569) led to role expansion and that the rewards of such expansion may exceed the burdens. Seiber identifies four ways in which adaptation to role conflict contributes to good mental health: 1) tolerance of discrepant view points, 2) exposure to many sources of information, 3) flexibility in adjusting to the demands of diverse role partners and 4) reduction of boredom.

Value and Ethical Conflicts

Public human service workers must somehow respond to the expectations of a number of subsystems. Billingsley (1964) listed the following six primary conflicting situations that can result from such varying expectations: 1) client needs vs. agency policies; 2) client needs vs. professional standards; 3) client needs vs.
community expectations; 4) agency policies vs. professional standards; 5) agency policies vs. community expectations; and 6) professional standards vs. community expectations. He claimed that each of these conflicting situations pit subsystems against each other. Consequently, social workers are forced to make decisions in the face of conflicting values and expectations. Value conflicts exist between client and worker, among client, worker and society and even within each group (Reamer, 1983).

Various authors have identified a number of micro and macro value conflicts resulting in ethical issues evident in social work practice. Frederick Reamer (1982) attempted to systematize the range of value conflicts and ethical predicaments encountered in social service as well as health care settings. Areas of conflict included informed consent, distribution of scarce resources, use of biomedical technology and whistle blowing. Abramson (1983) discussed the complex issues that underlie discharge planning processes in health care such as patient compliance and self-determination. Rhodes (1985) elaborated some general ethical issues, such as issues of power (e.g., control over client outcomes and resources) and confidentiality. She discussed more specific micro-issues (e.g., lying to clients) and macro-issues (e.g., obeying an agency's rules and union issues). Lowenberg and Dolhoff (1992) listed professional knowledge versus client rights, conflicting obligations and expectations, informed consent, ambiguity and uncertainty, truth telling and deception, confidentiality, distribution of limited resources, priority of client's interests versus worker's interest, and suspension of judgement.
as pertinent issues that may result in value conflict and ethical dilemmas in social work practice.

Concern with the lack of research attention to the issue of value and ethical conflict in the human services profession has often been noted (Abramson, 1983; Gilbert & Specht, 1976; Levy, 1976; Lowenberg & Dolgoff, 1992; McCann & Cutler, 1979; Reamer, 1982; Reamer, 1983). Some of the reasons for the growing concern about ethics seem self-evident. The trust necessary for an effective professional-client relationship hinges on the professional’s ethical behavior which is the foundation of all professional relationships. Trust provides the basis for professional accountability to the client, management and the public. Not surprisingly, therefore, unethical conduct is often the basis for malpractice suits (Reamer, 1982; Lowenberg & Dolgoff, 1992). Additionally, ethical factors are often the core issues in debates about licensure. In localities where licensing exists, ethical matters are central to issues of retention. Abramson (1983) asserted that the reasons for the apparent growth of interest in professional ethics in recent years may very well reflect responses to advances in medical and computer technology, increasingly scarce resources, consumerism as a movement affecting social services, the maturation of social work as a profession, and the continuing interest in using litigation to resolve problems.

Theoretical writings about ethics often posit that personal as well as professional values are central to decision making and practice (Lowenberg & Dolgoff, 1982; Pilseker, 1978). Ross (1982) described and classified the kinds of ethical
conflicts and organizational impediments that constitute obstacles to ethical practice. A recurring theme of the dissertation study is that the basic obstacle to ethical practice perceived by public human service workers arises from a conflict between acting in the best interest of the client and obeying legal statues or the formal rules of sponsoring organization (Billingsley, 1964; Pottas, 1979; Reamer, 1979).

Studies focusing specifically on human service workers are especially rare. An exception is the work of Billingsley (1964) which was conducted more than 30 years ago. In Billingsley's study, social work practitioners and supervisors from a child protective agency and a voluntary family counseling agency were compared with regard to the conflicting expectations between client's needs and community expectations on the one hand and between agency policies and professional standards on the other. Interestingly, his data substantiated the hypothesis that both supervisors and direct-line casework practitioners are more oriented to carrying out agency policies and procedures than they are to a professional ethical standards in the face of perceived conflicts.

The conflicting value and ethical issues between professional goals and organizational constraints is apparent in the National Association of Social Workers’ (1993) Code of Ethics, which states:

The social worker should regard as primary the service obligation of the social work profession.... the social worker's primary responsibility is to clients.... the social worker should adhere to commitments made to the employing organizations.... the social worker should avoid relationships or commitments that conflict with the interests of
clients.... the social worker should withdraw services precipitously only under unusual circumstances, giving careful consideration to all factors in the situation and taking care to minimize possible adverse effects.

Lowenberg and Dolgoff (1992) contend, that while the NASW Code of Ethics serves the function of providing the profession with a single, general statement of its ideals and aspirations, it is questionable how much guidance it provides to individuals facing specific ethical dilemmas arising from the unique features of their organizational roles, work assignments and work policies that they are expected to implement.

As previously mentioned, role conflict is inevitable when working in organizations. The literature seems to indicate that it is especially evident among professional workers in formal organizations (Parsons & Hughes, 1954). The fact that social workers are socialized within the profession according to a set of values, which differ to some extent from those characteristics of formal organizations, may tend to make them more sensitive to a range of ethical dilemmas based on job expectations and related pressures.

Abelson and Nielsen (1967) reported that the difference between ethical behavior as conformity to a code of conduct and ethical reasoning to guide a specific course of action was reflected in the distinction that schools of ethics make between the content of an ethical system and the process by which ethical judgments are made. They label this distinction the content approach and the process approach. In the first approach, the rules of ethical conduct are assumed to be
known, while in the second, the rules are assumed to be open to further inquiry and discussion. These authors contend that professional ethical behavior means making judgements about what should guide conduct when 1) ethical codes are too vague, 2) the ethical principles are in conflict with each other or, 3) the professional determines that one ethical rule must be broken to realize the supremacy of another.

How human service professionals are prepared to manage the previously identified conflicts is of central importance to the profession and to the individual professional’s work satisfaction. Several researchers view the “content approach” to ethics as inferior or at a lower stage of development to the “process approach”. Writing specifically of ethics for the field of public human service and public administrators, Rohr (1978) labeled the approach that addresses ethics exclusively in terms of adherence to agency rules as the "low" road, in contrast to the "high" road of ethical reasoning based on a systematic set of principles. Abelson and Neilsen state that the ‘process approach’ makes greater demands on those who aspire to be ethical. They contend that it requires training and ethical reasoning and sets the expectation of incorporating ethics into every decision that employees, especially administrators make.

Kohlberg (1969) suggests that moral development proceeds through a series of stages in which people move from an early emphasis on compliance with a set of ethical rules to incorporation of norms and, finally, to an internalization of
their own moral and ethical “guidebook”. Bosanquet (1918) argued that ethical behavior requires a "good" will and concrete understanding of moral difficulties and, further, that "your moral conclusions must issue from your whole self and be inspired by the convictions which dominate your life and determine your special outlook on your special situation (p.12)." Cavanagh (1981) and his colleagues developed a framework for ethical reasoning about organizational bureaucracy based on the major approaches used by ethicists to study moral issues. These approaches are the utilitarian approach, the theory of moral rights and the theory of justice. Utilitarianism judges actions by their consequences and asserts that moral acts are those that produce the greatest good for the greatest number. Decision-makers estimate the effect of alternative courses of action on all concerned parties and select the one that optimizes the satisfaction of the greatest number. This approach entails enormous decision complexities because of the difficulty in identifying all the parties affected by a single action and because of the need to calculate the action's consequences for each party.

The theory of moral rights asserts that people have a certain moral entitlement that should be respected in all decisions. The rights most germane to political acts in organizations are the right to free consent, the right of privacy, the right to freedom of conscience and the rights of free speech and due process. This approach defines as unethical any action that violates an individual's rights. The theory holds that the protection of the rights of employees is as important to the
conduct of responsible behavior within organizations as it is in society in general.

The theory of justice, by contrast, makes ethical judgements about processes in terms of whether or not they produce fair outcomes. This approach requires that employees and managers be guided by fairness, equity, and impartiality. In this approach, the canons of justice that are relevant to organizational bureaucracy and politics are equal treatment, consistent administration of rules, and restitution. Further, equal treatment means that people who are similar in relevant respects should be treated similarly. Equally important is the principle that individuals who differ in relevant respects should be treated differently and in proportion to the differences between them. Further, the theory holds that in order for rules to be consistently administered, they should be clearly written and communicated. Individuals should be held to consistent expectations and their performances impartially judged. Restitution refers to the manager's responsibilities for dealing with injustices.

Gilligan (1982) has formulated two general modes of reasoning about ethical choices and about the world. Her formulations drew heavily from the stages of moral reasoning developed by Kohlberg. Briefly, the "responsibility" mode focuses on caring, responsibility, and nurturance in accordance with people's needs. The "rights" mode stresses reasoning based on moral principles, particularly principles of justice, equality and individual rights. Gilligan's modes of thought, the responsibility mode theory and the rights mode theory, seem to correspond to the core
ideals of social work practice.

The "responsibility mode" of thought embodies many of the basic ideals of social work practice. As developed by Gilligan, this mode bases the highest stage of decision making on caring for the needs of others, responsibility for others, and on nurturance. This view focuses on feelings of compassion and concern, rather than on a rational consideration of abstract principles, and on the actual specific consequences of a decision on the lives of the people involved. In addition, this approach includes a reluctance to judge and a focus on mercy rather than justice. These are the characteristics traditionally assigned to social work and human service practice. In line with this thinking, Rhodes (1985) stated that social work in particular is characterized by "its direct concern for the well-being of the individual." She stated that it is "a process used by certain human welfare agencies to help individuals to cope more effectively with their problems in social functioning" (p. 14). Gilligan's "rights" mode of thought focuses on the autonomous and atomistic individual separate from others whose rights are not to be abrogated. Equality and fairness take over equity and need in this mode. The ethical series of Rawls (1971) and Frankina (1963), for example, exemplify this thinking.

The rights mode of thinking and approach faces serious problems when applied to social work decisions especially casework decisions. Prottas (1979) emphasized that a worker's focus on general principles can lead to indifference to particular circumstances and to bureaucratization of the social work process. In
his book, *People-Processing*, he emphasized that adherence to rules may take precedence over meeting people’s needs. He stated:

> Usually this sort of treatment of a human being is decried as demeaning, as not recognizing the client as a complete human being. On the whole, such criticism of bureaucracies is just, in that impersonal treatment is often used as part of a public degradation ritual (p. 143).

In her moral development theory, Gilligan describes the same type of conflict. This theory relates to the poignant and fundamental paradox public human service personnel encounter when trying to most effectively serve the needs of their clients while also responding to the needs and demands of the bureaucratic organization and the community power structure to which the organization is accountable.

**SUMMARY**

Spurred by concern with the high rate of staff turnover in public human service settings and the perceived lack of understanding of the value conflicts inherent in the work environment that influences job satisfaction and retention, the literature was thoroughly reviewed to establish the current levels of knowledge with respect to the variables of quality of worklife, job satisfaction, and staff retention patterns as they are influenced by value conflicts among public human service workers.

The literature reveals considerable research and theoretical foundations related to areas of job satisfaction and quality of worklife. Considerably less atten-
tion has been paid to the unique organizational environment evident in public human service settings. Indeed, there is a paucity of research exploring the organization’s impact on the variables of job satisfaction, quality of worklife, value conflict, staff turnover and desire to leave the job. Of particular interest is the impact of value conflict as experienced by public human service workers, especially social workers. This influence can be presumed to be significant given the incongruence between the bureaucratic organizational structure with its tight centralization of policy and decision-making and professional commitment to protect and enhance the integrity and functioning of the client. There is little empirical research examining the power of this variable on workers.

The dissertation study was designed to explore the nature, power and implications of the relationships between value conflict, job satisfaction, quality of worklife and desire to leave the job. The study tested the hypotheses depicted in the path model in Figure 1.

\[ \text{Figure 1: Hypothesized Relationships among Variables} \]
**Hypothesis 1:** There is a negative relationship between value conflict and quality of worklife (QWL) such that as value conflict increases, QWL decreases.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is a negative relationship between value conflict and job satisfaction such that as value conflict increases, job satisfaction decreases.

**Hypothesis 3:** There is a positive relationship between value conflict and desire to leave the job such that as value conflict increases, the desire to leave the job increases.

**Hypothesis 4:** There is a positive relationship between QWL and job satisfaction such that as QWL increases, job satisfaction increases.

**Hypothesis 5:** There is a negative relationship between job satisfaction and desire to leave the job such that as job satisfaction increases, desire to leave the job decreases.

**Hypothesis 6:** There is a relationship between value conflict and job satisfaction mediated by QWL.

**Hypothesis 7:** There is a relationship between value conflict and desire to leave the job mediated by QWL and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 8:** There is a relationship between QWL and desire to leave the job mediated by job satisfaction.

The literature on rural social work practice suggests that rural practice is different from urban practice with regard to practice roles, specialization, and use of informal networks (Whitaker, 1986; Austin, Mahoney & Seidl, 1978; Bealer, Willits, & Kuvlesky, 1882). Taking this into account, it was hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 9:** The region where the county human service offices are located will moderate the relationship between value conflict and QWL and value conflict and job satisfaction. Specifically, the magnitude of the path of value conflict and QWL will be negative and larger in absolute value in urban areas than it will be in rural areas. The magnitude of the path of value conflict and job satisfaction will be negative and larger in magnitude in urban versus rural areas.

A recurring theme of the dissertation study is that public human service
workers experience an obstacle to practice that arises from the conflict between acting in the best interest of the client and obeying the legal statutes and the formal rules of sponsoring organizations. Degreed public human service workers may experience this conflict more profoundly because their professional foundation and Code of Ethics commits them to act in the best interests of their clients.

**Hypothesis 10:** The level of education of the county human service worker will moderate the relationship between value conflict and QWL and value conflict and job satisfaction. Specifically, the magnitude of the path coefficient of value conflict and QWL will be negative and larger in absolute value among Bachelor and advanced degreed workers than it will be among non-degreed workers. The magnitude of the path coefficient of value conflict and job satisfaction will be negative and larger in absolute value among Bachelor and advanced degreed workers than it will be among non-degreed workers.

While all professions are guided by a strong ideology, Code of Ethics, and principles leading them to act in the best interest of their clients, the origins of social work are strongly rooted in the Judeo-Christian tradition of charity, which led the profession to adopt the traditional values of advocacy, community service and commitment to social change. The National Association of Social Worker’s (NASW) Code of Ethics (1997), which guides the social work profession, begins with a preamble that is particularly relevant to these values and states,

> A historic defining feature of social work is the profession’s focus on individual well-being in a social context and the well-being of society. Fundamental to social work is attention to the environmental forces that create, contribute, and address problems in living.

**Hypothesis 11:** The field of study of the county human service worker will moderate the relationship between value conflict and QWL and value conflict and job satisfaction. Specifically, the magnitude of the path coefficient of value conflict and QWL will be negative and larger in absolute value among social workers than
it will be among non-social workers. The magnitude of the path coefficient of value conflict and job satisfaction will be negative and larger in absolute value among social workers than it will be among non-social workers.
STUDY DESIGN

The dissertation study utilized a cross-sectional study design using path analysis procedures to test the hypothesized set of relationships between value conflict, quality of worklife, job satisfaction and desire to leave the job. The study was limited in that it was a correlational design and did not allow for testing causal hypotheses. In some respects the study was exploratory since there have been few empirical investigations in the human services profession and because original instrumentation for some scales had to be developed.

SAMPLING STRATEGY

A stratified random single stage cluster sample of county Department of Human Service (DHS) offices located in urban and rural areas in the State of Ohio was obtained. County human service agencies included Income Maintenance, Child Support Enforcement, and Public Children Service offices. The population was stratified on urban (large or metropolitan counties with a population size of 200,000 or more) and rural (small counties with a population size under 90,000) areas where county human service offices are located.

The sampling frame consisted of 219 targeted agencies in the State of
Ohio. 36 or 16% of these agencies were located in urban areas and 183 or 84% were located in rural areas (Appendix A). A random sample of agencies was selected. The list of urban and rural agencies was placed in random order using a random number table. The first urban agency was selected for the sample, followed by the first four rural agencies. All of the direct service workers employed in the selected agencies were invited to participate and administered a survey questionnaire. The process of selecting five agencies, one from the urban randomized list and four from the rural randomized list, was repeated until an adequate sample of direct service workers was obtained. An adequate sample of direct service workers was predetermined to be 5%-10% of the population of 15,650 direct service workers employed at the targeted county human service agencies. Agencies were selected from the randomized list until 5%-10% (between 783 and 1565) direct service workers were surveyed.

DATA COLLECTION STRATEGY

The data collected for this study was primarily gathered through site visits to the urban or rural county human service offices randomly selected for the study. A letter explaining the purpose and nature of the dissertation research was sent to the Executive Director of each of the randomly selected DHS, CSEA and PCSA agency. This letter was followed by phone calls to arrange meetings with each of them to further clarify and explain the study and answer questions regarding the nature and details of the study. Procedures for worker anonymity and
confidentiality were explained. It was emphasized that no individual worker responses would be made available for review and that only aggregate study results by region (urban and rural) would be reported. Executive Directors were informed that they, as well as any interested personnel, may have access to the overall aggregate study results. After approval to proceed was granted from the Executive Director of each DHS, CSEA and PCSA office, Department Directors were contacted to arrange and coordinate site visit dates, times and procedures for workers to complete surveys. During the site visit and prior to the time the study participants began to complete their questionnaires, the principal investigator explained the study to those workers willing to participate. Procedures for worker anonymity and confidentiality were described and assured. To assure anonymity, participants were given a survey questionnaire to complete with an envelope attached. To enhance confidentiality, all envelopes had the word SURVEY pre-printed on them. Study participants were instructed to enclose their completed questionnaire in the envelope and seal it. Participants were told to place their envelopes in a designated box which was located in the same room where they were completing their questionnaires. They were instructed not to put their name or other identifying information on the questionnaire or envelope and were informed that only various demographic information like age, gender, type of agency, and educational background would be reported.

Study participants were informed that neither the principal investigator or agency supervisory staff would be in the room during the time they were complet-
ing their surveys. However, before the principal investigator left the room, those completing the survey were given time to ask questions and to seek clarity regarding the survey process and were informed that the investigator was available if a question or concern arose. Study participants were informed where the investigator would be in the event that a question or concern arose that required immediate attention or assistance during the time they were completing the questionnaire. The investigator was alone at the designated place in order to avoid association of worker/participant by supervisory or other agency staff. Participants were instructed not to show their questionnaire to the investigator at any time. They were informed that blank copies of the study questionnaire along with file folders were placed in the same room where they were completing the surveys. If participants had a question about a particular item, they were instructed to take their questionnaire and place it in a file folder where it would be completely covered. They were told to take a blank questionnaire, as well as the authentic one placed in their folder, to the room where the investigator was located to reference their question about a specific item or concern. They were instructed not to leave the questionnaire they were completing unattended at any time until it was placed in the sealed envelope and put in the designated box.

Surveys from all departments were completed and collected on the same day. Participants were requested to complete only one survey. Only one day at each site was allotted for data collection. The investigator did not open the box of completed envelopes until it was taken away from the research site. Survey
instruments were kept in a locked file cabinet and destroyed after data analysis procedures were completed.

Due to the unavailability of staff and various time constraints at a few selected sites, some county DHS directors opted to have a non-supervisory worker place study surveys, with envelopes attached, in the mailboxes of all staff having direct contact with clients. In those instances, all employees agreeing to participate sent their anonymous surveys (with the agency code pre-printed on it) directly back to the primary investigator.

STUDY VARIABLES

The variables of value conflict, job satisfaction, quality of worklife, and desire to leave the job were examined in this study. The measured scale for each variable represented a total of the responses for the items on each scale after accounting for the reverse order items. The discussion which follows describes the study variables, the instruments used to measure them and the range of scores for each.

Value Conflict

In this study value conflict referred to the incompatibility of demands county human service workers experience when trying to adhere to personal and professional principles to act in the best interest of clients while simultaneously following rigid rules and policies, obeying legal statutes, and responding to
expectations of sponsoring organizations, individuals and groups which influence the organization’s access to resources. Because of the paucity of research measuring such value conflict, a new scale was developed (Appendix B).

In order to enhance content/face validity of the value conflict scale, the constructs and scale items were distributed to 10 human service workers (5 male and 5 female) for assessment of clarity of definition, understanding of items, ease of survey administration, etc. These workers made individual comments on their questionnaires and were then interviewed for their feedback, comments and suggestions. Items were revised accordingly. To test reliability of this newly developed survey scale, a reliability analysis of actual dissertation data was conducted as part of the dissertation research and is reported in the Results chapter of this dissertation. The range of value conflict scores for this study sample was 39-108, with higher scores indicative of higher value conflict and lower scores indicative of lower value conflict.

Job Satisfaction

For this study, the variable of job satisfaction was defined as a feeling or affective state an employee holds in relation to his or her job (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951; Wanous, 1972; Locke, 1976; Korman, 1977; Calder, 1981). The general level of job satisfaction was measured by an 18 item index developed by Brayfield and Rothe (1951) (Appendix B). The range of job satisfaction scores for this study sample was 19-88, with higher scores indicative of higher job satisfaction and
lower scores indicative of lower job satisfaction.

The items in the Job Satisfaction instrument covered a range of evaluative reactions and were chosen by Brayfield and Rothe through statistical examinations from a pool of over 1,000 statements. Brayfield and Rothe reported that the first respondents to complete the final set of items were 231 young female office workers. The range of job satisfaction scores for this sample was 35-87. The mean score was 63.8 (SD=9.4). The split-half reliability coefficient computed for this sample was 0.77, which was corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula to obtain an internal reliability coefficient of 0.87 \[t(229)= 26.70, p<.05\]. A second sample of 91 night-school students in various jobs yielded a mean of 70.4 (SD=13.2).

Brayfield, Wells and Strate (1957), in a study of civil service office employees, reported means of 60.54 (SD=14.98) and 63.81 (SD=8.62) for 41 men and 52 women respectively. Split-half internal reliability coefficients were 0.90 \[t(39) = 12.56, p<.05\] and 0.78 \[t(50) = 8.81, p<.05\]. Orpen (1974) cited means for 62 black and 72 white South African Americans of 76.51 and 65.42, respectively. Average scores ranging from 56.79 (for 332 taxi drivers) to 66.02 (for 195 nurses aides) are reported by Baker and Hansen (1975). Ninety part-time Master’s degree students produced a mean of 63.78 and a Kuder-Richardson internal reliability of 0.99 \[t(88) = 65.83, p<.05\] in research described by Johnson and Stinson (1975).

Three studies have used the Brayfield-Rothe index with a narrower focus to
assess satisfaction with work itself. Respondents were asked to "think only about the work that you do," not about other factors such as pay or colleagues. The correlation between the Brayfield-Rothe measure and the Job Scope measure was found to be 0.73 \( t(333) = 19.49, p<.05 \). In research embracing many types of jobs in a single company, Stone, Mowday and Porter (1977) found this type of satisfaction to be significantly associated \( r = 0.38, t(333) = 7.50, p<.05 \) with Job Scope (perceived variety, autonomy, task identity and feedback). A comparable value of 0.43 \( t(592) = 11.59, p<.05 \) was recorded by Stone (1976) of 594 various employees. The association with a Protestant ethic score derived from the Survey of Work Values (Wollack, Goodale, Wijting & Smith, 1971) was 0.43 \( t(333) = 8.69, p<.05 \). Using a modified version of the Job Diagnostic Survey to measure perceived job characteristics, Rousseau (1977) found a consistent pattern of significant positive correlations with the Brayfield-Rothe Overall Job Satisfaction measure. Rousseau quoted mean scores on the Brayfield-Rothe measure between 61.59 and 71.08 for differing work technologies.

Ronen (1977) used Hebrew translation to examine the relationship between specific satisfactions measured through the Job Descriptive Index and Brayfield and Rothe's Overall Job Satisfaction Survey in two samples of Israeli workers. The strongest association was with satisfaction with the work itself \( r = 0.73, t(133) = 12.32, p<.05 \) and the weakest was with pay satisfaction \( r = 0.18, t(185) = 2.49, p<.05 \), a pattern very similar to that observed for the Hoppock measure. Using the Brayfield-Rothe measure, relationships between overall job satisfaction and age,
occupational level, job tenure and associations with a range of personnel values were examined by Ronen (1978). Mean values of overall job satisfaction were 65.29 (SD=9.92) and 61.13 (SD=11.91) for 135 kibbutz and 187 private sector employees respectively.

Using Brayfield and Rothe’s Overall Job Satisfaction measure, a mean of 62.3 (SD=10.4) and an internal reliability (type unspecified) of 0.87 [t(521) = 40.28, p<.05] were reported by Lopez and Greenhaus (1978) in their study of 523 academic and support staff in a school system. The measure was correlated 0.27 [t(521) = 6.40, p<.05] with a Self-Esteem measure (Rosenberg, 1965) and African American employees were found to be more satisfied with their jobs than Caucasians. Nursing, clerical and support staff of a single hospital were studied by Mobley, Horner and Hollingsworth (1978). The mean Job Satisfaction score was 66.0 (SD=8.9) and the correlation with personnel turnover in the subsequent 47 weeks was -0.21 [t(201) = -3.05, p<.05]. Particularly strong was the association with thoughts of quitting which was reported at -0.54 [t(201) = -9.10, p<.05]. The latter index emerged from multiple regression analysis as the most likely outcome of dissatisfaction, feeding subsequently into job search behavior and actual turnover. Orpen (1978) described a two-phase study of 73 South African managers where the test-retest correlation between Overall Job Satisfaction scores across 12 months was 0.27 [t(71) = 2.36, p<.05].

In developing the Overall Job Satisfaction Survey, Brayfield and Rothe (1951) specified the job satisfaction variables which were to be inferred from
verbal reactions to a job expressed along a favorable-unfavorable continuum. The statement used in this scale had uniformly small Q values and indicated a marked consistency among the judges in the validity testing of the items and scale. The job satisfaction blank was administered to 91 adult night school students in Personnel Psychology classes at the University of Minnesota during 1945 and 1946. Responses were anonymous. The group included 49 males and 42 females. The age range was 22-54 with a median of 35 years. Practically the entire membership was engaged in either clerical, semi-professional and professional, or managerial and supervisory occupations. The range of job satisfaction scores for this sample was 29-89, mean = 70.4 and SD = 13.2. The common denominator for the members of this sample was their enrollment in an evening class in Personnel Psychology. Enrollment in this class was considered to be an overt expression of their interest in personnel work. The authors argued that some indication of the strength of this interest was afforded by the student's continued attendance in a night class (after a full day's work) for a full semester and before the blank was administered. It was assumed that those persons in the class employed in occupations appropriate to their expressed interest should, on the average, be more satisfied with their jobs than those members of the class employed in occupations inappropriate to their expressed interests in personnel work. This assumption seemed reasonable to Brayfield and Rothe and provided a test of the validity of the Job Satisfaction blank.

The 91 persons in this study were divided into two groups (Personnel and
Non-Personnel) with respect to their employment in a position identified by payroll title as a personnel function. Four occupationally unidentified persons were placed arbitrarily in the Non-Personnel group. In all, 40 persons comprised the Personnel and 51 the Non-Personnel groups. A comparison was made between the mean scores for the two groups on the Job Satisfaction blank. The mean for the Personnel group was 76.9, with a SD of 8.6 as compared to a mean of 65.4, with a SD of 14.02 for the Non-Personnel group. This difference of 11.5 points \([t(89) = 5.18, p<.05]\) was significant and the difference between the variances was also significant \((F(50, 39) = 2.66, p<.05)\). Brayfield and Rothe applied the Fisher and Behrens' \(d\)-test and argued that it is appropriate to use when significant differences are found between two means and their respective variances. Brayfield and Rothe argued that if the original assumption as to the differential significance of membership in one or the other of the two groups is accepted, these data furnishes evidence for the validity of the Job Satisfaction blank.

The most systematic and earliest attempt to develop an index of job satisfaction was that by Hoppock in the early 1930's (Hoppock, 1935). Originally, Hoppock tested a series of simple attitude scales as part of an interview study of 40 employed adults. These scales were revised to consist of four items each with 7 responses at step intervals. Values were assigned arbitrarily to the responses in each item; the smaller numbers being assigned to the responses indicating dissatisfaction. The range of possible total scores was 4 to 28. This system of scoring correlated 0.97 \([t(299) = 21.27, p<.05]\) with a system of scale values
assigned on the basis of z scores. The corrected split-half reliability coefficient for the same 301 cases was reported to be 0.93 [t(299) = 43.75, p<.05]. This scale has been assumed to have "face" validity.

The night school classes completed both blanks. The product-moment correlation between scores on the Hoppock blank and on the Brayfield-Rothe was 0.92 [t(89) = 21.90, p<.05]. Although the two blanks were developed by different methods and contain items which over-lap only slightly, they give results which are highly correlated.

A comparison was made between the means of the Personnel and Non-Personnel groups on the Hoppock blank. The mean for the Personnel group was 22.2 with a SD of 2.6 and the mean for the Non-Personnel group was 19.2 with a SD of 4.0 [F(50, 39) = 2.37, p<.05]. Differences between the variances were significant, but the means [t(89) =0.87] were not significantly different.

Brayfield and Rothe (1951) list the following benefits to using the Job Satisfaction index as a useful measure of job satisfaction:

1) It should give an index to overall job satisfaction rather than to specific aspects of the job situation.
2) It should be applicable to a wide variety of jobs.
3) It should be sensitive to variations in attitudes.
4) The items should be of such a nature (interesting, realistic and varied) that the scale should evoke cooperation from both management and employees.
5) It should yield a reliable index.
6) It should yield a valid index.
7) It should be brief and easily scored. (p. 307)
Quality of Worklife (QWL)

As an alternative to a narrow conception of job satisfaction, the quality of worklife variable in this study was defined as a broader term referring to the psychological state or feeling and, therefore, a cognition of pleasure, happiness, well-being and satisfaction regarding the relationship between the worker and his/her work environment as a whole, with emphasis on the human dimension and worker affect. The overall total score of the 1977 Quality of Employment Survey (Quinn & Staines, 1979) Facet-specific Job Satisfaction sub-scales was used to measure QWL (Appendix B). As suggested by the literature, this scale was chosen because it measures a broader, more general response to the job and allows for a more extensive examination of a worker's general affective reaction. The range of quality of worklife scores for this study sample was 43-158, with higher scores indicative of a higher quality of worklife and lower scores indicative of a lower quality of worklife.

The items on the Quality of Employment scale were drawn from earlier research in order to yield a simple, easily administered instrument. Applicability to all levels and types of employees was a primary criterion for item selection. A 1977 sample using this scale contained 1,515 respondents, representative of all employed adults, all industries, and all occupations in the United States. Quinn and Staines cited an overall mean of 3.66 (SD=1.02) for their 1977 national sample.

A correlation of 0.55 [t(1513) = 25.62, p<.05] is reported with the Quinn and
Staines measure of Facet-Free Job Satisfaction. Two short forms of the Facet-Free Satisfaction Scale contain either two or three items with reported alpha coefficients of 0.56 \( t(738) = 18.36, p<.05 \) and 0.65 \( t(738) = 23.24, p<.05 \) respectively, and correlations with the full scale of 0.93 \( t(738) = 68.74, p<.05 \) and 0.84 \( t(738) = 42.06, p<.05 \). Means of the short forms were 3.56 (SD=.14) and 3.24 (SD=1.35) respectively.

Beehr et al. (1976) used items 1, 3, 4, and 5 in a study of 651 employees (49% female) from five organizations and reported a mean of 3.94 (SD=0.97) and a split-half reliability coefficient of 0.80 \( t(649) = 33.97, p<.05 \). Facet-Specific Job Satisfaction correlated -0.22 \( t(649) = -5.75, p<.05 \) with a measure of role ambiguity and 0.43 \( t(649) = 12.13, p<.05 \) with Quinn and Shephard's (1974) index of Depressed Mood at Work. When combining Quinn and Staines's measures of Facet-Specific Job Satisfaction and Facet-Free Job Satisfaction, the findings are reported from the Quality of Employment Survey conducted in 1973 and 1974. The overall job satisfaction scores presented in terms of the 1973 mean, which is zero by definition, yielded a SD of 8.8, \( N = 1455 \). Levels of satisfaction were reported to have declined by 1977, yielding a mean difference of -.21 (SD 8.9, \( N = 1515 \). Quinn and Staines also published mean values for several groups in terms of sex, age, race, education, geographical region and
occupation. Two examples from the 1977 data are cited:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Place of Employment</th>
<th>Type of Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 9 workers (N = 370):</td>
<td>White collar workers (N = 769):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 99 workers (N = 546):</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 999 workers (N = 365):</td>
<td>Service workers (N = 184):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 or more workers (N = 200):</td>
<td>Farm workers (N = 42):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other blue-collar workers (N = 520):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Coefficient Alpha was 0.85 \([t(1513) = 62.76, p<.05]\) for the 1977 sample, and the inter-correlation between the two component measures was 0.55 \([t(1513) = 25.62, p<.05]\). Analysis of the sampling errors indicated that the standard error of the means averaged about 1.2 times the standard errors that would be obtained from simple random samples of the same size; whereas the standard error of differences between means were about 1.1 times the comparable differences from simple random sampling (Cook, Hepworth, Wall & Warr, 1981).

While the items are well tested, Cook et al. reported that the equal weighting of two components of very unequal length and the complicated procedure for deriving overall scores, might persuade some potential users to use the Facet-Specific and Facet-Free measures separately (Cook, Hepworth, Wall & Warr, 1981).

A combined overall total score for the following six factor categories was used in this study. Two indices were included in each factor. The first represented how important the worker felt the job facets included were to him/her on the job. The second represented how satisfied the worker was within the job
facets included in the factor. The overall reported reliability of the six factor/variable category scales that were used is .85 \[t(1513) = 62.76, p<.05\]. The reliability of the overall measure was computed using Guilford’s formula for calculating the reliability of an index consisting of a combination of composite scores. This procedure took into account both the reliability of the components and the correlation between them.

The six categories of the QWL scale that were used in the study were: comfort, challenge, financial rewards, relations with co-workers, resource adequacy and promotions. As previously indicated, the six factors were combined into one overall total score for the QWL variable. The comfort factor describes a job that provides "solid creature comforts" (Quinn & Staines, 1977, p.212) such as convenient working hours, pleasant physical surroundings, convenient travel etc. The comfort factor has a reported overall reliability of .69 \[t(1513) = 37.08, p<.05\]. The second factor, challenge, reflects a worker's desire to be stimulated and challenged by his/her job and ability to exercise acquired skills at work. The challenge factor has a reported overall reliability of .88 \[t(1513) = 72.07, p<.05\]. The third factor, financial rewards, includes pay, fringe benefits, and job security. It has a reported overall reliability of .66 \[t(1513) = 34.17, p<.05\]. The fourth factor, relations with coworkers, contains only three items and relates to a person's chances to make friends and the friendly nature of co-workers. It has a reported overall reliability of .61 \[t(1513) = 29.94, p<.05\]. The fifth factor, resource adequacy, represents workers' wishes for adequate resources with which to do
their jobs well, e.g., help, equipment, information and good supervision. This factor has a reported overall reliability of .88 \[t(1513) = 37.08, \, p<.05\]. The sixth factor, promotions, relates to chances for promotions and how they are handled. It has a reported overall reliability of .76 \[t(1513) = 45.49, \, p<.05\].

**Desire to Leave the Job**

In this study the desire to leave the job variable referred to the interest, thoughts and/or intention a worker has to seek a new job. An instrument was specifically developed to measure this variable (Appendix B). In order to enhance content/face validity of the desire to leave the job scale, the constructs and items were distributed to 10 human service personnel (5 male and 5 female) for assessment of clarity of definition, understanding of items, ease of survey administration, etc. Workers made individual comments on their questionnaires and were then interviewed for their feedback, comments and suggestions. Items were revised accordingly. The range of scores for desire to leave the job for the study sample was 9-45, with higher scores indicative of a greater desire to leave the job and lower scores indicative of a lower desire to leave the job. To test reliability of this newly developed scale, a reliability analysis of actual dissertation data was conducted as part of the dissertation research and is reported in the following section.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Table 1 provides a descriptive analysis of study participants. Individuals who completed study surveys were employed by urban or rural county Department of Human Service offices (Income Maintenance, Child Support Enforcement, and/or Children’s Services) in the State of Ohio. All participants engaged in direct service or had direct contact with clients. A total of 27 randomly selected agencies (6 urban and 21 rural) participated in the study. Three rural agencies, encompassing 18 potential study participants, initially agreed to participate but later declined due to time constraints.

A total of 1,069 study surveys were returned. Of the returned surveys, 967 (90.5%) contained responses to all of the four scale items with no missing data. Data were analyzed from those 967 surveys (551 from urban and 416 from rural agencies) and list-wise deletion was used rather than procedures for handling missing data since there was less than 10% of total missing data (Cohen & Cohen, 1983) and because there was missing data on both the independent and dependent variables.

Urban participants represented 57%, and rural participants represented 43%, of the sample. There was a 51.8% response rate from the rural participants
Table 1: Description of Sample Subgroups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent of Sample</th>
<th>Value Conflict</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Desire to Leave Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>std dev</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>106.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>72.20</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>71.27</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>69.68</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>72.62</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>72.79</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>72.96</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>58.23</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>73.04</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>73.06</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>73.97</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>73.08</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Field</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>72.20</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated Field</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>70.67</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCHS</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>72.22</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEA</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>68.83</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCSA</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>71.18</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Units</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>70.85</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>73.38</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>68.84</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and a 25.3% response rate from urban participants. The overall response rate for study participants was 32.3%. The mean response rate for rural agencies was 52.2% (SD=29.1; range 0-100) and 31.5% (SD=11.5; range 19-44) for urban agencies. The overall mean response rate for all agencies was 48.7% (SD=27.4).

Study participants ranged in age from 20 to 66, with 38.5 as the mean age. The majority of participants were female (77%). Sixty-eight of the study participants reported working in an Income Maintenance rather than a Child Support Enforcement or a Protective Children’s Services department where the primary work responsibility involved determining welfare benefit eligibility for clients. There was a fairly even split of participants who had High School degrees (35%) and those who had Bachelor’s degrees (37%). Thirty-six percent of the study participants had a high school degree, 38% had a Bachelor’s degree, 9% had obtained a Master’s degree and 1% had a Doctorate. Of the 13 participants with a Doctorate degree, 10 had a Juris Doctorate, and one had a Doctorate of Education. Two participants did not report the type of Doctorate degree they had obtained. The majority of participants with high school degrees worked in an Income Maintenance department.

Of the 967 participants, 168 were social workers which were defined as anyone having a degree in Social Work. Participants with an Associate degree in Human Services must have obtained a license from the Ohio Counselor and Social Worker Board to be considered a social worker in this study. Forty-eight percent of the social workers had obtained a Bachelor’s degree and 18% had
obtained a Master’s degree. Thirty four percent had obtained an Associate’s degree in Human Services, and were licensed through the State of Ohio Counseling and Social Worker Board as Associate Social Workers. None reported having a Doctorate in Social Work.

Participants with a Bachelor’s or Master’s degree in Social Work represented 18% of the total sample and worked primarily in Protective Children’s Services units, where the primary work responsibility involved assessing and intervening in instances of child abuse and neglect. Participants with a degree unrelated to social work represented 26% of the sample and were evenly split between working in a Protective Children’s Services (PCSA) department and a Child Support Enforcement (CSEA) department where the primary work responsibility involved tracking and collecting child support benefits. In describing the sub-populations, no group was distinguishable in terms of their mean scale scores. However, study participants working in multiple human service agencies (e.g., PCSA and CSEA offices) had higher QWL and job satisfaction mean scores, but lower mean scores for desire to leave the job. Those participants with a Doctorate degree had lower mean scores in value conflict than those with a Master’s, Bachelor’s, Associate’s or High School degree.

RELIABILITY ANALYSIS OF STUDY INSTRUMENTS

Coefficient Alpha was used to estimate the reliability of each scale. The reliability analysis of dissertation data yielded the following Alpha reliability
coefficients for each of the study scales: Value Conflict = .83, Quality of Worklife = .91, Job Satisfaction = .90, and Desire To Leave The Job = .91.

TEST OF ASSUMPTION

Tests performed to determine the plausibility of the multivariate normality assumption produced significant results, suggesting that the assumption of multivariate normality was not plausible for the study data. In light of this, the path models were estimated using the robust standard error and t statistic options in the EQS program (Bentler, 1995). The results of these analyses converged on the same conclusions, suggesting that the violation of the assumption, while statistically significant, did not lead to erroneous results.

DATA ANALYSIS

Path analysis procedures using the LISREL 8 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993) program were used to analyze the data and produce the estimates for the path model depicted in Figure 2. Specific means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients were used to compute a covariance matrix (Table 2), which was used as input to LISREL 8. The Maximum Likelihood estimation procedure was conducted to analyze the data. To determine that results were not unique to the Maximum Likelihood estimation method, the path coefficients were also estimated using the Generalized Least Squares method of estimation and yielded almost identical results.
The study model (Figure 2) was developed from Williams’ (1996) work suggesting the usefulness of a single indicator model that accounts for the measurement error present for each variable in contrast to traditional regression methods which assume that variables are measured without measurement error. The full model in Figure 2 specifies the relationships among the latent variables that are indicated by the variables Value Conflict (V), Quality of Worklife (QWL), Job Satisfaction (S), and Desire to Leave the Job (L), as given by the total score for each survey section administered. For example, the ellipse C represents the construct of Value Conflict and was measured by a single indicator, the Value Conflict Scale. The arrow from ellipse C to the rectangle Value Conflict, indicates that the Value Conflict Scale is an indicator of the C construct (latent variable). Williams refers to the number (.913) next to this arrow as representing the upper limit of a validity coefficient given a specific reliability. It has also been referred to as a factor loading. This value is determined by taking the square root of the reliability coefficient for the Value Conflict scale. The number 20.89 on top of the Value Conflict rectangle reflects the error variance in the scores from the Value Conflict scale. In the path diagram, the first number on top, along the arrow from one ellipse to the next, represents the path coefficient. The middle number represents the standard error of the path coefficient and the last number represents the t value.
Figure 2. Path diagram of relationships among Value Conflict, Quality of Worklife (QWL), Job Satisfaction and Desire to Leave the Job, taking measurement error into account.
Table 2: Input statistics for LISREL path analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Conflict</td>
<td>71.4281</td>
<td>11.2350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>106.8852</td>
<td>17.6345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>61.6298</td>
<td>11.2607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Leave the Job</td>
<td>26.9255</td>
<td>7.9222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value Conflict</th>
<th>QWL</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Desire to Leave Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Conflict</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>-0.4398</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.4137</td>
<td>0.6432</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Leave Job</td>
<td>0.4097</td>
<td>-0.6081</td>
<td>-0.7788</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Covariance Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value Conflict</th>
<th>QWL</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Desire to Leave Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Conflict</td>
<td>126.19</td>
<td>-112.43</td>
<td>311.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>-112.43</td>
<td>311.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-60.12</td>
<td>142.16</td>
<td>126.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Leave Job</td>
<td>42.20</td>
<td>-89.04</td>
<td>-76.98</td>
<td>62.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS OF HYPOTHESES

Figure 2 depicts results relevant study hypotheses 1 through 8. The discussion of the results relevant to each hypothesis follows.

Hypothesis 1: There is a relationship between value conflict and QWL such that as value conflict increases, QWL decreases.

The path coefficient from value conflict to QWL was tested to determine if it was negative and statistically significant. The results established that there was a statistically significant negative relationship between value conflict and QWL. The path coefficient for the relationship between value conflict and QWL was estimated to be -0.89 with a standard error of 0.051 and resulted in a t-value = -17.49, which was statistically significant with p < 0.01.

Hypothesis 2: There is a relationship between value conflict and job satisfaction such that as value conflict increases, job satisfaction decreases.

The path coefficient from value conflict to job satisfaction was tested to determine if it was negative and statistically significant. The data revealed a statistically significant negative relationship between value conflict and job satisfaction. The path coefficient for the relationship between value conflict and job satisfaction was estimated to be -0.10 with a standard error of 0.036 and resulted in a t-value = -2.87, which was statistically significant with p < 0.01.
Hypothesis 3: There is a relationship between value conflict and desire to leave the job such that as value conflict increases, desire to leave the job increases.

The path coefficient from value conflict to desire to leave the job was tested to determine if it was positive and statistically significant. Results indicated a significant positive relationship between value conflict and desire to leave the job. The path coefficient for the relationship between value conflict and desire to leave the job was estimated to be 0.058 with a standard error of 0.019 and resulted in a t-value = 3.03, which was statistically significant with p < 0.01.

Hypothesis 4: There is a relationship between QWL and job satisfaction such that as QWL increases, job satisfaction increases.

The path coefficient from QWL to job satisfaction was tested to determine if it was positive and statistically significant. The data analysis established that there was a significant positive relationship between QWL and job satisfaction. The path coefficient for the relationship between QWL and job satisfaction was estimated to be 0.42 with a standard error of 0.022 and resulted in a t-value = 19.26, which was statistically significant with p < 0.01.

Hypothesis 5: There is a relationship between job satisfaction and desire to leave the job such that as job satisfaction increases, desire to leave the job
The path coefficient from job satisfaction to desire to leave the job was tested to determine if it was negative and statistically significant. It was determined that there was a significant negative relationship between job satisfaction and desire to leave the job. The path coefficient for the relationship between job satisfaction and desire to leave the job was estimated to be -0.58 with a standard error of 0.018 and resulted in a t-value = -31.51, which was statistically significant with p < 0.01.

Hypotheses 6 through 8 concerned the mediating effects of one or more variables on the relationship between two other variables in the model.

**Hypothesis 6: There is a relationship between value conflict and job satisfaction mediated by QWL.**

To test this hypothesis, the path coefficients from value conflict to QWL and from QWL to job satisfaction were tested for statistical significance. Results indicated that QWL appeared to be a mediating variable between value conflict and job satisfaction. The path from value conflict to QWL was estimated to be -0.89 with a standard error of 0.051 and resulted in a t-value = -17.49, which was statistically significant with p< 0.01. The path from QWL to job satisfaction was estimated to be 0.42 with a standard error of 0.022 and resulted in a t-value= 19.26, which was statistically significant with p < 0.01.
Hypothesis 7: There is a relationship between value conflict and desire to leave the job mediated by QWL and job satisfaction.

To test this hypothesis, the path coefficients from value conflict to QWL, from QWL to job satisfaction, and from job satisfaction to desire to leave the job were tested for statistical significance. Results indicated that QWL and job satisfaction appeared to be mediating variables between value conflict and desire to leave the job. The path coefficient for the relationship between value conflict and QWL was estimated to be -0.89 with a standard error of 0.051 and resulted in a t-value = -17.49, which was statistically significant with p < 0.01. The path coefficient for the relationship between QWL and job satisfaction was estimated to be 0.42 with a standard error of 0.022 and resulted in a t-value = 19.26, which was statistically significant with p < 0.01. The path coefficient for the relationship between job satisfaction and desire to leave the job was estimated to be -0.58 with a standard error of 0.018 and resulted in a t-value = -31.51, which was statistically significant with p < 0.01.

Hypothesis 8: There is a relationship between QWL and desire to leave the job mediated by job satisfaction.

To test this hypothesis, the path coefficients from QWL to job satisfaction and from job satisfaction to desire to leave the job were tested for statistical significance. Results indicated that job satisfaction appeared to be a mediating variable between QWL and desire to leave the job. The path coefficient for the
relationship between QWL and job satisfaction was estimated to be 0.42 with a
standard error of 0.022 and resulted in a t-value = 19.26, which was statistically
significant with p < 0.01. The path coefficient for the relationship between job
satisfaction and desire to leave the job was estimated to be -0.58 with a standard
error of 0.018 and resulted in a t-value = -31.51, which was statistically significant
with p < 0.01.

In hypotheses 9 through 11 the region where county offices were located, the level of education of the county human service worker, and the field of study of the county human service worker were hypothesized to be moderating variables between value conflict and QWL and between value conflict and job satisfaction. The data were grouped according to levels of the presumed moderating variable and were analyzed using the multiple groups method and LISREL 8. The path coefficients were estimated for each group and the invariance of path coefficients across the levels of the moderating variable tested with the $\chi^2$ goodness-of-fit statistic (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993).

Hypothesis 9: The region where county offices are located will moderate the relationships between value conflict and QWL and between value conflict and job satisfaction. The magnitude of the path coefficient of value conflict and QWL will be negative and larger in absolute value in urban versus rural areas. The magnitude of the path coefficient of value conflict and job satisfaction will be negative and larger in absolute value in urban versus rural areas.
To test the moderating relationships of urban and rural regions, a test was conducted to determine whether the path coefficient from value conflict to job satisfaction was greater in magnitude for urban regions than it was for rural regions, and whether the path coefficient from value conflict to QWL was greater in magnitude for urban regions than it was for rural regions. The region in which county offices were located was not a significant moderator on the relationship between value conflict and QWL, and region was not a significant moderator on the relationship between value conflict and job satisfaction. For the rural and urban groups, the means, standard deviations and the correlations among the four study variables were used to compute a covariance matrix which was used as input to LISREL 8. Those values are summarized in Table 3.

The goodness-of-fit of the model in which the path coefficients were constrained to be equal across urban and rural samples from value conflict to quality of worklife (QWL) and from value conflict to job satisfaction resulted in $\chi^2(11) = 37.42$ (p<.001). Allowing the paths from value conflict to quality of worklife to be different across urban and rural samples led to a goodness-of-fit $\chi^2(10) = 37.06$ (p<.001). The difference Chi-Square for these two different models was $\chi^2(1) = .36$ (p>.05). Allowing the paths from value conflict to job satisfaction to be different across urban and rural samples led to a goodness-of-fit $\chi^2(10) = 35.86$ (p<.001). The difference Chi-Square for these two different models was $\chi^2(1) = 1.56$ (p>.05). These results suggested that the paths from value conflict to quality
Table 3. Input statistics for LISREL path analysis of moderating relationships by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean (Rural)</th>
<th>Std Dev (Rural)</th>
<th>Mean (Urban)</th>
<th>Std Dev (Urban)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Conflict</td>
<td>68.8365</td>
<td>10.4283</td>
<td>73.3848</td>
<td>11.4335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>111.0913</td>
<td>16.7847</td>
<td>103.7096</td>
<td>17.6104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>63.5144</td>
<td>10.1914</td>
<td>60.2069</td>
<td>11.8164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Leave the Job</td>
<td>25.2740</td>
<td>7.4165</td>
<td>28.1724</td>
<td>8.0689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RURAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Covariance Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value Conflict</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QWL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-87.69</td>
<td>281.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-42.19</td>
<td>103.66 103.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desire to Leave Job</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.41</td>
<td>-79.05 -59.03 55.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**URBAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Covariance Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value Conflict</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QWL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-91.21</td>
<td>310.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-53.64</td>
<td>135.68 139.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desire to Leave Job</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.12</td>
<td>-80.43 -73.42 65.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of worklife and from value conflict to job satisfaction were the same across urban and rural areas.

**Hypothesis 10:** The level of education of the county human service worker will moderate the relationships between value conflict and QWL and between value conflict and job satisfaction. Specifically, the magnitude of the path coefficient of value conflict and QWL will be negative and larger in absolute value among Bachelor and advanced degree workers than it will be among non-degree workers. The magnitude of the path coefficient of value conflict and job satisfaction will be negative and larger in absolute value among Bachelor and advanced degree workers than it will be among non-degree workers.

Originally, the questionnaire responses for Educational Degree were coded as non-degree (High School and Associate), Bachelor's degree, or advanced degree (Master's and Doctorate). To test the moderating influence of degree level, it was originally planned to test whether the path coefficient from value conflict to QWL was greater in magnitude among Bachelor's and advanced degree workers than it was among non-degree workers, and whether the path coefficient from value conflict to job satisfaction was greater in magnitude among Bachelor's and advanced degree workers than it was among non-degree workers. However, the small number of respondents in the advanced degree group did not make it possible to test this hypothesis. To adjust for this inadequate response, the degree level variable was collapsed into degree and non-degree workers and the
revised hypothesis 10a was tested.

Hypothesis 10a: The level of education of the county human service worker will moderate the relationships between value conflict and QWL and between value conflict and job satisfaction. Specifically, the magnitude of the path coefficient between value conflict and QWL will be negative and larger in absolute value among degreed workers than it will be among non-degreed workers. The magnitude of the path coefficient between value conflict and job satisfaction will be negative and larger in absolute value among degreed workers than it will be among non-degreed workers.

The questionnaire responses for Educational Degree were coded as non-deg (High School and Associate) or deg (Bachelor's, Master's and Doctorate). To test the moderating relationships, analyses were conducted to determine whether the path coefficients from value conflict to QWL and from value conflict to job satisfaction were greater in magnitude among degreed workers than it was among non-degreed workers.

The level of education of the county human service worker did not significantly moderate the relationship between value conflict and QWL, but education did significantly moderate the relationship between value conflict and job satisfaction. For the non-deg and deg groups, the means, standard deviations and correlations among study variables were used to compute a covariance matrix which was used as input for the LISREL analysis. These are
summarized in Table 4.

The results established a goodness of fit of the model $\chi^2 (11) = 56.19 (p< .001)$ in which the path coefficients from value conflict to quality of worklife and from value conflict to job satisfaction were constrained to be equal across degreed and non-degreed samples. Allowing the paths from value conflict to quality of worklife to be different across degreed and non-degreed samples led to a goodness-of-fit $\chi^2 (10) = 56.10 (p<.001)$. The difference Chi-Square for these two different models was $\chi^2 (1) = .09 (p>.05)$. Allowing the paths from value conflict to job satisfaction to be different across degreed and non-degreed samples led to a goodness-of-fit $\chi^2 (10) = 45.52 (p<.001)$. The difference Chi-Square for these two models was $\chi^2 (1) = 10.67 (p<.005)$. These results suggested that the paths from value conflict to quality of worklife are the same across degreed and non-degreed samples but that the paths from value conflict to job satisfaction are different across degreed and non-degreed samples. The path coefficient from value conflict to job satisfaction among the degreed group was -.18 with a standard error of .04 and $t = -3.8$. The path coefficient from value conflict to job satisfaction among the non-degreed group was -.00059 with a standard error of .044 and $t = -.014$. These results were consistent with hypothesis 10a.
Table 4. Input statistics for LISREL path analysis of the moderating relationship of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Rural (n=416)</th>
<th>Urban (n=551)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Conflict</td>
<td>70.5711</td>
<td>10.4621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>108.1856</td>
<td>18.1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>63.0062</td>
<td>9.9038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Leave the Job</td>
<td>25.1423</td>
<td>7.0067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NON-DEGREEED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value Conflict</th>
<th>QWL</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Desire to Leave Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Conflict</td>
<td>109.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>-83.73</td>
<td>330.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-37.11</td>
<td>111.87</td>
<td>98.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Leave Job</td>
<td>24.46</td>
<td>-76.28</td>
<td>-52.22</td>
<td>49.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEGREEED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value Conflict</th>
<th>QWL</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Desire to Leave Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Conflict</td>
<td>140.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>-109.00</td>
<td>287.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-64.55</td>
<td>143.55</td>
<td>154.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Leave Job</td>
<td>46.28</td>
<td>-90.36</td>
<td>-82.05</td>
<td>68.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 11: The field of study of the county human service worker will moderate the relationships between value conflict and QWL and between value conflict and job satisfaction. Specifically, the magnitude of the path coefficient of value conflict and QWL will be negative and larger in absolute value among social workers (Bachelor’s, Master’s or Doctorate degree in Social Work or Associate degree in Human Services with a license from the Ohio Counselor and Social Worker Board to practice social work) than it will be among non-social workers. The magnitude of the path coefficient of value conflict and job satisfaction will be negative and larger in absolute value among social workers than it will be among non-social workers.

Originally, the responses for the field of study category from the demographic questionnaire were coded as social work or non-social work (sociology, psychology, counseling and other). However, the large number of responses (343) for the other fields of study category prompted a recoding of categories for this variable. The responses for the field of study category were recorded as social work, other related fields (sociology, psychology, counseling), and other unrelated fields (education, law). The following revised hypothesis 11 was tested:

Hypothesis 11a: The field of study of the county human service worker will moderate the relationships between value conflict and QWL and between value conflict and job satisfaction. Specifically, the magnitude of the path
coefficient of value conflict and QWL will be negative and larger in absolute value among social workers than it will be among non-social workers. The magnitude of the path coefficient of value conflict and job satisfaction will be negative and larger in absolute value among social workers than it will be among non-social workers.

To examine the moderating relationships, tests were conducted to determine whether the path coefficient from value conflict to QWL was greater in magnitude among social workers than non-social workers, and whether the path coefficient from value conflict to job satisfaction was greater in magnitude among social workers than non-social workers.

For each field of study group, the means, standard deviations and correlations among all four study variables were used to compute a covariance matrix as input for the LISREL analysis. These are summarized in Table 5.

The field of study of the county human service worker did not significantly moderate the relationship between value conflict and quality of worklife and did not significantly moderate the relationship between value conflict and job satisfaction. The goodness-of-fit of the model in which the path coefficients from value conflict to quality of worklife and the path coefficients from value conflict to job satisfaction were constrained to be equal across social work, related and unrelated fields of study yielded $\chi^2 (21) = 27.63$ ($p<.05$). Allowing the paths from value conflict to quality of worklife to be different across social work, related and unrelated field of
Table 5. Input statistics for LISREL path analysis of moderating relationship of field of study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Social Workers (n=169)</th>
<th>Other Related (n=221)</th>
<th>Other Unrelated (n=639)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Conflict</td>
<td>73.041</td>
<td>11.952</td>
<td>73.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>105.734</td>
<td>18.260</td>
<td>103.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>62.539</td>
<td>10.768</td>
<td>59.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Leave</td>
<td>27.000</td>
<td>7.531</td>
<td>29.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOCIAL WORKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Covariance Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Conflict</td>
<td>142.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>-110.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-50.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Leave Job</td>
<td>37.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER RELATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Covariance Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Conflict</td>
<td>131.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>-81.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-51.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Leave Job</td>
<td>31.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER UNRELATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Covariance Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Conflict</td>
<td>125.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWL</td>
<td>-105.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-62.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Leave Job</td>
<td>40.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
study samples led to a goodness-of-fit $\chi^2 (19) = 24.54 (p>.05)$. The difference Chi-Square for these two different models was $\chi^2 (2) = 3.09 (p>.05)$. Allowing the paths from value conflict to job satisfaction to be different across social work, related and unrelated fields of study samples led to a goodness-of-fit $\chi^2 (19) = 25.03 (p>.05)$. The difference Chi-Square for these two different models was $\chi^2 (2) = 2.6 (p>.05)$. These results suggested that the paths from value conflict to quality of worklife and from value conflict to job satisfaction are the same across social work, related and unrelated fields of study samples.

**SUMMARY OF DATA ANALYSIS**

The results of this study suggest that value conflict is related to job satisfaction, quality of worklife and desire to leave the job when controlling for the relationships among the other variables in the directions hypothesized by the overall study model. The data were consistent with the first five hypotheses concerning the associations among the major study variables. Specifically, statistically significant negative relationships between value conflict and quality of worklife (hypothesis 1) and between value conflict and job satisfaction (hypothesis 2) were identified. A statistically significant positive relationship between value conflict and desire to leave the job (hypothesis 3) and between quality of worklife and job satisfaction (hypothesis 4) was also established. A statistically significant negative relationship between job satisfaction and desire to leave the job was identified (hypothesis 5).
Data revealed results consistent with hypotheses six through eight which examined the mediating impact of quality of worklife and job satisfaction between value conflict and job satisfaction, between value conflict and desire to leave the job, and between quality of worklife and desire to leave the job. Quality of worklife was found to mediate the relationship between value conflict and desire to leave the job (hypothesis 6). Quality of worklife and job satisfaction were found to mediate the relationship between value conflict and desire to leave the job (hypothesis 7). Further, job satisfaction was found to mediate the relationship between quality of worklife and desire to leave the job (hypothesis 8).

Contrary to what was hypothesized, the urban/rural location of the work setting was not a moderating influence on the relationship between value conflict and job satisfaction, and was not a moderating influence on the relationship between value conflict and quality of worklife (hypothesis 9). Mixed results were obtained with respect to the hypothesized role of degree status in explaining the relationships among the study variables. Academic degree level did not moderate the relationship between value conflict and quality of worklife (hypothesis 10). However, as hypothesized, academic degree did moderate the relationship between value conflict and job satisfaction. Finally, the data did not establish the anticipated moderating impact of academic field of study on either the relationship between value conflict and quality of worklife or the relationship between value conflict and job satisfaction (hypothesis 11). Data revealed consistency of results across the different estimation methods.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The primary objective of the study was to investigate the degree to which public human service employees experience value conflict while seeking to act in the best interest of their clients within the constraints of rules and cultural and legislative policies, while also responding to the separate concerns of sponsoring organizations, interest groups and other individuals or groups in the community which influence the organization’s access to resources. The dissertation study was designed as a stratified random single stage cluster sample of public human service departments located in urban and rural counties in the State of Ohio. The relationships between the variables of value conflict, quality of worklife and desire to leave the job among public human service personnel were examined. A cross-sectional study design using path analysis procedures was used to test the hypothesized set of relationships between these variables. This research examined value conflict factors previously unexplored in the social work literature. The results of this study are noteworthy in that they support the general hypotheses that there are significant relationships between value conflict, job satisfaction, quality of worklife and desire to leave the job among public human service employees.

Study results seem to suggest the possibility that by decreasing value conflict in public human service settings, job satisfaction and quality of worklife may
be enhanced, whereas desire to leave the job may be decreased. The data further suggests that an increase in quality of worklife may lead to an increase in job satisfaction among public human service workers, while an increase in job satisfaction may decrease any desire to leave the job. Results also seem to suggest the possibility that a decrease in value conflict may increase quality of worklife and job satisfaction to a greater extent for degreed workers than non-degreed workers. While job satisfaction and quality of worklife would not be influenced by the public human service worker’s academic field of study. Study results seem to further indicate that decreasing value conflict in the public human service setting may more positively influence job satisfaction for degreed workers than non-degreed workers.

STUDY RESULTS PERTINENT TO RESEARCH

By establishing significant associations among the study variables, research results are similar to the previously reviewed studies relating to job satisfaction, quality of worklife, and job retention rates among public human service employees (Berg, 1980; Billingsley, 1964; Harrison, 1980; Kahn, et al., 1964; Prottas, 1979). For example, the results suggest the possibility that the inconsistency found between work structures and professional responsibility may generate value conflict for public human service employees. Further, based on the construct of value conflict as defined in this study, conflicts of loyalty to employers, colleagues, funding sources, regulations, community and third parties may
negatively impact the well-being, job satisfaction and quality of worklife for public human service personnel. By establishing a relationship between value conflict and desire to leave the job, research results also appear to reinforce the findings of Daley (1979), Hutchinson (1988) and Russell (1987) that job satisfaction and quality of worklife are negatively associated with the retention of public human service employees and that value conflict is associated with lower levels of job satisfaction.

**STUDY LIMITATIONS**

The interpretation of study results must be considered within the context of the following limitations and weaknesses:

1) As previously mentioned, the results of this study are particularly noteworthy in that they specifically addressed unique value conflict factors previously unexplored in the social work literature. However, the correlational analysis of this study did not allow for a precise experimental investigation of the cause and effect relationships among the study variables. The study could not determine how a decrease in value conflict would specifically impact quality of worklife, job satisfaction and desire to leave the job. Redesigning work processes would not necessarily increase job satisfaction or decrease quality of worklife. Because the study did not manipulate study variables and participants to different treatment/conditions, all that can be determined is that the data are consistent with the study model. The data might also be consistent with
other models using the same variables, but depicting different relationships. While it makes sense intuitively that value conflict would precede job satisfaction, an argument could also be made that job satisfaction could influence value conflict as well. Public human service administrators cannot assume that work systems redesigned to specifically minimize value conflict would positively impact quality of worklife. For these reasons, it is important to interpret the data cautiously.

The study model leaves much of the variance unexplained, inviting the possibility that other variables such as personal factors (e.g., worker longevity), client characteristics, factors related to the organizational context and climate (e.g., agency program focus) and particular department/unit type could have influenced study results in undetectable ways. For example, a worker who had been working at a county Department of Human Service office for a number of years may experience a different level of value conflict, job satisfaction, quality of worklife and desire to leave the job than a worker who had been recently employed. An examination of these variables may have led to more precise and useful findings.

Although the sampling strategy in the study was designed as a single stage cluster sample, the low overall mean response rate (48.7%) from all agencies very likely renders the sample a non-probability sample. Consequently, any generalization of results should be made with caution.
4) The Value Conflict and Desire to Leave the Job Scales were newly constructed scales specifically developed for this dissertation study. While a reliability analysis conducted on these scales yielded high Alpha reliability coefficients (Value Conflict = 0.83, Desire to Leave the Job = 0.91), no validity study was conducted.

5) When conducting research sensitive to the job setting, it is important to establish ways that can most effectively assess and eliminate response bias. As indicated in the Research Methodology section of this study, strenuous efforts were made to assure the anonymity and confidentiality of participant responses. However, the length of the questionnaire and the sensitivity of the items could have contributed to some biased responses. For example, study participants may have been fearful that their responses would be made known to their supervisor, which could have resulted in an under-reporting of value conflict. If that were the case, the relationship between value conflict and the study variables may have been stronger than what was reflected in the data. However, only two out of the 1,069 study participants who completed questionnaires expressed concern regarding the confidential nature of them suggesting that issues leading to response bias in this study were most likely minimal.

6) Hypothesis eleven purported that the influence of value conflict between job satisfaction and between value conflict and quality of worklife would be stronger among social workers than non-social workers. The
rationale for this hypothesis stemmed from the historical roots of the social work profession. While all professions are guided by a strong ideology, values, Code of Ethics, and principles leading them to act in the best interest of their clients, the origins of social work are strongly rooted in the Judeo-Christian tradition of charity, which led the profession to focus on the social environment and adopt the traditional values of advocacy, community service and commitment to social change. The National Association of Social Worker’s (NASW) Code of Ethics (1997), which guides the social work profession, begins with a preamble that is particularly relevant to these values and states, “a historic defining feature of social work is the profession’s focus on individual well-being in a social context and the well-being of society. Fundamental to social work is attention to the environmental forces that create, contribute, and address problems in living.”

Interestingly, the research results indicated that while there was a strong correlation among value conflict and job satisfaction and among value conflict and quality of worklife, there was not a significant difference among workers degreeed in social work and workers degreeed in other fields of study as hypothesized. The following considerations are offered as possible explanations for the observed lack of difference between these groups:

a) The study defines value conflict as the incompatibility of the
demands county human service workers experience when acting in the interests of their clients in the face of rigid organizational rules. and the concerns of groups and individuals which influence access to resources. Perhaps the value conflict scale was not sensitive enough to capture the unique value conflict social workers experience relative to other disciplines. The question of how value conflict is experienced and whether it is dissimilar among the different disciplines was not able to be answered.

b) Public human service workers, whether degreed in social work or other disciplines, come to positions in public human service organizations strongly committed to their clients and challenged to think independently in how to apply skills and resources to impact a particular problem in a client’s best interest. Perhaps we should not be surprised that both groups experienced similar levels of conflict with work structures, policies and other constraints they perceived as being adverse to effectively serving clients.

c) As reviewed in this study, research provides evidence that individuals internalize and adapt to conflicting organizational values in order to survive and function in work places hostile to their personal and professional values. Perhaps social workers understand and experience the inherent conflict between workers, stakeholders and recipients of service in public human service departments but feel
powerless to affect and advocate for change. The other argument could be that perhaps social workers do not experience this conflict as compromising their personal or professional standards and basically adapt to their jobs of helping clients in what is often perceived as a hostile system. This argument could be extended further to suggest that the professional orientation of social work is fundamentally no different than that of other disciplines.

d) Responding to the excessive abuses of workers and the poor which characterized the early Industrial Revolution, social work adjusted to the scientific management theories and practices which characterized the 1930’s and forced many work processes to become fragmented and bureaucratized for the sake of “efficiency” and mass production. Vitner (1959) asserted that as a result, workers in public human service organizations surrendered their primary advocacy role and commitment to social change to become “sophisticated organization men” in settings that have become casework “factories” for reproducible social work “products.” The power of this institutional social setting may simply overwhelm any academic orientation and its associated values.

e) Since the social work curriculum requires significant exposure to social service agencies, it may be that those training and learning experiences have strongly moderated job expectations for those who
pursue employment in the public human service setting.

f) The small number of social workers in the sample weakens the confidence in the study findings. Further, the definition of a social worker in the study did not take into account differences in practice experience between degree levels. For example, participants with an Associate’s degree in Human Services (and a license to practice social work from the Ohio Counselor and Social Worker Board) have had less academic exposure to social work practice and principles compared to those with a Bachelor’s or Master’s degree. These differences could have affected their overall job expectations how they experience value conflict.

7) Interpretations of the results of this study, as they relate to the urban or rural location, must recognize that the sample consisted of public human service personnel in one state only. The fact that no differences were found between the responses of public human service personnel in urban and rural areas need not be interpreted as meaning that no differences exist. Significant localized cultural experiences pertinent to geographical locations may exist that are too subtle to be uncovered by the variables examined in the present study. Even if there are imperceptible differences among social work practice roles from rural to urban populations, there may be differences in the way these roles are acted upon in the local environment.
URBAN AND RURAL SOCIAL WORK DIFFERENCES

While this study failed to demonstrate a difference in responses, the often dramatic differences in urban and rural social patterns deserves additional discussion. It is conceivable that workers do not perceive strong differences between rural and urban communities and thus have no reason to practice differently. The research findings of Whitaker (1986) and Mermelstein & Sundet (1996) suggests that there is little or no difference between social work practice in rural and urban environments.

If rural communities are perceived as being different, it is important to ask why those differences are not evident in practice. One possible explanation is that the differences are not relevant to the public human service field and social work in general. Such reasoning undergirds Richard Dewey’s (1960) discussion of the relevance of these differences for sociology. Dewey argues that differences along the rural/urban continuum are real but relatively unimportant to understanding social organizations and individual behavior. It is conceivable that the perceived differences in community dynamics are relevant to social work practice but not to practices defined by the variables explored in this study. Additionally, the possibility exists that human service personnel perceive relevant differences between rural and urban communities, but are not academically prepared to practice in ways that incorporate these differences. Since most schools of social work are located in urban areas, perhaps the focus of academic training rests too heavily on urban
practice issues and the academic program is not appropriately preparing students for rural practice. Further research should focus on specific aspects of social work practice that could be relevant to the rural/urban continuum and may guide training programs to better prepare social workers to practice consistent with the unique characteristics of the urban and rural environment.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE AND TRAINING

The implications of this research for professional social work practice and training should excite both the practice and education communities to further examine the issues. Burton Gummer (1985) observed that there is a clearly established trend of declining numbers of social workers entering the public welfare field. Gummer argued persuasively that the relationship between public human service settings and the social work profession has been severed beyond repair. He blamed this on the actions of graduate schools of social work which have focused on enhancing casework skills to advance the profession’s status while the public welfare sector has sought increased management skills to deal with the ever increasing size, diversity and complexity of the public welfare system.

If, indeed, schools of social work have not equipped graduates to function effectively within the organizational complexities and constraints of public human service organizations, perhaps we should not be surprised by the decline of social work’s participation in and influence on public welfare. Gummer’s observation that the “social worker in public welfare is an endangered species” begs an explanation
for the decline in the number of social workers seeking positions in public human service settings. It is important to consider whether the decline is due to a preference for the ostensibly more prestigious clinical positions of voluntary social work agencies and private practice, or the inability to utilize training and skills to effectively assist clients because of the constraints and mandates imposed by such settings.

Following this line of thinking and in light of study results, there are several questions worthy of consideration. Are the drastic cuts in the resources available to public welfare agencies making work more difficult and less rewarding to social work professionals with strong client concerns? Does a lack of understanding of the professional social worker’s role in public human service settings contribute to a waning interest of social workers to pursue careers in public human service settings? Are schools training social workers to equip them with the management, financial, legal, and attitudinal skills needed to work effectively within the constraints of public human service settings? Are schools of social work effectively preparing social workers to meet the individual and family problems of service recipients in these environments? Is the social work curriculum promoting the development of knowledge and skills needed to work effectively in public human service settings, particularly with respect to management, client advocacy, and the legislative and political processes? Are schools of social work encouraging dialogue with public human service agencies which could lead to enhancement of the mutual understanding and trust necessary to encourage and expand public human service
field placements? Both the training and practice communities should consider these issues as they examine the adaptation of social workers to the public human service setting.

The historical roots of social work lie at the interface of the individual and the institutions (social, political, and economic) that shape the social environment. The historical mission of social work has been to advocate for the disadvantaged to change the social environment in ways that enable the individual to function effectively. While the research design prohibits conclusions, the strength of the correlations do suggest the possibility that today’s social worker is inadequately equipped to function effectively in this environment.

The industrial workplaces of the early part of this century spurred the social work community to advocate for worker protections in areas like child labor, workplace safety, reasonable work hours, and worker’s compensation. The high correlations between value conflict and job satisfaction, quality of worklife and desire to leave the job suggest the possibility that the public human service work setting itself is in need of change so that workers can function more effectively, find greater satisfaction in their efforts, and provide more effective assistance to clients as measured in outcome characteristics. While it is ironic to suggest that the “safety net” public welfare system, which the social work profession advocated. is itself in need of change, the strength of the associations among the study variables raises this suggestion. Such an examination is all the more urgently needed in light of the radical restructuring of the public welfare system initiated by the political advocates
of welfare reform.

It has previously been suggested that one of the possible explanations for the failure to discern a difference in value conflict between those respondents with professional social work training and those trained in other disciplines is that they adapt to the changed work emphasis of the public institution. If that is indeed the case, both the social work practice and training communities must ask whether such adaptation is really in the long-term interests of the profession, the clients they serve, and the society at large.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL WORK ADMINISTRATION

The research results did not provide the information necessary to assist public human service administrators with designing strategies to reduce value conflict and maximize job satisfaction. However, the results demonstrate significant correlations among the variables that merit the effort of public human service administrators to examine the work processes that serve to perpetuate value conflict, limit job satisfaction and contribute to desire to leave the job in the work setting. Such an examination could ultimately lead to the redesign of programs.

Patti (1988), asserted that when developing and redesigning programs to enhance job satisfaction in social service settings, client service effectiveness should be the principle concern of management and should be the primary objective of all social welfare organizations. She stated, “changing people and/or the social conditions in which they live is the raison d’être of the human service agency, not
the acquisition of resources, the efficient utilization of resources, or the satisfaction and development of staff” (p. 9). She contended that while all of these factors are instrumental in providing effective services, they are not sufficient conditions to the achievement of effective client outcomes.

In light of Patti’s argument to focus on client outcome measures, the redesign of jobs in public human service settings should incorporate greater responsibility for client outcomes as part of a continuous effort to acquire new skills, more effective decision-making and improved communication within and among agencies. Job redesign approaches, such as job enrichment, participative management, work teams and quality circles, are all designed to give workers greater control over their work and reduce job dissatisfaction, with the ultimate aim of enhancing client outcomes and service effectiveness.

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

In addition to the recommendations listed in the Discussion section of this dissertation, the following are suggested as ideas for further exploration and potential for future research:

1) A validity study could be conducted to determine the validity of the newly constructed Value Conflict and Desire to Leave the Job Scales.

2) Although the study model provided a good fit across groups, assessing the power and relationship of job satisfaction, quality of worklife, and job retention requires specifically examining the differential impact of various
job factors. A new model could be developed to consider the influence of other variables such as the number of years on the job, type of agency setting (e.g., Income Maintenance, Child Support Enforcement, Children Services) and an examination of the differences between public and private agencies. In addition, an examination of how various organizational factors such as amount and pace of work, supportive supervision, participative decision-making and work redesign might impact the study variables would enhance understanding of public human service agencies. A more comprehensive, in-depth analysis of the impact of value conflict on job satisfaction, quality of worklife and desire to leave the job would yield valuable information.

3) In relationship to the value conflict issues pertinent to this study, Patti’s (1985) argument that “service effectiveness can serve as a philosophical linchpin in a time when external conditions act as a strong centrifugal force pulling administration and direct practice into quite different orbits” (p.9) is important to consider. Reinforcing her contention that while job satisfaction, quality of worklife and job retention among public human service employees are indeed important in their own right, research should concentrate on examining these variables in relationship to service effectiveness and client outcomes. A more productive research strategy would be to examine the design, delivery, and evaluation of social services with particular attention to how the internal and external
environments of agencies can be managed and designed in order to optimize service effectiveness and enhance client outcomes.

4) In order to establish a more comprehensive understanding of the value conflict experienced by public human personnel, a research design incorporating both qualitative and quantitative approaches could be developed. Conducting personal interviews with public human service workers would allow for a personal perspective of how they actually perceive and respond to the value conflict dilemmas, and would add a new depth and richness to this research.

5) Future research should focus on specific aspects of social work practice that could be relevant to the rural/urban continuum and guide training programs to better prepare human service workers to practice consistent with the unique characteristics of the urban and rural environment.

6) The definition of value conflict could be re-conceptualized by comparing Codes of Ethics and then redesigning an instrument that would more accurately decipher the unique value conflict that social workers may experience relative to related and unrelated professional disciplines.

7) The definition of a social worker should be specifically limited to those with a Bachelor’s or Master’s degree in Social Work.
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APPENDICES
### APPENDIX A1

**SAMPLING FRAME: URBAN (Population Size 200,000+)**

All County Departments of Human Services (CDHS), County Child Support Enforcement (CSEA), and County Public Children Services (PCSA) in the State of Ohio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>CDHS Code</th>
<th>CSEA Code</th>
<th>PCSA Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoning</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A2

**SAMPLING FRAME: RURAL (Population Size <90,000)**

All County Departments of Human Services (CDHS), County Child Support Enforcement Agencies (CSEA), and County Public Children Services Agencies (PCSA) in the State of Ohio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County CDHS</th>
<th>County CSEA</th>
<th>County PCSA</th>
<th>County CDHS</th>
<th>County CSEA</th>
<th>County PCSA</th>
<th>County CDHS</th>
<th>County CSEA</th>
<th>County PCSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams CDHS</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Defiance</td>
<td>038</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>075</td>
<td>Monroe CDHS</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Ross CSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams CSEA</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>Defiance</td>
<td>039</td>
<td>Hocking</td>
<td>076</td>
<td>Monroe CSEA</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Ross PCSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams PCSA</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>040</td>
<td>Hocking</td>
<td>077</td>
<td>Monroe PCSA</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Sandusky CDHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland CDHS</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>041</td>
<td>Hocking</td>
<td>078</td>
<td>Morgan CDHS</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Sandusky CSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland CSEA</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>042</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>079</td>
<td>Morgan CSEA</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Sandusky PCSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland PCSA</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>Erie CDHS</td>
<td>043</td>
<td>Holmes CSEA</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>Morgan PCSA</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Scioto CDHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens CDHS</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>Erie CSEA</td>
<td>044</td>
<td>Holmes PCSA</td>
<td>081</td>
<td>Morrow CDHS</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Scioto CSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens CSEA</td>
<td>008</td>
<td>Erie PCSA</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>Huron CDHS</td>
<td>082</td>
<td>Morrow CSEA</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Scioto PCSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens PCSA</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>046</td>
<td>Huron CSEA</td>
<td>083</td>
<td>Morrow PCSA</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Seneca CDHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auglaize CDHS</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>Fayette CSEA</td>
<td>047</td>
<td>Huron PCSA</td>
<td>084</td>
<td>Muskingum</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Seneca CSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auglaize CSEA</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>Fayette PCSA</td>
<td>048</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>085</td>
<td>Muskingum</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Seneca PCSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auglaize PCSA</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>Fulton CDHS</td>
<td>049</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>086</td>
<td>Muskingum</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Shelby CDHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont CDHS</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>Fulton CSEA</td>
<td>050</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>087</td>
<td>Noble CDHS</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Shelby CSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont CSEA</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>Fulton PCSA</td>
<td>051</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>088</td>
<td>Noble CSEA</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Shelby PCSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont PCSA</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>Gallia CDHS</td>
<td>052</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>089</td>
<td>Noble PCSA</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Tuscarawas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown CDHS</td>
<td>016</td>
<td>Gallia CSEA</td>
<td>053</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>Ottawa CDHS</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Tuscarawas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown CSEA</td>
<td>017</td>
<td>Gallia PCSA</td>
<td>054</td>
<td>Knox CDHS</td>
<td>091</td>
<td>Ottawa CSEA</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Tuscarawas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown PCSA</td>
<td>018</td>
<td>Geauga</td>
<td>055</td>
<td>Knox CSEA</td>
<td>092</td>
<td>Ottawa PCSA</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Union CDHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll CDHS</td>
<td>019</td>
<td>Geauga</td>
<td>056</td>
<td>Knox PCSA</td>
<td>093</td>
<td>Paulding</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Union CSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll CSEA</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>Geauga</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>094</td>
<td>Paulding CSEA</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Union PCSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll PCSA</td>
<td>021</td>
<td>Guernsey</td>
<td>058</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>095</td>
<td>Paulding PCSA</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Van Wert CDHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>022</td>
<td>Guernsey</td>
<td>059</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>096</td>
<td>Perry CDHS</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Van Wert CSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>Guernsey</td>
<td>060</td>
<td>Logan CDHS</td>
<td>097</td>
<td>Perry CSEA</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Van Wert PCSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>024</td>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>061</td>
<td>Logan CSEA</td>
<td>098</td>
<td>Perry PCSA</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Vinton CDHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton CDHS</td>
<td>025</td>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>062</td>
<td>Logan PCSA</td>
<td>099</td>
<td>Pickaway</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Vinton CSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton CSEA</td>
<td>026</td>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>063</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Pickaway</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Vinton PCSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton PCSA</td>
<td>027</td>
<td>Hardin CDHS</td>
<td>064</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Pickaway</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coshocton</td>
<td>028</td>
<td>Hardin CSEA</td>
<td>065</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Pike CDHS</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coshocton</td>
<td>029</td>
<td>Hardin PCSA</td>
<td>066</td>
<td>Marion CDHS</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Pike CSEA</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coshocton</td>
<td>030</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>067</td>
<td>Marion CSEA</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Pike PCSA</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Williams CDHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>031</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>068</td>
<td>Marion PCSA</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Preble CDHS</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Williams CSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford CSEA</td>
<td>032</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>069</td>
<td>Meigs CDHS</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Preble CSEA</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Williams PCSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford PCSA</td>
<td>033</td>
<td>Henry CDHS</td>
<td>070</td>
<td>Meigs CSEA</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Preble PCSA</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Wyandot CDHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darke CDHS</td>
<td>034</td>
<td>Henry CSEA</td>
<td>071</td>
<td>Meigs PCSA</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Putnam CDHS</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Wyandot CSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darke CSEA</td>
<td>035</td>
<td>Henry PCSA</td>
<td>072</td>
<td>Mercer CDHS</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Putnam CSEA</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Wyandot PCSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darke PCSA</td>
<td>036</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>Mercer CSEA</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Putnam PCSA</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiance CDHS</td>
<td>037</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>074</td>
<td>Mercer PCSA</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Ross CDHS</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

An Examination of the Relationship Between Value Conflict, Quality of Worklife, Job Satisfaction and Job Retention Among Workers Employed by County Department of Human Service Agencies in the State of Ohio.

The following questionnaire was developed as part of a doctoral dissertation study which examines the relationships between value conflict, job satisfaction, quality of worklife and desire to leave the job among workers employed by county Department of Human Service, Child Support Enforcement and Public Children Services agencies in the State of Ohio. This research will provide insight into how to improve the work environment and the overall job satisfaction and productivity of public human service employees. These questionnaires will remain totally anonymous and at no time should you put your name or any other identifying information on the questionnaire. Please make sure to seal your questionnaire in the attached envelope.

You will only report various demographic information such as age, gender, education level, whether your agency is located in an urban or rural area, and whether you work for a CDHS, CSEA, or PCSA unit within your county human service office. Questionnaires will be stored in a locked file cabinet located at the office of the researcher until data analysis procedures begin. As stated, only overall aggregate study results will be reported and individual response sheets will be destroyed as soon as the results are statistically compiled.

Your participation will be voluntary, and you may refuse to participate. You have the right to ask questions, convey concerns, or withdraw from participation at any time without penalty or prejudice. You have the right to have access to the overall study results. Completion of this survey constitutes your consent to participate.

It should take no longer than 30 minutes to complete this questionnaire. Upon completion, if you have any questions about the questionnaire, data compilation or any other specific concerns, please don't hesitate to contact Laurie White at 937-548-3806.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION!
Please provide the following demographic information about yourself and your job by marking the appropriate box. Do not put your name or any other personal identifying information on the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Educational Degree</th>
<th>Field of Study</th>
<th>Agency Unit</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender: □ Male □ Female</td>
<td>□ High School □ Associate □ Bachelor’s □ Master’s □ Doctorate</td>
<td>□ Social Work □ Sociology □ Psychology □ Counseling □ Other (list)</td>
<td>□ CDHS □ CSEA □ PCSA □ Other (list)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: _______</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the following pages, you will find several different questions about your job. The questions are designed to obtain your perceptions and attitudes toward your job and your reaction to it. Specific instructions are given at the start of each section. Please read them carefully. There are no "trick" questions on the questionnaire.
Please respond to each statement using the scale listed below:

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

1. _____ Agency policies often make it difficult to help a client.
2. _____ Legal mandates are more important to consider in my job than the needs of my clients.
3. _____ I frequently have to bend rules to assist a client.
4. _____ Rigid agency rules keep me from being able to make decisions that would assist my clients.
5. _____ The regulations of my agency force me to terminate services to clients before they are ready.
6. _____ Expectations of interest groups in the community do not coincide with my professional standards.
7. _____ Agency regulations prevent me from helping clients in the way I would like.
8. _____ It is easy to follow the policies of my agency when helping clients.
9. _____ Legal mandates prevent me from making decisions in the best interests of my clients.
10. _____ The policies of my agency assist me to effectively serve my clients.
11. _____ The goals of my organization are incongruent with the basic principles of my profession.
12. _____ I am often limited to what I can do for my clients because of the attitudes of powerful people in the community.
13. _____ I rarely experience conflict between my professional values and what my agency expects me to do.
14. _____ It is more important to meet the needs of my clients than it is to follow the rules of my agency.
15. _____ Bureaucratic "red tape" often stands in the way of helping my clients.
16. _____ Performing my job according to professional standards often requires violating community expectations.
17. _____ I am afraid to go against an agency policy when assisting my client for fear I might lose my job.
18. _____ Budgetary considerations in my agency result in service cutbacks which are not in my client's best interest.
19. _____ I do not experience conflict between following the policies of my agency and serving the needs of my client.
20. _____ My agency refers clients to programs that are not beneficial to them.
21. _____ It is more important to be loyal to my clients than to my employer.
22. _____ I am empowered by my agency's administrative staff to make the decisions I feel would be most appropriate in assisting a client.
23. _____ Agency policies are in line with my personal values.
24. _____ I am torn between my client's needs for services and the work demands placed on me by my supervisor.
Please respond to each statement using the scale listed below:

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly Agree  

1. _____ I have enough time to get the job done.  
2. _____ The hours are good.  
3. _____ Travel to and from work is convenient.  
4. _____ The physical surroundings are pleasant.  
5. _____ I can forget about my personal problems.  
6. _____ I am free from the conflicting demands that other people make of me.  
7. _____ I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.  
8. _____ The work is interesting.  
9. _____ I have an opportunity to develop my own special abilities.  
10. _____ I can see the results of my work.  
11. _____ I am given a chance to do the things I do best.  
12. _____ I am given a lot of freedom to decide how I do my own work.  
13. _____ The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.  
14. _____ The pay is good.  
15. _____ The job security is good.  
16. _____ My fringe benefits are good.  
17. _____ The people I work with are friendly.  
18. _____ I am given a lot of chances to make friends.  
19. _____ The people I work with take a personal interest in me.  
20. _____ I have enough information to get the job done.  
21. _____ I receive enough help and equipment to get the job done.  
22. _____ I have enough authority to do my job.  
23. _____ My supervisor is competent in doing (his/her) job.  
24. _____ My responsibilities are clearly defined.  
25. _____ The people I work with are competent in doing their jobs.  
26. _____ My supervisor is very concerned about the welfare of those under(him/her).  
27. _____ My supervisor is successful in getting people to work together.  
28. _____ My supervisor is helpful to me in getting my job done.  
29. _____ The people I work with are helpful to me in getting my job done.  
30. _____ My supervisor is friendly.  
31. _____ Promotions are handled fairly.  
32. _____ The chances for promotion are good.  
33. _____ My employer is concerned about giving everyone a chance to get ahead.
Please respond to each statement using the scale listed below:

1 = Strongly Disagree  
2 = Disagree  
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree  
4 = Agree  
5 = Strongly Agree 

1. _____ There are some conditions concerning my job that could be improved.
2. _____ My job is like a hobby to me.
3. _____ My job is usually interesting enough to keep from getting bored.
4. _____ It seems that my friends are more interested in their jobs.
5. _____ I consider my job rather unpleasant.
6. _____ I enjoy my work more than my leisure time.
7. _____ I am often bored with my job.
8. _____ I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.
9. _____ Most of the time I have to force myself to go to work.
10. _____ I am satisfied with my job for the time being.
11. _____ I feel that my job is no more interesting than others I could get.
12. _____ I definitely dislike my work.
13. _____ I feel that I am happier in my work than most other people.
14. _____ Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.
15. _____ Each day of work seems like it will never end.
16. _____ I like my job better than the average worker does.
17. _____ My job is pretty uninteresting.
18. _____ I find real enjoyment in my work.
19. _____ I am disappointed that I ever took this job.
Please respond to each statement using the scale listed below:

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

1. _____ I often feel like I want out of this job as soon as possible.
2. _____ I would like to complete my career at the agency where I currently work.
3. _____ I frequently daydream about being in a new job.
4. _____ I have no desire to leave this job.
5. _____ I count the days until I can find a new job.
6. _____ I would not consider leaving this job.
7. _____ I am interested in learning about other jobs in an entirely different field.
8. _____ I would definitely recommend this job to a friend.
9. _____ I look for new job opportunities.

Thank you for your willingness to participate!
VITA
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