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between professional isolation and job satisfaction, organizational size and job satisfaction, age and job satisfaction, and marital status and job satisfaction were not confirmed and the null hypotheses were not rejected. Hypotheses dealing with relationships between the geographical location of the assignment and job satisfaction, role conflict and job satisfaction, gender and job satisfaction, and military rank and job satisfaction were confirmed and the null hypotheses rejected. Significant differences were found between the job satisfaction scores of male and female social work officers with the males reporting higher satisfaction scores. Male social work officers also had higher scores on job challenge than did their female counterparts. Regression analysis revealed that job challenge, job comfort, and the package of financial rewards were significant predictors of overall job satisfaction for this sample. Some comparisons with the results of the Jayaratne and Chess (1982) study were made using the results obtained from the military sample. In these comparisons, a major similarity was that job challenge was the single most important predictor of job satisfaction for both the civilian and military samples. A major difference was that while Jayaratne and Chess (1982) found no significant differences in overall job satisfaction
scores of males and females, there was a significant difference on this measure between male and female social work officers in the Air Force.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There are many aspects to the practice of social work. In its traditional form social work has been concerned with society and its problems. Health, education, housing, employment, and income maintenance are examples. Social workers have worked in schools, medical settings, community programs, social planning, industrial and labor settings. In recent decades a small number of social work professionals have worked in the military services. While much has been written about the more traditional social work settings, the literature and research concerning social work in the military services is still sparse.

Other professions such as medicine and nursing have longer histories of involvement with the military. The beginnings of social work in the military services can be traced back to the late 1950's and early 60's. Since those days the profession has steadily enhanced its role, both in impact and in numbers, in the services. This is especially so in the two branches that employ the vast majority of military social work officers - the U.S. Air Force and the U.S. Army.
When one compares the histories, traditions, and values of the military and social work, differences quickly become apparent. These differences impact upon the social work profession within the military. Traditionally, the military officer has been viewed as a manager of the potential for legitimized violence. This potential is inherent in the mission which society imposes on its military institutions. Professional social work officers, for whom violence is not a professional value, face the same conflicts as do other professions in the military such as medicine, nursing, and the chaplaincy. The focus of the first section of this study will be on the value differences between the military and social work and some of the job satisfaction issues which surface when social workers choose a military career.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study focuses on the job satisfaction of Air Force Social Work Officers. It attempts to better understand what are the various organizational, job-related, and personal factors which have an effect on the overall level of job satisfaction among these social work officers. It is based on a study conducted of social workers in the civilian sector and will attempt to make some comparisons between the social workers in two sectors of our society - the military and the civilian.
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The questions for which this study will seek some of the answers are:

**Question 1:** What are the levels of job satisfaction among social work officers in the Air Force?

**Question 2:** Which elements of the organizational structure contribute to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction?

**Question 3:** What effect does the geographical location of the social work officer's assignment have on the level of job satisfaction? Specifically, are assignments in the United States related differently to job satisfaction than are assignments in overseas areas?

**Question 4:** Does the number of social workers assigned to an Air Force base contribute to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction? How does the presence or absence of other mental health professionals impact on job satisfaction or dissatisfaction?

**Question 5:** What effect do personal or individual characteristics such as age, gender, marital status, or military rank have on job satisfaction or dissatisfaction?

**Question 6:** How does the perception of role con-
conflict by the Air Force Social Work Officer influence the level of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction?

These questions are the source for the five hypotheses which are stated in Chapter III.

SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES

In order to achieve the objectives of this study, survey questionnaires were mailed to 206 social work officers in the Air Force. The data from these questionnaires was collected and coded in order that the statistical analyses could be performed. The analyses of the data was accomplished by using the various statistical techniques described in Chapter III.

BACKGROUND

The Military as a Society and an Organization

In this day and age, military organizations have taken on an importance that cannot be overstressed. Current society and politics have been greatly influenced by military institutions. The military has been influenced by society. "The military is a corporate part of the social structure, yet it is a separate entity." (Spindler, 1948:83). The personnel who are part of the military bring with them the attitudes and behavioral patterns of
the society-at-large. In the modern era the individual can be both physically and psychologically separated from the civilian community, although this is less so since the advent of the all-volunteer force which has not stressed the actual separation between the two sectors. There is presently a much freer movement of personnel and attitudes across the military/civilian boundary. Elements of that separation still remain, however.

The separation from civilian society is consciously promoted by the command, which always restricts the new recruit to the post for the first few weeks in order to speed the process of assimilation which eventually results in his finding the satisfaction of needs within the military unit." (Spindler, 1948:84)

This places the military in the position of a sub-society or sub-culture. This is due to two factors. First, the military is part of the larger society and, as such, the cultural patterns and values of the civilian society are projected into the military society. Secondly, the military maintains a separation from the larger society and has developed its own form of self-sufficiency. This points out... "both the self-sufficient, separative tendencies and the inclusion within and subordination to the larger society and its culture." (Spindler, 1948:84)

The demarcation between the military and the civilian sectors can be quite sharp. The military has major distinguishing features. Freeman (1948) described some of
them. First, the military exists at all because society has decided that it should. In theory, a military institution is not at all essential to the beginning of a society. In actual practice, however, it does seem to be related to the continued existence of that same society. Second, the military organization is a highly stratified one in which the hierarchy of grade and class exist. Following from this are the elements of power, authority, status, and privilege. Third, as previously noted, the specialized role of the military, its mission, its self-sufficient posture, its traditions, and the transient nature of its personnel due to the frequent changes of assignment, all contribute to the separation of the military from the larger society. Fourth, there is a loss of individuality in the military due to the processes of discipline and regimentation. Fifth, the organization of the military is highly decentralized, yet has a strong system of control from the top. Commanding others, while being commanded by others, provides an organizational glue which holds the structure together. Sixth, the military has a certain unpredictability of function which is dependent on whether there is a war, emergency, or a state of peace. Finally, and perhaps most important, military personnel work in a bureaucracy which places severe restrictions on personal options. If unhappy, the military person simply cannot decide to quit. While this provides
the organization with a certain stability and permanence among personnel, it also carries with it the risk of inhibiting the personnel and creating a disaffection which has a negative impact on the organization.

Brotz and Wilson (1946) also described the military organization and its structure. They see the military as a hierarchy of command. There is a subletting of power. Each officer is expected to know his or her personnel as well as possible. While this subletting of power is designed to facilitate personal control, it also can lead to abuses of that same power. The military uses uniform and ordered procedures. While providing for organizational consistency, the tendency exists to shift responsibility because the regulations don't always specify who is responsible. The self-contained nature of the military allows it to maintain its own internal functioning. The myriad of duties which arise cause role changes for the officers involved who must often shift from disciplinarian to advice-giver to record-keeper. Finally, despite the intimacy of military life, individuals can become isolated within the group. The impersonal manner used in managing larger numbers of people can lead to anonymity. Yet, these same forces are the ones necessary to create a unified combat unit.
It is this feeling of identification, of 'we-ness,' that provides one motivation for endurance of hardship and the constant threat of injury or death in combat. Men do not fight, in most cases, for abstractions. The universal drive is very simple. 'I can't let the guys down.' (Spindler, 1948:84)

Janowitz (1960) proposed a different model of the military as an organization and society. He feels that the nature of complex organizations necessitates that the military be integrated with the civilian society and not isolated from it. This certainly provides for a more effective civilian control which is part of our political philosophy. The model which posits separation of the military from the civilian sector relies heavily on the President following through on the will of the people, on the traditional checks and balances working effectively, and on an effective chain of command. Janowitz's model, however, allows for a lessening of the sharp distinction between the military and civilian institutions. Direct contact between the two communities takes place. Military personnel maintain their identity as civilians who are currently in the military services. The advent of the all-volunteer force hastened this change and, as will be seen later in this paper, brought about changes in the manner in which military personnel are managed in their job roles.

The military is a large-scale organization. In
order to administer such an organization, the bureaucratic system seems to be inevitable. Max Weber (1946) addressed this point when he wrote "... military discipline and technical training can be normally and fully developed, at least to its modern high level, only in the bureaucratic army." (p. 222). In the classical bureaucracy authority originates in a central office. It then flows through a series of integrated offices according to a specified set of rules. The authority, however, resides in the office held, not in the person who holds it. This is the essential element of the military bureaucracy. The organization of general staffs, different military commands, and the distribution of responsibility and authority in the units of command, all fit well into the overall structure of a bureaucratic system. It is through this structure of rank, responsibility, authority, and privilege that the hierarchy of status in the military develops. It is maintained by the time-honored rituals and traditions and, at times, by the actual separation of officers and enlisted personnel. The military has enhanced the characteristics of the classic bureaucracy and provided a special emphasis which heightens the element of status.

All of this seems directly related to the efficient management of the large scale military organization. It provides for the element of predictability in the organization. Weber (1946) put it this way:
The calculability of behavior is of paramount importance in military operations, as in economic administration in a capitalistic economy, because it dehumanizes relationships, thus eliminating from official business, love, hatred, and all purely personal, irrational, and emotional elements which escape calculation. (p. 216)

It is on this calculability of behavior that the military system of discipline is based. The military bureaucracy helps to achieve this. This is a two-edged sword. It can lead to the rigidity and formalized procedures which so often result in the "red-tape syndrome." It also is the source of the disciplined behavior that prompts the cooperation among personnel which leads to the accomplishment of mission requirements under the adverse conditions of battle. Thus, while individualism is repressed, the "we-ness" of the cohesive military unit is emphasized.

The Military as a Profession

The career military officer has been historically regarded as a professional. This carries with it a legitimation through expertise which is based on specialized training, some type of certification as a professional, a significant level of occupational autonomy, and a service orientation. Janowitz (1977) addressed these points:

The concept of profession (and of professionalism) continues...to apply to the military because it
implies (a) a high level of skills (higher than for an occupation); (b) an important degree of self-regulation; and (c) a strong element of corporate cohesion. (p. 52)

As with other professions, the military as its own value system. This has generally been accepted by both the critics (Mills, 1956) and the supporters of the military (Janowitz, 1960; Moskos, 1970). The distinctiveness of this value system is based on the nature of the military and its functions. The military officer is considered to be a professional in the management of violence. He is part of an organizational system, legitimized by society's fiat, which has the capacity to commit, and deal with the consequences of, large-scale, legitimate, collective violence. "The perspective of the military man is based on the willingness as well as the capacity to eliminate dysfunctional elements from the social (or organizational) system's environment (if so defined by legitimate authorities)." (Bachman et al., 1977:106-107)

This belief system is fostered by a number of processes. Abrahamsson (1972) has identified some of them. They are:

(1) self-selection through initial interest or motivation; (2) screening procedures used by the military; (3) continuous selection and retention within the profession; and (4) professional socialization and training. (p. 75)

Historically, based on such processes, the military
officer corps has developed its professional role. It has carried out this role in the institutional bureaucracy. However, in recent years, the institutional nature of the military, which has been almost automatically accepted, has begun to be questioned. Moskos (1976) pointed out that such concepts as profession and calling have been traditionally associated with the military.

It does imply a sacred mission, legitimation through institutional values, a high level of devotion to the tasks of office, communion with others in the calling, and a reward system based not as much on salary as on a life-style appropriate to the social position of the calling, i.e. on deference rather than remuneration. (Bachman et.al., 1977:152).

Such quasi-monastic concepts have traditionally been associated with monastic institutions. Gabriel (1979) related this distinction to the military. He distinguished between corporative bureaucratic structures and entrepreneurial bureaucracies. In his judgement the military is undergoing a transformation from a corporative bureaucratic structure to a largely entrepreneurial one. Entrepreneurial bureaucracies place their values on the product produced, whereas corporative bureaucracies formulate procedures and norms that are valued in and for themselves more than for any contribution they make. Entrepreneurial bureaucracies stress the ethics of self-interest in both an organizational and individual sense, whereas corporative
bureaucracies stress the ethic of community interest. Individuals employed in entrepreneurial bureaucracies do so because it is in their perceived self-interest to do so. This translates into more money, rewards, prestige, larger offices, and similar inducements. Thus, entrepreneurial bureaucracies stress the attainment of material rewards while corporative ones have a marked tendency to define their rewards in psychological or ritual terms often expressed as a recognition of contributions made by the individual to the community which is served.

The military has over the years held strongly to a corporative value system.

Clearly in corporative bureaucracies, such as the officer corps, one may be expected to behave in a manner which is consistent with accepted values but which would be regarded by the entrepreneur as highly dysfunctional in that material self-interest is not served. (Gabriel, 1979:91)

A similar distinction has been made by Charles Moskos, Jr. (1977). He sees the current trend in the military as shifting from an institutional (corporative) format to an occupational (entrepreneurial) format.

An institution is legitimated in terms of values and norms, i.e., a purpose transcending individual self-interest in favor of a presumed higher good. Members of an institution are often viewed as following a calling; they generally regard themselves as being different or apart from the broader society and are so regarded by others. To the degree one's institutional membership is congruent
with notions of self-sacrifice and dedication, it will usually enjoy esteem from the larger community. Although remuneration may not be comparable to what one might expect in the economy of the marketplace, this is often compensated for by an array of social benefits associated with an institutional format as well as psychic income. (Moskos, 1977:42)

This institutional value system has pervaded the military for many years. The milieu of the service academies and other military educational programs is often similar to monastic settings. Some are now questioning whether the all-volunteer force has not brought with it, or possibly been brought about, by a shift to an occupational model.

An occupation is legitimated in terms of the marketplace, i.e., prevailing monetary rewards for equivalent competencies. In a modern industrial society employees usually enjoy some voice in the determination of appropriate salary and work conditions. Such rights are counterbalanced by responsibilities to meet contractual obligations. The occupational model implies priority of self-interest rather than that of the employing organization. (Moskos, 1977:43).

While in the civilian professions, personnel are often compensated for their expertise, compensation in the military is a function of rank and seniority. Historically, the military has attempted to avoid the occupational model since it sets up an employer-employee relationship that does not always fit well with the traditional military values. If carried to its logical conclusion, the personnel in the military should be unionized as they are in some
of the Western European countries. The occupational model has made inroads into the military institution. Certain professions, such as physicians, receive extra compensation for their non-military skills. Unfortunately, social work is not in that enviable position within the military organization.

Janowitz (1977) also addressed this trend. While he agreed with it in some ways, he did not see it as an either/or situation.

The military profession is undergoing long-term transformation which involves increased penetration by other professions and institutions. In 1960, I described these trends as those of the civilianization of the military, as they converged more and more with civilian professions. The end of this convergence is being reached, but we are not there yet. One of the essential characteristics of this convergence is the introduction of more and more contractual relations between the officer and the state.

However, it must be recognized that we are not dealing with a "zero sum" game. The military can and must participate in the larger and at the same time maintain its relative autonomy, specialized competence, and crucial element of group cohesion. (Janowitz, 1977:53)

Stahl et al (1978) argue that to hold Moskos' model to a rigid interpretation would amount to a zero-sum game.

...one might posit that the acquisition of civilian skills by the military comes only at the expense of the heroic warrior role and the traditional values. Therefore, it would be a contradiction to expect a highly skilled technician, engineer, or surgeon to also be a loyal, self-sacrificing
military person in the traditional sense. The two are simply not compatible: an individual can not be 'high institution' and 'high occupation.' (p. 258)

In their research, however, they conclude that it is possible to be both highly committed to the military in the institutional sense, agreeing with its norms and values, and at the same time being concerned with such things as equity for the individual, technical expertise, and rights which are counterbalanced by obligations.

Bachman et al (1977) trace the transforming of the military from a calling to an occupation to three trends. The first is a changing technology of warfare that makes civilian populations as vulnerable to attack as frontline troops, and thus has socialized the danger of war and reduced the unique liability and sacrifice of armed forces personnel. (Lasswell, 1941)

As the technology of warfare has become both more destructive and more complex, the nature...of jobs in the military has come to approximate jobs in civilian enterprise (e.g. Biderman, 1967). Thus, at the same time that the unique liability of the military organization in the time of war is decreasing, so is the uniqueness of the tasks performed within that organization.

The third trend is the growing tendency for makers of military personnel policy to treat soldiering as equivalent to a civilian job. (Moskos, 1975). ...(T)he conditions of working in the armed forces as a uniformed member of the service have increasingly come to resemble the employment conditions of a civilian occupation. (p. 153)

The third trend appears to be the one which has had the most significant impact on this transition. It has
been primarily since the advent of the all-volunteer force that policy makers have treated military work roles as basically equivalent to civilian occupations. The U.S. President's Commission on an All-Voluntary Armed Force (1970) recommended that military compensation be based on a salary system which is similar to that found in civilian industry. Lateral hiring of trained civilian personnel into the military was suggested. In general, it was recommended that the all-voluntary forces compete with industry for the quality personnel which were required.

In the past there were discrepancies and economic disadvantages for the military when compared to the civilian sector. These were viewed as being partially offset, however, by the benefits package provided by the military. These generally included the housing allowance, health care for dependents, educational benefits, commissaries, and post or base exchanges.

Among the latent functions of this pattern of compensation were: support of the military occupation as a calling rather than simply an occupation, maintenance of the military installation as a community, enhancement of the fraternal nature of the military organization, legitimation of the military as a social institution, and incentive for the citizen to serve as a soldier and fulfill a right and responsibility of citizenship. (Bachman et al, 1977:20)

With the movement toward the equalization of the military and civilian jobs has come the consequent reduc-
In sum, the conditions of working for the armed forces as a uniformed member of the service have increasingly come to resemble the employment conditions of the civilian occupation. Whether by design, intuition, or accident, the makers of military personnel policy have sought to compete with commerce and industry for citizen-workers by making military employment increasingly similar to civilian employment. (Bachman, 1977:22)

Social Work as a Profession

Professional social work had its origins in the voluntary associations which undertook to criticize and reform the institutions which were then known as "charities and corrections." What began as a religiously motivated movement became the "scientific philanthropy" movement.

Two currents developed in society which influenced the growth of social work as a profession. One was the growing spirit of professionalism in the labor force in general. The other was a popular interest in science and scientific psychology. Engineering and technical schools, medical schools, schools for teachers, business schools, journalism schools and similar developments in other professions took place. Social work followed along the same track attempting to identify itself as a profession. In addition, lawyers, physicians and clergymen had been
traditionally held to high ethical standards as professionals because they assisted vulnerable people who were making serious decisions while these people were often in a state of personal crisis. Since they worked with people in similar situations, social workers developed a professional ethic and a spirit of service became an important part of professional development.

As it grew, social work found itself closely allied to the institutional bureaucracies of the times. They were settings in which "casework" could be applied. The courts were the forum for probation officers; medical social workers in hospitals assisted patients and their families; truant officers and visiting teachers assisted students and their families in the schools; and aftercare for patients in the mental hospitals was the role of the psychiatric social worker.

The drive to develop a unified and coherent profession was difficult in the face of diverse specializations and interests. Leaders in the field sought to define a core technology, a "nuclear skill" in Lubove's terms, that would at once provide a model of practice for workers in various settings and serve as a basis for a distinctive professional expertise. Social casework, as is well known, became that nuclear skill, the focal point around which the profession would forge its identity. (Patti, 1983:2)

From this professionalization process arose the basic value system which has been at the core of the social work profession over the years. This same value system has
brought the profession into conflict at times with the institutional bureaucracies with which social work interacts.

Florence Hollis, in her classic text, enumerated some of these values.

Casework is characterized...by its direct concern for the well-being of the individual. It is not primarily an organ of social control, designed to bring the individual into conformity with society and thus rid it of the social hazard presented by the discontented, unsatisfied, rebellious individual. On the contrary, case work came into being as a response to the needs of human beings for protection against social and natural deprivations and catastrophes...This emphasis upon the innate worth of the individual is an extremely important, fundamental characteristic of casework. (Hollis, 1964:12)

From this basic tenet flow two others which the profession espouses in its interaction with clients - acceptance and self-determination.

By acceptance we mean the maintaining of an attitude of warm good will toward the client whether or not his way of behaving is socially acceptable and whether or not it is to the worker's personal liking.

...Self-determination is perhaps not too felicitous a term; it is too absolute in its implications. What we really mean by this concept is that self-direction, the right to make his own choices, is a highly valued attribute of the individual. The more he can make his own decisions and direct his own life the better, and the less the caseworker tries to take over these responsibilities the better. (Hollis, 1964:13)

In general, then, flowing from these values is the
understanding that each person is considered to be important and of inestimable value. The familiar ideas of uncondemning attitudes, congruence, confidentiality, and respect are all part of this value set. They are part and parcel of the social worker's daily practice. Implementing them is not always easy. The military, as noted earlier, tends to perceive individuals as members of a group. Individuality and self-determination are not highly valued. It is at crossroads such as this that the values of the profession of social work and the military profession meet and come into conflict.

Social Work and Bureaucracies

Both professions and bureaucracies are consequences of similar forces. They are expressions of general trends toward division of labor and specialization that characterize complex societies.

Organizational theories have pointed out that even small agencies tend to be organized along the lines of classic bureaucracies. This has implications for the professional social worker since conflicts between organizational and professional norms often arise. This may be less a problem of some personal conflict with authority than a role conflict between bureaucracy and professionalism.

While not all professions find themselves committed
to bureaucratic organizations, most social work is provided through such organizations. This points up the fact that there are consequences to the association between the social work profession and the agency or bureaucracy involved. There are certain administrative requirements with which the social work profession can be compatible. Most administrative bureaucracies foster an impersonality which social work can find compatible with its norm of regarding the client with a certain detachment which allows the social worker to keep personal feelings out of the professional relationship. Often the goals of both the social worker and the agency spring from similar humanitarian value systems. In many ways, then, the social worker performs tasks which both sanction the profession's values and the agency's goals.

Not all features of the bureaucracy and the profession are complementary, however. One of these situations can occur when the professional's needs for mastery of technical skills and dedicated service come into conflict with the agency's needs to use scarce professional resources to the best advantage of the organization. The best possible use of human and other resources with short-term goals in mind might well be at variance with the professional's goals. In most cases strains of this type can be worked out to the tolerable satisfaction of both
parties. Nonetheless, these strains do often give rise to role conflicts.

Vinter (1959) identified some types of role conflict that arise in such circumstances.

A pervasive type of role conflict arises from discrepancies between agencies' limited service goals (the 'function' of each agency) and the profession's relatively unlimited commitments. As an agency employee, the social worker must often refuse service because the prospective client's needs do not assume the form appropriate to a given agency: ...Some of this conflict is expressed in staff dissatisfaction with 'restrictive' agency policies, and is partially relieved by heavy emphasis on referrals and by attempts to expand the service jurisdictions of agencies...

A second type of role conflict is generated by discrepancies between specific agency goals and professional values. Social workers tend to concentrate in agencies whose means and ends are most compatible with the profession's codes and standards, and thus avoid those where major incongruities are perceived. ...Workers are sometimes required to perform tasks not perceived as commensurate with their training and professional images: they may experience constraints in the full utilization of core technical skills, or find little organizational support for their distinctive values and practices...

Another type of conflict between professional and agency role demands is that arising from inherent differences between the administrative structure and the professional culture. The profession values skill rather than procedure, and service rather than routines. The agency, in contrast, interposes a variety of requirements relevant to the operation of a complex organization. Records must be written, files maintained, requisitions prepared and routed, directives adhered to, and so on. (p. 250-251)

Conflict can also arise as a result of agency size,
Thomas (1959) studied agency size as related to the worker's role.

Enlarging the size of the staff generally presents greater requirements for coordination and control. More supervisors are needed with added workers; at some point it becomes necessary to introduce a division head or 'supervisor of supervisors.' Direct positive relationships have been found between the number of employees and the number of vertical ranks in comparable welfare units. (p. 39)

Obviously, this extension of the chain of command in the organization can create communication problems. Smaller military organizations in which the social worker is assigned can allow a more direct access to other professionals and to the hospital commander. Word of mouth then becomes a workable vehicle for sharing problems and decisions. Not so in larger organizations. Here the social worker is faced with a more formal (and often formidable) structure and greater distance between professional personnel. Administrators can become remote. While a degree of subunit informality can remain, interunit rivalry can begin to develop. The larger organization, then, in some respects can be a different place for the social worker to work when compared to the smaller organizational setting. Not all professionals cope well with these differences. If the job conditions are found to be unsatisfactory, staff morale and productivity can suffer. If left unchanged, such conditions become the fertile ground
which gives rise to personnel turnover. If the military is indeed shifting to an occupational model, such factors must be examined and personnel policies adjusted to meet different needs. The needs of the contemporary professional in the military service may not be well met by referring back to the traditional ethic of "duty, honor, country" which served well in the era of the corporative institutional military.

The structure of the authority system typically takes the form of a hierarchical ordering of personnel into official positions. Everyone is a subordinate to someone else, and superior to others. Each person has a different responsibility and there are levels of authority inherent in each position. The structure of the bureaucracy, then, gives rise to rules and regulations.

An agency's official system of politics, rules, and procedures comprises another dimension of its authority structure. This system establishes patterns of expectations that direct and prescribe staff members' activities. Furthermore, the official structure becomes elaborated and supplemented with informal patterns: work norms develop and persist, subordinates in one department are granted more discretion than in another, or warm and friendly relations rather than cool formality exist between administrative levels. (Vinter, 1959:380)

Role strain can also develop when the traditional non-authoritative approach of the social worker comes up against the exercise of authority and control in a rigidly structured bureaucracy. While the organization may have
need for increased administrative control, professional staff may resist.

While traditional health and welfare agencies take into account these needs of the social worker, it must be remembered that military organizations have different perspectives than these agencies and thus may not be as responsive. Self-determination runs counter to the tradition of discipline and obedience. Individualism runs counter to anonymity as found in the military. Autonomy runs counter to the military system of control. Self-determination runs counter to the military's prohibition against "quitting" if the service member becomes dissatisfied with the organization or job role. All of this means that the management of professionals in the contemporary military must take into account a number of factors which, in the past, the services did not have to address.

The Management of Professionals in Organizations

Within the military, professional social workers work in units which compare favorably with professional service organizations (PSO) in the civilian sector. PSOs possess characteristics which, if not recognized, can become the source of management headaches.

All PSOs have to rely on non-professional personnel in order to handle the day-to-day routine operations of the organization. Traditional management techniques that
work effectively with non-professionals may well not produce the same results with the professional staff.

Professionals normally hold positions and function in jobs that are highly enriched. This has a direct relationship to the high level of education which they possess. There are also high status needs and demands for higher earnings among professionals. As a consequence, the professionals normally possess a higher degree of power in the organization. With power often come problems of control of that power. Within any organization, including the military, this can lead to organization-professional conflict.

Certain psychological factors assume a major role in the structure of need satisfactions of professionals. If one considers Maslow's need hierarchy, self-esteem and self-actualization seem to be major motivators of professionals. Their enriched jobs have the following characteristics:

1. Variety in assigned tasks.
2. Employee autonomy and discretion in task performance.
3. Feedback with regard to performance.
4. Completion of a whole and identifiable piece of work that can be associated with the service rendered. (Fitzsimmons and Sullivan, 1982:222-228)
The actual services are provided, in most cases, by the professional staff and this provides them with their power base within the organization. The skills and expertise they possess cannot easily be replaced. This forms the basis for the professionalization process. Freidson (1973) defines it as follows:

...a process by which an organized occupation, usually but not always by virtue of making a claim to special esoteric competence, and to concern for the quality of its work and its benefits to society, obtains the exclusive right to perform a particular kind of work, control training for and access to it, and control the right of determining and evaluating the way the work is performed. (p. 22)

The power of professionals, then, stems from two sources. First, they tend to involve themselves in functions that are somewhat uncertain because of both the complicated nature of their knowledge base and the very nature of the activities which they undertake (Nilson, 1979). Second, the state or the organization provides some degree of legitimation by providing the profession with a legally exclusive right to the provision of the services themselves. The power to regulate itself and prohibit encroachment into its domain by other professional groups is also part of this process. (Freidson, 1970)

The policy-makers and managers of organizations which rely heavily on professionals for service delivery, regardless of whether the organization is military or
civilian, must learn how to keep the potential for professional-organizational conflict to a minimum.

The twentieth century has been a period of dynamic change for organizations in every field: business, government, military, educational, religious, and medical. (Reemzits, 1972:77)

When such changes occur, the requirements for the professionals also change. In this case there has been a shift in the working environment for many professionals. In the past the norm for professionals was the independent practice. What has been happening with increasing frequency is that professionals have brought their services to the structured organizations. This amalgamation did not occur without the expected adjustment reactions. "There is a necessary conflict between organizational and professional goals." (Elliott, 1972:99)

Professionals place a high degree of importance on their autonomy and without such autonomy would feel that their ability to function effectively in the organization would be greatly diminished. Organizations have a need to control the behaviors of their employees. Balancing these conflicting drives can be problematic. Some degree of professional autonomy needs to be tolerated.

At too low a level of autonomy the professionals become parochial 'company men'; at too high a level their autonomy threatens loyalty to the organization to the extent that the organization's survival is at stake. (Katz, 1968:167)
Others, however, do not perceive the conflict between the two as reaching crisis proportions automatically.

Such a conflict may be more imaginary than real if it is recognized that both bureaucratization and professionalism are alternative mechanisms of control. Through bureaucratization, the organization relies on task specification, routinization, and formalization of procedures to set limits on staff performance. Through professionalism, the organization relies on internalized professional standards and norms to set such limits. (Hasenfeld, 1983:163)

Given those opposing drives, the management style of the organization assumes as increasingly important role. In the military, as in the civilian sector, the old traditional autocratic style of management would seem to herald problems when attempting to deal with the professional employee. The management and policy levels must take into account the strong ego needs of professionals. High needs for such factors as achievement, responsibility, power, success, and material rewards also enter into the picture.

The manner in which the organization exercises its authority has a direct impact on the professionals input into the decision-making process. McGregor (1960) described the range of the exercise of authority.

At one end of the range the exercise of authority in the decision-making process is almost complete and participation is negligible. At the other end of the range the exercise of authority is relatively small and participation is maximum. (p. 126)
Rensis Likert addressed the same concept when he described management styles as four systems on a continuum:

1. the exploitative-authoritarian style
2. the benevolent-authoritarian style
3. the consultative style
4. the participatory style. (Likert, 1967:46)

Chris Argyris (1955) addressed the same issue:

Studies show that participative management tends to (1) increase the degree of 'we' feeling or cohesiveness that participants have with their organization; (2) provide the participants with an overall organizational point of view instead of the more traditional 'now' departmental point of view; (3) decrease the amount of conflict, hostility and cut-throat competition of participants; (4) increase individual's understanding of each other, which leads to increased tolerance and patience toward others; (5) increase the individual's free expression of his personality, which results in an employee who sticks with the organization because he (i.e., his personality) needs the gratifying experiences he finds while working there; and (6) develop a 'work climate' as a result of the other tendencies, in which the subordinates find opportunity to be more creative and to come up with the ideas beneficial to the organization. (p. 1-7)

All of this suggests that the professional social worker in the military organization would function best under a participatory style of management. This, however, is not the traditional way in which the military does things. The exploitative-authoritarian style has been the norm. In some instances the benevolent-authoritarian style
has been used. If the military, in this era of the shift to an occupational model, is going to obtain the maximum productiveness from professional personnel, then increasing awareness of and sensitivity to the work setting and the level of job satisfaction of the professional personnel will benefit both the individual and the organization.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE STUDY AND RELATED RESEARCH

The military, just as other organizations in recent years, has had to face the economic realities of budget constraints. The result has been the well-known solution of "more or less." The foreseeable future does not indicate any change in this policy approach. Emphasis on the job satisfaction of the military social work officer then, can tend to take on added importance in this economic environment. The various influences which affect job satisfaction, the morale and attitudes of the military social work officer need to be studied to determine what can be done to help accomplish "more for less."

Within the area of job satisfaction studies Sarata (1974) indicated that less than 20 scientific studies of job satisfaction within the human services occupations had been completed. Of these, the majority involved the nursing profession. Even fewer studies examining the job satisfaction of workers in the mental health field were found. Within this occupational category, the number of studies which examined the job satisfaction of military
social work officers was practically non-existent.

Studying the military social work officer as an occupational group brings with it some problems. One cannot merely transfer the findings of industry, where most of the job satisfaction studies have taken place, to those of the human service settings. Goals, policies, organizational structures, and the service delivered, to name a few, are different in the human services. When one adds the unique traditions, organizational structure, and mission of the military organization, a specialized entity emerges which may have qualities different from those of the manufacturing bureaucracy, or even the service oriented organizations in industry.

If the military organizational system is not responsive to the needs of the military social work officer, the quality of service will be limited and obstacles will be imposed in the process of attempting to achieve "more with less." In addition, mental health professionals often have been known to neglect their own work needs in the process of trying to meet the needs of their clients. Therefore, maximizing staff morale requires a greater understanding of the military social work officers' attitudes toward their work, and other personal and organizational factors that influence job satisfaction.

Nord (1977) discusses some common assumptions that often form the basis of our knowledge of job satisfaction.
He asserts that the influences of the prevailing social, political, and economic values in the nature of work have been overlooked. The individualistic potential of workers has been emphasized to the detriment of the cooperative aspect. Organizations, because of their scarce resources and the power struggles which take place over utilization of these resources, often foster competing interests and conflicts. Military organizations share in these job pressures. This may limit the degree to which any military organization is able to provide the milieu which provides optimum levels of job satisfaction for its members.

Nord (1977) then proceeds to discuss some of the weaknesses of previous studies of job satisfaction. (1) He feels we have limited ourselves to an incomplete and biased set of dependent variables, citing such traditional management goals as reducing turnover, increasing productivity, or overcoming resistance to change. (2) Studies have failed to recognize that organizations often lack the motivation to study ways to increase job satisfaction and may well be oriented to maintaining the status quo. (3) The quality of the product (or service) produced can often have a significant impact on the worker's job satisfaction, yet this often is not considered in studies. (4) More attention needs to be given to such basic satisfactions such as income, job security, supervisor-worker
relationships, and the like. (5) The importance of worker's feelings of power and control need to be addressed in relationship to job satisfaction. This study will attempt to take into consideration these and other sources of the job satisfaction of military social workers, specifically Air Force Social Work Officers.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

Examining some of the theories on human motivation will help develop the basic framework of this study and provide a better understanding of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

Abraham Maslow (1954) formulated a well-known theory of human motivation. He developed his theory based on the hierarchy of worker needs. Workers have levels of needs and, according to Maslow, only unsatisfied needs can motivate the worker to increase productivity. These needs, beginning with the basic ones, are: (1) physiological needs including hunger, thirst, sleep; (2) safety and security needs composed of protecting self and lifestyle; (3) needs for belongingness and love; (4) self-esteem needs including the need for self-approval and prestige; and (5) self-actualization needs which are composed of the needs to realize one's potentials. As the worker satisfies one level of these needs, another level comes to
the fore to again exercise control of the worker's life. In the normal situation, the worker is assumed to be in a condition of partial fulfillment of some needs and at the same time a corresponding partial unfulfillment of other needs exists. As the worker fulfills some of the self-esteem needs, for example, feelings such as self-confidence, adequacy, worth, and usefulness develop and lead to an increased level of productivity. Conversely, obstructing this level of need and the accompanying feelings produces the negative feelings of inferiority, lack of confidence, and uselessness. On the job these feelings can be the difference between the worker feeling satisfied or dissatisfied which, in turn, can have an impact on productivity and the quality of work produced.

There are some implications here for human service workers in general, and AFSWOs in particular. Research needs to determine just where in the need scale the military organization may have failed to meet the needs of the AFSWO. If very low pay and thus a low standard of living is, for example, a major concern, then attempting to increase self-actualizing opportunities on the job may prove unsuccessful since Maslow's theory argues that until the lower level needs are met, the higher order needs will not be motivators. Presumably then, the organizational needs of the Air Force will be better met if the AFSWOs lower
needs are met adequately so that the higher level needs can become dominant. The positive, growth-producing aspects of the therapy role can be effectively thwarted if the Air Force places unusual demands on the AFSWO to satisfy the organization's procedural needs to do things the "military way."

Frederick Herzberg (1966) formulated a two-factor motivation-hygiene theory. Stated simply, Herzberg contends that the factors which produce job satisfaction are separate and distinct from those which produce job dissatisfaction. This distinction is based on the assumption that man has two fundamental sets of needs: the need to avoid pain and the need to grow psychologically. He determined from his research that there are certain characteristics of the job situation that are consistently related to job satisfaction. These factors, intrinsic to the job itself, include such items as achievement, recognition, the nature of the work itself, responsibility, and advancement, and are known as motivators. Conversely, Herzberg postulated that factors which are more related to the work environment are more responsible for the avoidance of dissatisfaction. These hygiene factors, which are all extrinsic to the job itself, include such factors as company policy, administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status, and
job security. From his research Herzberg concluded that the absence of motivating factors leads to non-satisfaction which he considered to be distinct from dissatisfaction. The presence of hygiene factors leads to avoidance of dissatisfaction which is distinct from job satisfaction.

Herzberg's theory has been the source of considerable controversy. A number of authors have reviewed this theory and have conducted research reporting findings that conflict with those of Herzberg. (Burke, 1966; Carroll, 1969; Dunnette, Campbell, and Hakel, 1967; House and Wigdon, 1967; Porter, 1966). Smith and Cranny (1968) summarize the conflicting views when they indicate that Herzberg deserves credit for emphasizing the basic multidimensionality of satisfaction. The preponderance of recent evidence, however, is against his two-factor theory because it oversimplifies a complex reality. These authors adopt the traditional concept of satisfaction which assumes that the same job dimension is able to produce either job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The presence of both motivators and hygiene factors are able to contribute to employee satisfaction while the absence of these motivator and hygiene factors can lead to dissatisfaction. In general, they hold that high levels of the factor produce satisfaction whereas low levels produce dissatisfaction.

It can be hypothesized that rewards, either internal
to the person or externally provided by the organization, are what attract the person to the job. Thus, the degree to which the organization can meet the needs can produce either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. This could explain why some AFSWOs while involved in activities such as psychotherapy and consultation which would produce positive feelings, often do not because other organizational factors such as policies, procedures, and lack of peer and supervisory support, interfere with the worker feeling satisfied on the job.

McGregor (1960) developed a view of human motivation which sees man from two distinct perspectives. One is negative, Theory X, and the other is positive, Theory Y. Based on research conducted on the way in which managers interacted with their employees, he proposed that in Theory X, the typical human being has an inherent dislike for work, while in Theory Y the typical worker will willingly expend physical and mental effort at work in the same way that he/she does while engaged in other activities such as play or relaxation. The Theory X manager then feels that since workers tend to avoid work, workers have to be directed, coerced, controlled, and even threatened to get them to put forth the effort necessary to meet the organization's needs. The Theory Y manager, conversely, views employees as self-directed and self-controlled. Workers
will willingly commit themselves to make the effort necessary to achieve the organization's goals. In fact, they often use imaginative and creative means to achieve these ends. The perception of the employees which the manager brings to the managerial role affects the manner in which the employees are treated which, in turn, can directly affect employee satisfaction. McGregor's Theory X seems to correspond to Maslow's (1954) lower level needs for physiological and security needs whereas Theory Y seems more closely related to the self-esteem and self-actualization needs.

Victor Vroom's (1964) conception of motivation is based on the worker's psychological needs which influence the worker in choosing from different voluntary responses. He studied three variables: (1) the choices made by workers among their work roles; (2) the degree of satisfaction attained in the work role chosen; and (3) the level of performance in the work role chosen. He studied the effect of motivational variables on the worker's behavior in their work roles and the effects of the work roles on the motivational variables. He states that jobs which let the worker exercise responsibility and initiative allow that worker to use and develop these higher order needs. These job roles provide more ego satisfaction than those that thwart the worker's higher order needs and concentrate on
the organizational goals which may be more related to the lower level needs such as efficiency and procedure. Self-esteem is an important aspect of job satisfaction. Vroom suggests that because of these possible conflicts, the conditions which determine the worker's level of job satisfaction are not necessarily identical with those which determine the level of job performance. Some job conditions produce high satisfaction and low performance while other job conditions produce low satisfaction and high performance. Others produce high levels in both satisfaction and performance or, conversely, low satisfaction and low performance. Self-esteem seems to be an important ingredient in the worker's job satisfaction and performance.

These theories do not provide one conclusive model upon which to base research. They do, however, point out that thinking on job satisfaction must include the refinement which includes both the worker's internal needs as well as the external conditions of the job environment itself. While no one theory here is most appropriate for research in the human services field, consideration of the different aspects of these theories should allow the Air Force policy-makers to better determine just which aspects of the AFSWO's job and the organizational milieu influence job satisfaction.
JOB SATISFACTION RESEARCH

Over the years numerous studies on job satisfaction have been undertaken, yet no overall conclusive answers seem to have resulted. Our understanding of job satisfaction is still incomplete. Considerable confusion still exists as to whether job satisfaction results solely from the individual's attitudes, (the subjective element), from aspects of the job itself, (the objective component), or whether it results from some interaction between the worker and the job itself.

Another difficult issue here is the possible relationship between job satisfaction and job performance and productivity. Are they causally related? Brayfield and Crockett (1955) showed how the assumption that there was such a causal relationship formed the foundation for some of the early research. However, Locke (1970) pointed out the opposite:

There is no necessary relationship between overall job satisfaction and subsequent production. First, the fact that an individual likes his job says nothing about why he likes it. He may like it because the work interests him (despite his lack of ability) or because he likes his co-workers. In other words, high satisfaction may be caused by factors other than high production. (p. 495)

Just how these two factors are related certainly is not yet clear. They do seem, however, to have some relationship that is so complex in nature that it is not yet clearly
understood. The following research studies on job satisfaction are divided into two basic groupings: (1) those studying the characteristics of the individual, and (2) those studying the characteristics of the job itself.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Age

A number of studies indicate a general increase in the level of job satisfaction with increase in age. (Benge and Copell, 1947; Hoppock, 1960). Much empirical research has found that either a positive linear or a U-shaped curvilinear relationship exists between the age of employees and employees' levels of job satisfaction. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Copwell (1951) suggested as a result of their research that a U-shaped curvilinear relationship exists between age of workers and workers' levels of satisfaction. They based this conclusion on an extensive review of the literature and examination of the data involved. This applied to both managerial and blue-collar workers in the studies. Satisfaction appeared to be higher for younger employees immediately after employment began. After the first few years on the job, satisfaction dropped significantly, but then slowly rose again as the workers stayed with the job. They also found the same relationship between length of tenure and job satisfaction.
Gibson and Klein (1970) focused their research on the main relationship between age, tenure, and job satisfaction. They sampled blue-collar workers in two manufacturing firms. The results suggested the existence of a positive linear correlation between age and satisfaction, as well as satisfaction with such factors as pay, supervision, and a more positive view of co-workers. Klein (1969) found that in older workers the main predictors of overall job satisfaction were worker-manager and peer relationships. These relationships appeared not to be related to the job satisfaction of younger workers. Perceptions of job opportunities, and salary issues were more strongly correlated to the overall job satisfaction of younger workers.

Bernberg (1954) investigated age and satisfaction while controlling for tenure of service and supported the finding of a positive linear relationship between age and job satisfaction. He discovered that there were significant differences which were attributed to age when tenure was controlled. Bernberg provided no speculation as to "why" this relationship existed. Wild and Dawson (1972) also found a significant positive relationship between age and job satisfaction and also found this had an effect on attitudes toward pay, supervision, physical surroundings, and peer relations.

Other studies have reached somewhat different
conclusions about the relationship between age and the level of job satisfaction. Weaver (1974) for instance, found that there was no consistent pattern of association between the age of the worker and the level of job satisfaction.

In contradistinction to the U-shaped curvilinear relationship found by Herzberg, et al. (1957), Hulin and Smith (1964; 1965) expressed doubt about the U-shaped relationship. They concluded that the positive linear relationship they found was probably due to the individual's ability to better adjust their expectations to what the job milieu is able to provide. The closer the worker's expectations are to the actual return, the higher the level of satisfaction. Also, increased age may well be related to longer tenure and this may allow the individual to more accurately predict and then avoid the sources of frustration. This congruence of expectation with return, while assumed to be the cause, has yet to be proven, however.

Saleh and Otis (1964) also found a curvilinear relationship between age and job satisfaction. From their research they concluded that positive increments in job satisfaction occur up to the pre-retirement years and then the level of job satisfaction begins to decrease. They cite two possible explanations for this pattern. First, channels for continued self-actualization may become blocked by reduced future opportunities. Access within
the organization to such opportunities that could provide fulfillment for achievement, recognition, advancement, and skill growth needs could become blocked. Feelings of uselessness and alienation may result. Changes and problems with physical health, usually associated with aging, may also play a role. Second, job pressures, which the pre-retirement worker was able to previously manage, now cannot be handled so easily. Also, the older employee may be looking back to what appears to be the "good old days" and this may have an effect on how the older worker's responded to questions about their current level of job satisfaction.

Other authors have reached more mixed results. Laurence (1972) studied male officials in mid-management positions in different industrial/mining organizations. He found that when the conditions of employment, duties, and responsibilities were basically similar, differences in age did make a difference in attitudes and perceptions between older and younger workers about factors related to their jobs. The author suggests that factors associated with age, such as education and ambition, could have contributed to the results. He cautioned that there is no evidence to suggest that the workers "mellowed" as they aged. He suggests that the intolerance of the younger workers may have reflected their less tolerant views of
the activities of higher management. This also suggests that the perception of the organization changes as the worker moves up in the organizational structure.

Clearly, the literature shows that some type of relationship exists between age and level of satisfaction, but the precise nature of the relationship is not clear. This raises questions about the AFSWOs studied in this research. The relatively early "retirement" of military officers and their switching to new careers in the civilian sector may have an impact on the age-job satisfaction relationship different from those in some of the studies reviewed.

**Education**

Increasingly technical and complex societies and organizations, emphasis is being placed on the need for more highly educated persons in the work force. Education has often been associated with the age factor in studies. Some authors have found that the relationship between the educational level of workers and their level of job satisfaction is equivocal at best. (Saleh, 1954; Suehr, 1962; Vollmer and Kinney, 1955). Fournet, Distefano, and Pryer (1966) have suggested that the factor of education may well be confounded by age. Weaver (1974) found little important variation among reports of job satisfaction at different levels of education.
Others have found that the position within the organization has more impact on the worker's job satisfaction than does the educational level of the worker involved. O'Reilly and Roberts (1975) studied a sample of Navy officers and enlisted personnel in a high technology aviation unit. They did not intend to directly test individual differences as single predictors of job satisfaction, but were more interested in the differential relationships between individual and organizational variables with job satisfaction. Their results indicated that there was no strong relationship among job attitudes and the individual traits of the worker. There were, however, significant relationships between job attitudes and structural characteristics of the organization. Individual traits were shown to be strongly related to the organizational variables and not directly related to job satisfaction. They speculate that individual traits may predict the level of position attainment within the organization and that once in these positions, the characteristics of the position itself appear to determine the workers affective response to the job. Herman, Dunham, and Hulin (1975) reached a similar conclusion that the employee's frame of reference, which they conclude is formed by the immediate work setting, is the primary influence which acts on the workers perception of job satisfaction. Bergmann (1981) similarly con-
cluded that the hierarchical level of the employee had the most pervasive effect on job satisfaction, whether considered on its own or when considered in terms of the differential findings between the levels in individual characteristics such as education or age. Bergmann speculates that the education of higher level managers influences their attitudes toward other satisfaction variables. Being at the top changes their perspective. It is still, however, not clear whether getting to the top is the result of age, education, both, or neither.

Klein and Maher (1966) studied the relationship of educational level and satisfaction with pay. They hypothesized that the college educated workers would actually be less satisfied with their salaries than were the non-college educated workers. They theorized that satisfaction with pay is largely a function of expectation and that if the perceptions of pay possibilities were controlled, the differences between college and non-college educated workers would disappear. They found that higher levels of education were associated with relative dissatisfaction with pay. The major predictors for satisfaction with pay appeared to be the expectations of what salary the worker felt he would get internally as opposed to what he could get externally. The college-educated worker was more optimistic about the external opportunities, but less
optimistic about internal opportunities, when compared to the non-college educated worker. They caution that one should not be quick to assume that these findings indicate that higher levels of education lead to higher perceived self-worth which then relates to the study's findings.

Meinert (1975) studied some qualities of professions and related them to social workers and their job satisfaction. Professions are described as including the ability to meet community needs, occupational skills oriented to a body of knowledge, the sanction of the community to practice, autonomous decision-making, and adequate financial rewards. The author states that while social workers do not normally receive as high a monetary reward as other professionals, it is assumed that they derive at least symbolic satisfaction from their professional roles and activities. The author sampled members (N = 305) of the St. Louis Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW). The social workers were categorized into two groups. First, the highly professionally anchored social worker (HPASW) had a master's degree in social work, was accredited by the Academy of Certified Social Workers (ACSW), earned salaries above the median for social workers with comparable years of experience, and engaged in autonomous, non-supervised practice. Low professionally anchored social workers (LPASW) did not
possess these characteristics. The author hypothesized that HPASWs, because of their high anchorage to features associated with professions, would display high satisfaction scores and LPASWs, low scores. The author states both hypotheses were statistically accepted, but provided no actual corroborating data.

One can assume that the advanced degree possessed by the HPASWs had some impact on their perceptions of their professional status and corresponding satisfaction scores. The previous literature review indicates that educational level has a questionable, if not actual negative relationship to job satisfaction in most studies. At the current time, the AF Social Work program has a very high percentage of social workers with a Master's degree (approximately 85%) and a much smaller percentage of social workers with a doctoral degree (approximately 15%). In the AF system, the doctoral degree opens up opportunities not usually available to masters degree social workers such as director of alcohol rehabilitation programs, assignments of a highly sensitive nature, or staff positions attached to the Surgeon Generals office. The AFSWO with a doctoral degree, at present, also has less of an opportunity to receive the less desirable assignments. Consequently, this issue needs to be studied to see if having a doctoral degree is associated with increased level of satisfaction due to the
improved opportunities, or if it actually produces lower satisfaction levels because of such factors as increased expectations of the AFSWO not being met by the authoritative bureaucracy of the military system.

Marital Status

There are comparatively few studies which examine the influence of marital status on the relationship between specific job attitudes and overall job satisfaction. Wild and Dawson (1972) studied 2543 female workers in the United Kingdom and data on age, marital status, and length of service were correlated to features of the job such as the work itself, supervision, training, wages, peer relationships, management and the physical conditions of the job itself. They found that both age and marital status had significant effects on the relationship between job attitudes and job satisfaction. They affect the relationship of such variables as pay, supervision, physical working conditions, and social peer relationships with job satisfaction. In another study, Herman, Dunham, and Hulin (1975) found that workers with similar demographic variables in their backgrounds tended to perceive different aspects of their jobs in similar fashion. But, in their study, marital status did not directly affect job satisfaction.
However, other studies seemed to find a more conclusive relationship. Fanshel (1976) used NASW membership data to examine the employment patterns of male and female social workers. He studied the types of employment, marital status, and salary differences. In references to marital status, he found that administrative positions were more often held by married men than married women, and that this same relationship held for men even when compared to single women with no family responsibilities. In general, males also earned more money and dominated the administrative positions.

Tropman (1968) addressed the issue of marital status directly, but only studied married female social workers who had children and who worked in Cook County, Illinois. No male comparison group was used. He was primarily interested in whether the married status of these women was in any way related to feelings of role conflict. He suggested that the women studied experienced relatively little role conflict and that 65% stated they experienced no such conflict. He suggests that these women may have had a service orientation to their professional role, rather than a purely intellectual orientation. He feels that for the service oriented female social worker "there may be a greater degree of 'role substitutability' between the wife and mother role and the work role than is the
case for the intellectually oriented woman." (p. 665)
Additionally, he points out that this may be the case because the service oriented female is carrying out at work the more traditional roles assigned to women in our culture. This is not the case for the intellectually oriented female who may find family and career to be at odds. Instead of the coalescence of home and work roles, the author suggests this woman may seek from work a different set of satisfactions than those fulfilled at home. The boundaries between the two roles may be less permeable and conflict may result. This has importance in examining the marital status of females in the predominantly male AF military organization and attempting to determine if married female AFSWOS have different attitudes toward aspects of their jobs and job satisfaction in general than do their unmarried counterparts.

Gender

In and of itself, gender does not seem to be directly related to either high or low levels of job satisfaction. But many researchers have looked at the gender issue as related to an overall pattern of factors that do have an impact on job satisfaction levels. The constellation of factors which are related to gender include such items as job level, opportunities for promo-
In many ways the findings of previous research are equivocal, if not contradictory. Peck (1936) concluded that female teachers were not as well adjusted as male teachers, but Chase (1951) found women teachers to be more satisfied than their male counterparts. Cole (1940) found women to be less satisfied with their jobs while Benge (1944) and Stockford and Kunze (1950) found women to be more satisfied.

Generally, it could be expected that women would display lower levels of job satisfaction than men because of the generally lower levels of the jobs females hold, their lower pay, and reduced promotional opportunities. There is also the question of the traditional roles which society assigns to both males and females. Men in the military are fulfilling a role society expects of them. Women in these same positions are filling a less familiar role. Gender, then, can be related to the pattern of role stresses experienced by males and females in the same job positions which in turn can affect the respective levels of job satisfaction.

Hulin and Smith (1964), studied data from four industrial plants and found that female workers tended to be less satisfied with their jobs than were males. The authors suggest that gender per se is probably not the
crucial factor, but the constellation of gender related factors such as pay, job level, and promotion opportunities may well account for the differences. They do suggest that if the gender related items are controlled, there may not be significant differences in job satisfaction.

Saleh and Hyde (1969) addressed the same gender issue when they studied the intrinsic and extrinsic orientations of 600 workers. They based their study on the work of Herzberg (1966), Maslow (1954), and McGregor (1960) who emphasized the importance of intrinsic factors in contributing to worker job satisfaction. Intrinsic components refer to job content factors such as achievement, responsibility, and skill growth. Extrinsic components refer to job factors such as working conditions, salary, job security, and peer relationships. The authors contend that an orientation to one or the other relates to the fulfillment of a different set of needs. Intrinsic orientation relates to needs for growth and self-actualization and extrinsic orientation to the physiological and security needs. The authors contend that all individuals will seek to fulfill the highest level needs that motivate them. While some will be motivated to fulfill higher order needs, others, because of situational variables, will be forced to concentrate on lower order needs. They hypothesized that those who are intrinsically oriented will show higher
levels of job satisfaction than those who are extrinsically oriented. Their results supported the hypothesis. Overall, the dominant orientation for men was intrinsic while that for women was extrinsic. It seems probable that women, who often fill lower level positions, had less intrinsic stimulation on the job whereas men who usually held the higher level positions had more intrinsic stimulation on the job and that this led to the different results.

This result would be in keeping with the findings of researchers such as Fanshel (1976) who studied NASW membership of male and female social workers and found that men dominated the administrative positions and earned higher salaries.

Kravetz (1976) studied sexism factors in social work. He found that men exerted the greatest influence in areas of social work most consistent with traditional male roles such as community organization and social work administration, whereas women stayed in casework positions which are often more closely associated with traditional female roles. Female social workers, experiencing conflicts because of family and job roles, were often penalized in areas of both salary and career advancement. Male social workers were over-represented in social work education programs with 55% of full-time faculty, 63% of full and associate professorships, and 88% of deanships of
accredited graduate schools of social work being held by males.

When Tropmann (1968) studied married professional female social workers, those who had been promoted to high-level administrative positions sometimes experienced psychological conflicts between job and wife/mother roles that were severe enough to cause them to abandon their careers. The author speculates that this could be the case because these women found it easier to give up their work roles in their conflict situations than it would be to give up the roles of wife and/or mother. Women who are career oriented often avoid marriage and/or child-rearing. In both cases, these women pay a high price for their decision. Chafetz (1972) addresses the same gender issues and the obstacles faced by female social workers in the career structure and concludes that the professionalization of social work in effect "defeminized" it, making it more intellectual, rational, scientific, and administrative. In general, the author contends that professionalization gave social work more "male" qualities allowing males to dominate it.

Jayaratne and Chess (1982), studied a national sample of social workers (N = 541). Variables in their study included workload, comfort, challenge, financial rewards, promotional opportunities, role conflict and role
ambiguity. Emphasis was placed on gender differences. They found that male and female social workers appear to have different frames of reference when evaluating their jobs, although in absolute terms they expressed generally similar degrees of satisfaction on the job. Female social workers were significantly less satisfied with job comfort, financial rewards, and workload than their male counterparts. The two best predictors of job satisfaction for male social workers were job challenge and financial rewards whereas for female social workers they were job challenge and promotional opportunities. Marital status emerged as a significant predictor of job satisfaction for females, but not for males. The authors suggest that in future research, the existence of different frames of reference among males and females be considered when studying job satisfaction.

Job Level

The extensive body of literature available on job satisfaction has usually identified the determinants of job satisfaction as either the worker's individual characteristics or the organization's structural characteristics. But, since organizations are human systems, the interaction of people filling positions in the organization can interact to have an influence on the perception of job satisfaction.
Within that frame of reference, researchers found that people in similar positions in the organization perceived their task experiences in similar ways. (Herman, Dunham and Hulin, 1975) These same authors found from their research that employees who held similar positions in the organizational structure reported similar levels of satisfaction with such factors as pay, work itself, and supervision. This seems to suggest that each level of the organization provides different types of experiences and that this differential pattern is distributed across the organization. From their research they concluded that factors related to the structural characteristics of the organization and the employee's position in the organization are more highly related to the employee's occupational perceptions that are the employee's individual characteristics such as age or education. They suggest that the primary frame of reference the employee uses to evaluate the job experience is the immediate work setting and that this is related to the employee's apparent ability and willingness to adapt to different work environments in different levels of the organization. Herman and Hulin (1972) and O'Reilly and Roberts (1975) reached similar conclusions in their research.

Bergmann's study (1981) which investigated both individual and structural characteristics as related to
job satisfaction provided evidence that the hierarchical level had the most pervasive effect on job satisfaction, whether by itself, or when considered in terms of differential findings between levels on individual characteristics such as age or education. He also found that higher order needs such as personal progress and development rather than lower order needs such as pay or supervision were the strongest predictors of overall satisfaction. He also noted that top-level managers frequently appear to be more satisfied than their middle and lower level counterparts. He does suggest, however, that this may be due to the different perceptions which managers have from their organizational perspective and the fact that, due to their age and education, they may feel more of their higher order needs are being met than do their younger, less educated counterparts.

Generally research has shown that job satisfaction increases as job level progresses. (Gurin, Veroff, and Feld, 1960) Porter (1962) reported that those in lower management positions were more dissatisfied than managers in top level positions. He suggested that this might be due to the greater ego satisfaction, higher pay, status, self-direction, and increased responsibility and authority inherent in the top level positions. Porter (1963) also noted that when management level was taken into account,
there was no simple relation between size of the organization and job satisfaction whereas the size of the organization had little apparent effect on the relation between organization level and satisfaction: higher level managers perceive greater need satisfaction from their jobs than do lower level managers, regardless of the size of the organization.

The types of needs which are fulfilled at different levels have an influence on the workers evaluation of the job. Higher level managers seem generally more satisfied with their jobs. Cummings and El Salmi (1970) reported that need fulfillment deficiencies tended to increase at successively lower levels in the management hierarchy with the largest perceived deficiencies being found in the higher order needs such as autonomy and self-actualization. Porter and Henry (1964) had previously found that at each higher level of management employees placed increasing emphasis on inner-directed as opposed to outer-directed traits of the employee. These inner-directed traits would correspond to the higher order needs reviewed in some of the previously mentioned research.

Saleh and Hyde (1969), in a previously noted study, had examined job satisfaction and its relationship to intrinsic or extrinsic orientation on the part of the employee. Their results supported the hypothesis that
intrinsically oriented employees would show higher levels of job satisfaction than extrinsically oriented employees. It appears that higher level jobs tend to fulfill more higher order needs which in turn allows the higher level employee to experience higher levels of job satisfaction. Among AFSWOS, it should follow that higher ranking AFSWOS should express more job satisfaction because of the previously mentioned factors.

**Length of Service (Tenure)**

In studying the factors which influence the income expectations of workers, Ganguli (1957) found income was the most important aspect of the job relating to satisfaction and that in this study a substantial number of workers were actually dissatisfied with their pay. He found that in reference to aspirations, the dissatisfied workers displayed a pattern in which the more they earned, the more they wanted to make. But another important factor, tenure, was influencing the satisfaction level of workers. The author found that expectations in reference to income increased with the length of tenure. Also, he found that the worker's age was less a determinant of level of income aspiration than was tenure. Admittedly, it is difficult at times to separate the effects of increase of age from those of tenure on the job since both increase simultaneously.
Wild and Dawson (1972) studied the influence of a number of biographical variables in reference to the overall job satisfaction of some female workers. They found that both age and marital status had significant effects on the relationship to job satisfaction. They also found that with increasing length of service the relationship between job satisfaction and attitudes toward self-actualization, training, physical effort, and work conditions decreased while the relationship with attitudes toward pay increased. In a later study, Carnall and Wild (1974) extended the results of the previous study to both male and female workers and found basically the same results, namely, that age, marital status, and tenure had significant effects on the importance of many job attitudes in reference to overall job satisfaction.

In previously discussed research, a number of authors studied the effects of tenure, as well as other variables, on job satisfaction. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) reviewed the literature available and found that the relationship between tenure and satisfaction was U-shaped. Hulin and Smith (1964) found that tenure and age had distinct effects on job satisfaction. They suggested that this may be the result of the individual's ability to adjust his/her expectations to that which the work setting is probably able to provide. In effect, employees can adjust to basically undesirable work.
conditions by lowering their expectations of what the environment will provide. They also suggest that employees may start at a low level of satisfaction and then proceed to a neutral state. Saleh and Otis (1964) found positive increments in satisfaction up to the pre-retirement years, at which point the level of satisfaction began to decrease. They give two possible reasons for this effect. First, channels by which self-actualization needs could previously be met were now blocked. Second, mounting job pressures were more difficult to cope with than they were in previous years.

Gibson and Klein (1970) focused their study on the main relationships of tenure and age in reference to job satisfaction. They found a positive linear relationship between age and job satisfaction, but negative linear relationship between tenure and satisfaction. They offer some speculations about why tenure is negatively related to job satisfaction. It is possible that as people begin their careers, they may have high expectations of what the organization will provide. In the early period of the career feelings remain basically positive, but then the realization sets in that the job environment and organization probably will not be able to fulfill their original expectations and dissatisfaction begins to occur. There may also be an acculturation process which occurs when people with positive attitudes come to an environment that
has a "we/they" culture between management and non-
management (or possibly middle vs. upper-level management). 
Finally, they suggest that as people remain in the organ-
ization over a period of years, they see peers pass them 
in the promotion system and perceptions of favoritism or 
unfairness may result. 

AFSWOs may well display some of these same pat-
terns. But some organizational factors in the AF may 
produce different results. The pattern described by Saleh 
and Otis (1964) may or may not hold with AFSWOs. While 
their study examined pre-retirement which really was 
associated with the end of the total working career, many 
AFSWOs, because of the current military retirement system, 
are able to "retire" at ages from the early 40's to 50's 
and thereby actually take up a new career in the civilian 
sector. There certainly is concern about the fairness of 
the officer promotion system in the AF and pass-overs for 
promotion are not unusual. They may help to provide 
satisfaction patterns among AFSWOs that are similar to the 
results found by Gibson and Klein (1970). Also, the 
military's ability to meet the needs of the younger AFSWOs 
may not meet the AFSWOs own expectations. However, as one 
acculturates to the system, gets promoted, assumes more 
responsibility, and gains authority, the U-shaped pattern 
of Herzbert et al. (1951) may be found.
Locus of Control

Social learning theory (Rotter, 1960) has provided the general theoretical background for this factor. In general, it holds that a reinforcement acts to strengthen the expectancy that a particular behavior or event will be followed by that reinforcement in the future. Once built up, failure of the reinforcement to occur reduces and extinguishes the expectancy. When the reinforcement is seen as not contingent upon the subject's own behavior, its occurrence will not increase the expectancy as much as when it is seen as contingent. Conversely, its non-occurrence will not reduce an expectancy as much as when it is seen as contingent. McClelland (1961) suggested that people who are high in the need for achievement in all probability will have some belief that their own ability or skill helped determine the outcome of events. Phares (1962) found that subjects who had an internal orientation and who feel that they have some control of their situation were more likely to exhibit perceptual behavior that better enabled them to cope with potentially threatening situations than subjects who feel that chance or other non-controllable forces determine the outcome of their efforts.

Rotter (1966) studied the effects of rewards as reinforcement on preceding behavior depends in part on whether the person perceives the reward as contingent on
his/her own behavior or as independent of it. Persons may also differ in their generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. An event regarded by some persons as a reward or reinforcement may be perceived differently by others. One of the determinants of this response is the degree to which a person feels that the reward follows from, or is contingent upon, his/her own behavior versus the degree to which he/she feels the reward is controlled by forces outside himself/herself and could occur independently of his/her own actions. This forms the distinction between Rotter's concepts of external control and internal control.

Those at the internal end of the scale have been found to show more overt strivings for achievement than those who felt little control over their environment. Internally oriented people, if they perceive that it is to their advantage to conform, may do so consciously and willingly without yielding any sense of control. It is only where it might be clearly to their disadvantage that they would resist conformity pressures. In general he concludes that people who have a strong belief that they can control their own destiny are likely to (a) be more alert to those aspects of the environment which provide useful information for future behavior; (b) takes steps to improve the environmental condition; (c) place greater value on skill or achievement reinforcements and be
generally more concerned with their abilities and failures; and (d) be resistive to subtle attempts to influence them.

Sims and Szilagyi (1976) investigated the question of how characteristics of the individual moderated the relationship between perceptions of job characteristics and employee expectancies, satisfaction, and performance. They studied how the effect of higher order needs, locus of control, and occupational level moderated these relationships. While higher order needs and job level were significant moderators of job characteristic relationships, locus of control was found to have no moderating effect on these relationships.

The AF, being a highly bureaucratic organization which uses numerous regulations to structure the effective functioning of the various parts of the organization, would seem to better meet the needs of externally oriented persons. Persons with a strong internal orientation could possibly have difficulties dealing with the external controls and thereby react with lower levels of job satisfaction in early years, but with higher levels in later career years as the person adapts to the military organization and learns how to effectively manipulate the organization to meet their own individual needs.
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE JOB

Supervision

At first thought, the assumption could be made that the worker would derive some satisfaction or dissatisfaction on the job as a result of the interaction with the supervisor. Such an assumption, however, is not supported by the data from research studies. In general, no significant relationships have been discovered between the supervisory behavior and the worker's level of job satisfaction. (Nealy and Blood, 1968; Zander and Quinn, 1962; Pelz, 1952)

In one study Kermish and Kushin (1979) a problem of high turnover in a county welfare department was examined. Employees who left the agency were asked to state in writing the reasons for doing so. Reasons people gave for accepting the job in the first place were humanitarian considerations, a desire to acquire skills in working with people in need, and financial needs. Reasons cited for leaving the agency in order of frequency were overwhelming job demands, poor morale in the agency, inability to help clients adequately, poor supervision, low level of support from the administration, and little opportunity to be creative and use initiative.
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Organizational Size

There are numerous elements of the organizational structure that can have an impact on an employee's attitudes and the perception of job satisfaction levels. Factors such as communication, job differentiation, span of control, and coordination have been examined in other research. The primary emphasis of the research reviewed here will be on the size of the total organization and the organizational subunit.

Much of the research on organization size has concentrated on attempting to determine the optimum size of subunits in organizations that lead to the best levels of job satisfaction. These studies generally reach a similar conclusion, namely, that smaller work units seem to be associated with higher morale and greater job satisfaction. Worthy (1950) found that size was definitely one of the more important factors related to the employee's perceptions about the job. Smaller work units were associated with higher morale and larger work units were associated with lower morale. Viteles (1953) concluded that smaller sized work groups produced better attitudes among workers. A similar conclusion was reached by Strauss and Sayles (1960).

Porter (1963) studied the size of the company as related to the employee's need fulfillment and found that
at lower levels of management the managers in smaller companies were more satisfied than the managers of large companies. However, at higher levels of management, managers in large companies were more satisfied than their counterparts in smaller companies. Porter suggests that there may be an interaction effect of job level in the size of the organization in relation to the employee's attitudes. He speculates that workers at the bottom of large organizations have a much larger organization superstructure and more people above them than do similar workers in a smaller company. In effect, there are more bosses above the worker in the larger company and the worker has less influence within the organization than does the worker in the smaller company. On the other hand, a high level manager in a larger organization controls more people than a similar manager in a smaller organization and thus has more influence on the work environment. He further suggests that there may be a dividing line somewhere in the middle management area where the advantages offered by larger organizations begin to outweigh the obvious disadvantages and that greater material, financial, and personnel responsibility rewards of the larger organization may provide higher levels of satisfaction.

Talacchi (1960) studied the impact of organizational size upon the level of employee satisfaction. In
general, the results indicated that the size of the organization, mediated by division of labor and status differentiations, did have a significant effect on the employees' level of job satisfaction. He found that the larger the organization, the lower the level of satisfaction. He speculates that individuals with higher morale may for some reason prefer to go to smaller organizations while individuals with lower morale may prefer to go to larger organizations. Possibly, as subunit size increases, it is possible that it becomes more difficult to maintain high cohesiveness and good communications. Task specialization may also be more prevalent. All of these may lead to higher levels of dissatisfaction. Total organizational size also may have an effect on the attitudes of workers. Larger subunits may have disadvantages in large organizations, but it could also have advantages as long as the subunits within the larger organizations are kept relatively small. They suggest that the subunit/total organization distinction must be kept in mind due to the possibility that the effects of one may be confounded by the effects of the other.

Peer Support

There are other sources of satisfaction on the job than merely those related to aspects of the job itself.
The social aspect of the job environment has been studied. Macoby (1975) noted that such factors as union activities and social relationships can provide some of the satisfaction for many employees. The work group provides a source of identification, a way to fulfill interpersonal and friendship needs and thus leads to increased levels of job satisfaction. (Zalesznik, Christenson, and Roethlisberger, 1958)

Cobb (1975) focused his work on the role of the social support system on the job. He breaks down the concept of social support into three basic categories. First, there is information which leads the person to believe that he/she is cared for and loved. This is transmitted in intimate situations which involve mutual trust. Second, there is information which leads the person to believe that he/she is esteemed and valued. This is most effectively proclaimed in public and leads the individual to esteem himself/herself and reaffirm the sense of personal worth. Third, there is information which leads the person to believe that he/she belongs to a network of communication and mutual obligation. This is a common and shared phenomenon in which everyone in the network is aware that every other member also knows it.

Cobb believes that this type of social support helps the person to cope with the exigencies of daily living. Since such social support is part of the person's
developmental milieu, one should not expect to see a direct impact from it. However, it does influence the person in an indirect manner by moderating the impact of significant events in the person's life pattern. There is no reason to perceive of such social support as a panacea, but social support is an important element in the person's overall functioning and could well be one of the important factors that influence the employee's overall perception of satisfaction with the job.

In this dissertation, Cobb's concept of social support will form the basis for this author's concept of professional isolation. Since many AFSWOS practice in either geographically isolated situations, or in assignments where the AFSWO is the only professional social worker/mental health professional on the base, a lack of professional peer support, (professional isolation) may prove to be a factor which negatively impacts on the AFSWOS overall perception of job satisfaction.

Wasserman (1971) studied professional social workers in a bureaucracy and noted that one of the complaints that was voiced was the lack of group meetings with supervisors to discuss case problems. Apparently, they felt there were sufficient meetings to discuss administrative policies and procedures. The social workers studied generally felt that their supervisors were not competent
or helpful. The author concluded that the bureaucratic system stimulated and reinforced a type of defensive behavior among the professional social workers instead of a more positive coping behavior. This indirect lack of administrative and agency support kept the workers off-balance. As caseloads, rules, regulations, and procedures frequently changed, the workers experienced increasing instability and insecurity on the job. Wasserman stresses a need for informal groups in the work setting of such bureaucracies. Such groups serve two supportive functions: (1) they become the focal point for expressing complaints about the organization, and (2) they form one of the most important social systems for providing emotional support for workers and a sense of mutuality among them.

Maslach (1976) has found that workers are prone to less burnout if they actually express, analyze, and share their personal feelings with their colleagues. They not only get things off their chest, they can also receive constructive feedback from others who understand and are then able to develop new perspectives and understandings about their relationship with their clients. The results of this study also add the element of bureaucratic support to the concept of professional isolation to be studied later.
Job Security

Job security among AFSWOs is a concern of some significance. In all branches of the military in the United States, the "up or out" policy is in force for officers. This policy demands that, in most cases, if an officer is not promoted at the various selected year points in the career, another opportunity is offered during the next chronological year. If promotion is still denied, the officer is usually required to leave the service. Thus, regardless of the individual officer's desire to remain in the service, the decisions of other unknown officers on promotion boards holds an important key to job satisfaction. To an important degree, then, many officers feel their promotability is in the hands of forces outside of their control. This concern over job security, even though it comes to the fore only at selected year points in a career, (i.e. years 4, 11, 15), still carries with it concerns for long-term job security as each one of the year points is successfully passed. The impact this system could have on job satisfaction is evident.

Research has demonstrated that worrying about one's job security does have an effect on job satisfaction. Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960) showed that dissatisfied workers show a disproportionate concern for their job security. In another study, Mann and Williams (1962)
examined the attitudes of employees in an organization which had just implemented a new data processing system. The effects of introducing this new system included a tightening of task structure in the office, increased risk for individual jobs, an emphasis on understanding the overall system, and a greater need for interaction among the workers. The authors found that while the employees felt more satisfied because they had more job responsibility, an increased opportunity to learn new things, and more task variety, they also felt less satisfied with their jobs as a whole and expressed increased concern that the computerized process was placing their jobs at risk.

Altimus and Tersine (1973) investigated the job satisfaction of young blue collar workers and, considering intrinsic job variables including job security, esteem, autonomy, self-actualization, and total satisfaction, found that the youngest workers were significantly less satisfied than the older workers in only one of the areas, job security.

On the other hand, O'Reilly and Roberts (1975), in their study of U.S. Navy officers and enlisted personnel, examined individual traits and structural job characteristics as related to job satisfaction. Among the individual traits studied were ability, personality traits, and motivational traits. Among the motivational traits were
occupational status, self-actualization, power over others, high financial reward, and job security. Their results indicated that there was no strong relationship among the job attitudes and the individual traits, including job security. Since the individual traits were, however, shown to be strongly related to organizational variables while unrelated to job satisfaction, the authors suggest that individual traits may predict the attainment of organizational position and it is the structural characteristics of the position once it is attained that may well determine the worker's affective response to the job itself.

Skills and Training

A work environment which allows the optimal development and use of skills and training has been shown to be related to increased levels of job satisfaction. (Argyris, 1960) Kermish and Kushin (1969), in their study of county welfare personnel, found that one of the reasons cited for leaving the agency was that in-service training was unsatisfactory and that a majority who left would have considered staying on the job if there had been some changes in the agency's policies and environment. Employees also cited the lack of opportunity to use their own creativity and initiative as one of their major complaints.

Wasserman (1979) also studied new social workers
in a public agency and noted that the organizational characteristics of the agency tended to have more impact on decision-making in reference to clients than the actual skills and knowledge of the social workers. He examined the extent to which the professional practice of social work was determined by the knowledge and skills of the social worker and to what extent it was determined by structural constraints of the organization, thereby reducing the professional impact of these workers in their role with their clients. He states that at least half of those in the study felt frustrated by these organizational constraints which did not allow them to employ their knowledge and skills. The author concluded that the knowledge and skills acquired during their professional education often were insufficient to meet the demands imposed by the organizational constraints.

Steinman, Welch, and Comer (1978) state that there is general agreement in the literature on public welfare agency personnel regarding the inadequacy of their professional preparation. The professional status given to social work often implies the possession of rather sophisticated expertise, impartial inclination to apply that expertise to cases, and the commitment to service. But professional training is not always adequate and as such can have a negative influence on the social workers.
capacities to do the job as well as the desire to do so.

Meinert's (1975) study of the professional satisfaction of social workers examined their anchorage to the profession. High professionally anchored social workers (HPASWs) who had advanced education (Master's Degree in Social Work) and ACSW accreditation were found to have higher satisfaction levels than the low professionally anchored social workers (LPASWs) who did not possess commensurate academic and professional credentials.

Maslach (1978) states that research with 200 professionals at work made it clear that social service professionals need to have special training and preparation for working closely with people. While certain technical skills may be well developed, the ability to handle the intense, continual interactions with clients, which often are highly emotionally charged, often is not very well developed and ultimately has a negative effect on the worker's functioning on the job.

Income

There has been much popular opinion expressed that income is a primary motivator of employees and seemingly compensates for other deficiencies in the worker's job environment. Research has not borne out that opinion. Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) found that
pay was not the primary concern of employees. Job security was the first concern.

The income factor has been associated with level of education in some studies. Meinert (1975) stated that in relation to monetary rewards, professionals are usually compensated at generous levels. However, in some occupational groups such as social work, the level of income has not been commensurate with other professional groups. The author suggests that the belief is common that social workers probably derive at least some amount of compensatory symbolic gratification from their professional roles and activities. The results of his study indicated that while social workers are satisfied to a relatively high degree with their career choice, job performance, and role in the organization, they are only moderately satisfied with their level of income and relatively dissatisfied with the symbolic recognition by society and other professions. These results appear to indicate that the popular view of the compensatory role of the social work value system does not always serve to moderate the professional social workers aspirations for adequate financial reward.

Klein and Maher (1966) hypothesized in their study that higher education levels would result in lower levels of satisfaction with salary level. Their results supported the hypothesis. First level managers who had a college
level education were less satisfied with their pay than were their less well-educated peers. They found that the major predictors for satisfaction with pay were the expectations of what the salary level would probably be in the organization as opposed to what salary could be commanded outside the organization. The higher educated managers were more optimistic about the external possibilities and less optimistic about the possibilities internally. The authors do not speculate on whether the aspirations are well-founded or if they could be part of a "grass is greener" syndrome. Ganguli (1957) in his study found a corroborating result when he concluded that for dissatisfied employees the present income level served as a frame of reference by which aspirations were set so that it was generally true among the workers he studied that the more money they earned, the more they wanted. He also found a positive correlation between the level of education and the level of income the worker aspired to have. The more educated the employee, the higher the aspiration.

Gender has been found to be related to the level of income and subsequent satisfaction with the job. It comes as no surprise that males, who hold the majority of administrative level positions in the social work profession, generally earn higher levels of income than the professional female social workers. (Fanshel, 1976)
Voydanoff (1980) analyzed the relationship between perceived intrinsic and extrinsic job characteristics and overall job satisfaction. The author found some results with gender implications. One of the major differences found between male and female workers was that women placed greater emphasis on financial perception of role strain while men placed more emphasis on financial rewards and promotion. The author suggests that this result is probably related to the fact that in most organizations women are concentrated in the subordinate positions in the organizational structure while men occupy the higher level positions for which good income and promotion are more important factors.

Jayaratne and Chess (1982) concluded from their study of social workers that male and female social workers may have different frames of reference when they evaluate their jobs. They found that while both genders expressed similar overall job satisfaction levels, females were significantly less satisfied with job comfort, financial rewards, and workload than the males. While job challenge was a good predictor of job satisfaction for both males and females, financial rewards was more a predictor for males and promotional opportunities for females.

Stockford and Kunze (1950) found a similar pattern. They concluded that men showed more sensitivity to money issues than women did. They speculated that this could
have been due to the traditional male role as primary income producer whereas women often provided the secondary source of family income. They also found that the adjustments an individual makes to a job are affected by the starting wage. The wage rate helps form the initial mental set about the organization and impacts on consequent attitude formation. If dissatisfied with wages in the early period of a job, this negative attitude often lasts long past the time when the worker's wages exceed anything earned before.

The implications of these findings are of interest when studying AFSWOs. There are no differences in pay based on gender in the military. Pay is directly related to the rank of the individual so that all members in a specific rank, male and female, receive the same pay. Conceivably female AFSWOs should not express any significantly different level of satisfaction with pay when compared with their male counterparts. In reference to the impact of educational level the question is also of interest. In many settings, additional education level produces increased income, but in the military people of different educational levels often are in the same rank. Will this produce dissatisfaction for those with higher educational levels?
Geographic Location

Numerous aspects of the job have been studied in relationship to job satisfaction. Geographical location of the job is not one of them. This factor is of more importance in the military setting than it would be for the traditional setting in which most social work in the civilian sector takes place. Most civilian social work is practiced in metropolitan areas in the United States. The same is not true in the Air Force. There are numerous Air Force bases located in geographically less populated areas in the United States. Additionally, the overseas assignments are often located in geographically isolated settings and in cultures with which the AFSWO may not be familiar. The impact of this geographical variable, then, takes on importance in studying the job satisfaction of AFSWOs.

Studies on the characteristics of the community on job satisfaction are scarce. Vaydanoff (1980) examined the impact of extrinsic factors on the level of job satisfaction. The study used the distinction made by Herzberg, Hausner, Peterson, and Capwell (1957) between extrinsic and intrinsic characteristics of the job. But these studies conceived of extrinsic factors as primarily those of the immediate work environment, not the overall geographical environment.
Katzell, Barrett, and Parker (1961) and Cureton and Katzell (1962) studied the possible use of community characteristics as moderator variables which would moderate the direction and strength of the relationship between job satisfaction and some of the other variables such as job performance, absences, and turnover. The data generally indicated that average satisfaction scores and group productivity were unrelated. There were actually negative relationships between satisfaction, productivity, and such community variables as city size. Satisfaction scores turned out to be negatively related to the prosperity of the community. Satisfaction with pay tended to be more negatively related to the prosperity of the community than did the other aspects of job satisfaction.

Hulin (1966) studied the effects of community characteristics on job satisfaction and concluded that there are generally significant and often sizable correlations between job satisfaction and economic community characteristics. He concludes that this appears to be evidence that job satisfaction is a product of the discrepancies between expectations and actual experience on the job and the frame of reference of the worker against which the workers evaluate their present position and the alternatives open to them. Community characteristics serve as part of this frame of reference. He concludes that conceptualization of job satisfaction which do not include
recognition of the role played by frames of reference are inadequate. Community and situational variables should not be considered simply as nuisance or moderator variables, but as variables having a direct effect on job satisfaction.

Role Conflict

The AFSWO has a number of roles to fulfill in the job setting. At one and the same time the AFSWO is a military officer, a therapist, a consultant to other departments and agencies on the base, a manager of family advocacy programs and CHAP (Children Have a Potential) programs, a liaison person with civilian agencies which are responsible for child advocacy and education programs. The conflicts that can result from these roles competing with each other are obvious.

Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal (1964) focused on the role strain associated with integrating the various roles the social worker fills with the various demands made by the organization. Usually the social worker operates under the authority of laws, regulations, and policies and in situations wherein the clients are not seeking the social work services on a voluntary basis. All of this can set up contradictory expectations which the social worker is expected to fill to the satisfaction of the organization, the client, and the social worker's
own values. The result of these incompatible or barely compatible demands on the social worker is known as role conflict. While working under such conditions can often lead to a number of physical and emotional symptoms, there also is the negative effect on the social worker's performance to consider. The overall pattern can lead to increased levels of dissatisfaction with the job. Kahn et al. (1964) also found that frequently in role conflict situations, work overload is present in which there is the perception that too much is to be done and it cannot be handled within the constraints imposed by time and human and physical resources. They differentiated between qualitative overload wherein duties are too difficult to complete, and quantitative overload wherein there are too many duties to take care of.

Some have found that tasks involving boundary spanning activities should be more conducive to role conflict (Kahn et al, 1964). Other researchers found boundary-spanning activities to be unrelated to role conflict. A sample of managers and engineers showed no such relationship, but a sample of supervisors in the same study did show a significant relationship between boundary-spanning activities and role conflict. (Keller, Szilagyi and Holland, 1976) Green and Organ (1973), Lyons (1971), and Rizzo, House, and Lintzman (1970) also concluded that there
were negative relationships between role conflict and job satisfaction.

Some role conflict has been attributed to the characteristics of certain jobs with the governmental sector. Rainey (1979) hypothesized that there is greater vagueness and intangibleness of goals in government operations and that this could lead to middle managers having higher levels of perceived role conflict. However, he found no significant differences between government and business managers. He concluded that performance in public sector jobs might be more difficult to assess and the task expectations of public sector jobs might inherently conflict, but apparently there were no role-related conflicts.

Johnson and Stinson (1975) tested military officers and service personnel (95% male) to see if need for achievement and need for independence moderated the relationships between role conflict, role ambiguity, and job satisfaction. They found that different types of individuals responded differently to role conflict and role ambiguity. Persons with high need for achievement had the following characteristics: (a) they are goal-oriented; (b) they placed greater emphasis on accomplishing tasks as quickly as possible; (c) they placed more emphasis on exerting their best effort; and (d) they placed more emphasis on success than on being self-content. They tended to be more
dissatisfied if their situation was ambiguous since it conflicted with their characteristics. High need for independence individuals are characterized as basing their actions on their own judgements and evaluations more than the low-need-for independence persons. They expressed less desire to be told what to do by persons with legitimate authority. The authors concluded that they perceive conflicting role demands as a limitation on opportunities to exercise individual judgement.

Chafetz (1972) sees traditional cultural roles as influencing American society to perceive women, even when working, as still having the major responsibility for care of home and children. These roles often prevent women from attaining the higher occupational levels since they have to contend with the competing demands of the professional and home/child caring needs. The psychological conflict resulting from this conflict of roles can impact negatively on the woman's perceptions of career opportunities leading to lower levels of perceived satisfaction.

SUMMARY

In this review of the literature, the writer has examined the various factors which researchers have studied in relationship to the level of job satisfaction of workers. The literature generally indicates that job satisfaction
is a multi-faceted concept composed of various specific facets which are related to the characteristics of the individual, the organization, and the job itself. The literature also indicates that there is considerable ambiguity and inconclusiveness regarding how some of the facets are related to job satisfaction, or in some instances, whether they are related at all. Just about all of the studies reviewed obtained their data from the workers by using questionnaires and similar instruments. Some researchers reviewed previously obtained data from other studies to reach their conclusions.

There are some limitations in the literature reviewed. The use of the questionnaire tends to measure the workers responses at a static moment in time. There appear to have been no generally concerted efforts among researchers to measure job satisfaction over a period of time to see what changes may take place due to changes in the person-organization-environment mix. This tends to produce results that are static in nature and do not examine the dynamic aspects of job satisfaction levels. Admittedly, much more time and effort would be needed to measure job satisfaction over time and employee turnover and management reluctance to submit their organizations to such on-going study could be problematic.

Also the nature of the organizations and employees studied provide some additional limitations. Most of
satisfaction studies have taken place in industrial settings using blue-collar employees. A much smaller percentage used management employees in industry. Those which used social work officers in the military are for all practical purposes nil. There are differences of education, perspective, and values among these different employees and organizations which inhibit direct transferring of findings from one to another. Some findings, therefore, must be extrapolated and used with some caution when making any comparisons.
CHAPTER VII

METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to examine some of the relationships between the selected variables which the literature review identified as having some relevance to the job satisfaction of employees in bureaucratic organizations. The profession of social work and the United States Air Force was used to analyze these relationships. The pertinent literature has been reviewed and this has provided the framework for the development of the operational procedures used to measure the study variables. The review of previous research led to the development of a set of hypotheses to be used in this study.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Kerlinger (1964) states that "research design is the plan, structure, and strategy of investigation conceived so as to obtain answers to research questions and to control variance." (p. 275) Each research project may offer to the researcher several options or, based on the unique needs of the study, a unique course of action. The researcher is usually limited to the use of a specific
design which best addresses the objectives of the research and best utilizes the resources and talents available.

Selltiz, Wrightsman, and Cook (1976) discussed general groupings of the purposes of research and suggest the following four:

1. To gain familiarity with a phenomenon or to achieve new insights into it, often in order to formulate a more precise research problem or to develop hypotheses (exploratory research);
2. To portray accurately the characteristics of a particular individual, situation, or group (with or without specific initial hypotheses about the nature of these characteristics) (descriptive research);
3. To determine the frequency with which something occurs or with which it is associated with something else (usually, but not always, with a specific initial hypothesis) (correlational research);
4. To test a hypothesis of a causal relationship between variables (experimental research).

After reviewing the problem to be studied, the purpose of the study and the nature of the variables
involved, a correlational study which contained quantitative-descriptive hypothesis testing was chosen. This job satisfaction study of AFSWOs met the criteria for such a study in that (1) it did not meet the requirements for an experimental study because of the ex-post-facto study situation in which the independent variables already existed and were not amenable to experimental control; (2) the variables to be studied were able to be measured quantitatively; and (3) a number of hypotheses would be tested in the study. The hypotheses in this study predict the direction of the relationships between the study variables. The following variables were selected for this study.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Professional Isolation vs. Peer Support: In many Air Force assignments the AFSWO is the only social worker and/or mental health professional assigned to a base. This can be the result of either the limited size of the base or the geographical location of the base. This aspect is measured by responses to the questions: "Including yourself, how many social workers are assigned to your base?" and "How many other helping professionals (psychiatrists, psychologists, and mental health professionals, not social workers) are assigned to your base?" Professional isolation will refer, then, to the absence on the base of either
other social workers or mental health professionals with which the AFSWO can identify and from which informal group support can be obtained.

**Organizational Size:** Size will refer to two aspects of the organization. First, it will refer to the number of active duty personnel assigned to the entire base and will be measured by responses to the questions: "What is the size of the base to which you are currently assigned?" Respondents will check one of the appropriate categories ranging from "less than 500" to "over 6000." Second, size will also refer to the number of personnel assigned to the particular subunit (i.e. hospital, clinic) on the base to which the respondent is assigned. This aspect will be measured by responses to the question: "How many personnel work at the particular facility to which you are assigned?" Respondents will check one category ranging from "less than 25" to "more than 750."

**Geographical Location of the Assignment:** This will refer to the actual location of the base and will differentiate between duty locations in the United States and those overseas. Data can be grouped into larger sets such as Europe, the Pacific area, the United States, as well as into specific areas such as states and countries.

**Personal Factors:** All AFSWOs must have at least a Masters Degree from an accredited school of social work.
A small percentage of them have Doctoral Degrees in social work. This will be measured by asking the respondent to list the highest level of formal education achieved. Also, certain personal factors can influence, in as yet unknown ways, the results of this study. It is possible that items such as age, gender, marital status, military rank, and years of military service could have an effect on the responses regarding job satisfaction. A personal data section of the questionnaire will be used to gather this data.

**Role Conflict**: This refers to the conflicting demands that the AFSWO perceives as being present in the job role due to the demands arising from both organizational and professional needs. It will be measured by responses to a number of questions such as: "On my job, I can't satisfy everybody at the same time." A Likert-type scale will be used to quantify the responses.

**DEPENDENT VARIABLES**

**Job Satisfaction**: The literature indicates that there are different ways to measure job satisfaction. Beehr and Newman (1978) measured such facets as communication processes, organizational consequences, and environmental factors. Porter and Lawler (1965) measured span of control, line vs. staff, organizational size and centralized vs. decentralized decision-making as related
to job satisfaction.

Other authors concentrated on the individual. O'Reilly and Roberts (1975) studied individual differences in personality as related to job satisfaction. Carnall and Wild (1974) studied biographical and employment variables and overall job satisfaction. Caldwell and O'Reilly (1982) studied the worker's perception of the task and its impact on job satisfaction.

Fournet, Distefano and Pryer (1966) looked at both the individual and organizational aspects of job satisfaction. They measured individual characteristics such as age, gender, and education, and organizational characteristics such as management, supervisory style, and job security.

In this study, job satisfaction of AFSWOs is assumed to result not solely from purely personal characteristics of the worker, or from characteristics of the job itself, but from the interaction between the two. In this study, then, job satisfaction will be measured by obtaining the AFSWOs perception of his/her own global feelings about the level of their own job satisfaction. This approach was used by Quinn and Shepard (1974) and Jayaratne and Chess (1982). Job satisfaction will be measured in this study by respondent's answers to a global, job-facet-free question which measures the AFSWO's overall perception of his/
her own job satisfaction: "All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?" Responses will be made on a 4 item Likert Scale from "very satisfied" to "not at all satisfied."

HYPOTHESES

The review of the previous research and relevant literature, in addition to the personal experiences of the researcher as an Air Force Social Work Officer, led to the formulation of the following hypotheses:

Hypotheses I
Professional isolation (as opposed to a professional peer support condition) will decrease the level of job satisfaction among AFSWOs.

Hypotheses II
The size of the organization subunit to which the AFSWO is assigned will be inversely correlated to the level of job satisfaction.

Hypotheses III
An overseas assignment (as opposed to one in the United States) is likely to decrease the level of job satisfaction.
Hypotheses IV
The AFSWOs perception of role conflict will be inversely correlated to the level of job satisfaction.

Hypotheses V
Because there are conflicting findings in past research, it will be assumed that age, gender, marital status, and military rank, will not be significantly related to job satisfaction, and the null hypotheses (no differences) are offered in these instances.

DATA COLLECTION

The Sample
The study population selected for inclusion in this research was composed of 196 of the 206 AFSWOs on active duty at the time the questionnaire was mailed out. Ten AFSWOs were deleted from the study by the researcher because they had less than one year of actual experience in the Air Force and it was determined that they had insufficient experience within the system to provide informed responses. The 196 AFSWOs studied, were assigned to various job roles, in assignments throughout the world. Most were assigned to operational AF bases, but a small number were in Air...
Force Institutes of Technology (AFIT) sponsored doctoral education programs in civilian universities around the country. At the operational bases, the AFSWOs work in medical facilities ranging in size from out-patient clinics with no beds for inpatient care, to a large 1000 bed medical center having many medical specialties and capable of caring for a large inpatient population. The AFSWOs studied were assigned to USAF medical facilities in all major areas of the world from the continental United States (CONUS), to the Western Pacific (PACAF) and Western European areas (USAFE). Of the total population of 206 AFSWOs, a sample of 196 (95%) was included in this research.

Instrument

The survey questionnaire method was selected to gather data because the study population was geographically located throughout the world. Authorization to conduct the survey and a survey control number, SCN 83-62, were requested and received from the USAF (Appendix A). Prior to this study being initiated, the topic was discussed with Colonel Stuart S. Myers, the Associate Chief for Social Work, who agreed that the study topic had value for the improved management of the AF social work program and verbally endorsed the study. The questionnaire utilized in this research consisted of the Professional Satisfaction
Inventory. This instrument was developed, pre-tested, and the validity and reliability were established by Jayaratne and Chess (1982) for their survey of professional social workers in the United States. The questionnaire was used with their approval (Appendix B) and was adapted to the circumstances of the USAF by adding some questions using objective indexes to measure the size of the base, income, military rank, and the type of USAF setting which best characterized the practice settings. A few items were deleted from the original instrument because they had no bearing on working conditions in the USAF. Such items included questions relating to malpractice insurance and private practice, and role ambiguity. The latter was deleted because from the researcher's experiences, the role of the AFSWO is very clearly spelled out in the AF regulations (AF Reg. 36-1) (Appendix C). The problem seems to be one of role conflict. All other content of the original instrument was kept intact as developed by Jayaratne and Chess (1982).

**Questionnaire Content**

The questionnaire contained questions to gather both demographic data and data regarding the perceptions of the AFSWOs about aspects of their job role and work environment (Appendix D).
Demographic data from the questionnaire focused on the following aspects:

1. Location of assignment,
2. Size of the base and subunit,
3. Age,
4. Gender,
5. Military rank,
6. Years of military service,
7. Ethnic background,
8. Marital status,
9. Income,
10. Educational degree, and
11. Professional certification.

Perceptions about the actual job itself focused on the following aspects:

1. Caseload,
2. Practice methods,
3. Character of work setting,
4. Peer support and professional isolation,
5. Job related issues such as challenge, comfort, role conflict, financial reward, promotion opportunity, and supervision,
6. Training programs,
7. Emotional responses including depression, anxiety, irritability, and burnout.
8. Global perception of level of job satisfaction,
9. Locus of control (based on Rotter, 1966),
10. Somatic complaints,
11. Need levels (based on Maslow, 1954), and

**Distribution of the Survey Instrument**

The survey instrument was distributed to the 196 members of the research sample by first class mail on September 23, 1983. The materials sent included a cover letter, the study instrument, a Privacy Act Statement, a self-addressed, stamped envelope, and a stamped post-card to be returned separately from the instrument so that the researcher could keep accurate records of the respondents without knowing which instrument was completed by which individual. This allowed confidentiality of responses to be maintained (Appendix F & G).

The researcher waited approximately three weeks before the second mailing was sent out. This period of time was selected because there was a time lag getting the instruments to and from some overseas locations. On October 17, 1983 the second mailing went out to non-respondents (Appendix H). This included another instrument, a letter
of appeal, a Privacy Act Statement, another post-card and self-addressed envelope. On November 7, the final mailing was sent to non-respondents and included a package similar to the second mailing (Appendix I). The final response rate included 151 responses out of a total sample of 196 (77%). Of these questionnaires, two were unusable because of insufficient data provided by the respondents. The study used data from 149 of the 196 (76%) AFSWOS who responded to the survey.

Statistical Analysis

The nature of the study problem, the framework of the study, and the design of this research study have dictated the choice of the statistical procedures used in analyzing the data.

The data obtained from the survey questionnaires were coded and punched onto computer cards which then provided the medium for beginning the computer analysis of the data. Correlational analysis was selected as the statistical procedure to be used to measure the strength of association between the independent variables and the dependent variables. Nachmias and Nachmias (1981) state that the "... correlational design, often referred to as the cross-sectional study, is perhaps the most predominant design employed in survey research." (p. 123) Nie, Hall,
Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, in their introduction to correlation analysis state that

...the correlation coefficients indicate the degree to which variation (or change) in one variable is related to variation (change) in another. A correlation coefficient not only summarizes the strength of association between a pair of variables but also provides an easy means for comparing the strength of relationship between one pair of variables and a different pair." (p. 276-277)

Initially, the Frequencies subprogram of SPSS (1975) was used to obtain the descriptive statistics such as the mean, minimum, maximum, and standard deviation for the study variables. A number of analyses were accomplished by breaking down the data from an independent variable into two groupings and then testing the differences between the two means to determine whether they were equal or unequal. To obtain these t-tests for the differences of means, the T-Test subprogram of SPSS (1975) was used. In other instances the data from an independent variable was broken down into three levels to determine whether the treatment means were equal or not. To accomplish this the One-Way subprogram of SPSS (1975) was used. In cases where the data was continuous over a range, and the data was interval level, the Pearson Corr subprogram of SPSS (1975) was used. This provided a numerical measure of the relationship (or lack of one) between the two variables under consideration. Finally, to study the simultaneous effect of a set of the
independent variables on the dependent variable, the Regression subprogram of SPSS (1975) was used to obtain the correlational coefficients for the relationships between the set of independent variables and the dependent variable. This produced a numerical measure of the relative importance of the independent variables as predictors of change in the dependent variable.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

There are three basic limitations to this type of study. First, the sample being tested is not being randomly selected. There is a risk, therefore, of obtaining a biased sample which could result, in this study, from a low response rate to the mailed questionnaires. Self-selection could effect the data, for example, if only those AFSWOs responded who had an over-riding interest in the subject matter. Because of that danger, three separate mailings were used to increase the response rate. Second, the generalizations resulting from this study may have limited applicability for other organizations which are not similar to the USAF and to employees who may have different value systems than AFSWOs. Third, this study was limited to USAF bases and AFSWOs in the continental United States and overseas. As such, the generalizations of the study may only inferentially apply to other military organizations.
which have a different mission and structure or to other organizations which do not have the same organizational characteristics.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIAL WORK**

Since the social work profession plays an important role in the mental health delivery system of the USAF, a study examining the level of job satisfaction of the AFSWOs and the facets of the job, organization, and environment which have an effect on that level is important for this sector of the profession. Studies which help the profession of Air Force Social Work to better understand the role of the AFSWO and the interaction with the overall Air Force organization offer an improved data base for Air Force social work program managers to improve the policies used to manage the program and thus improve the effectiveness of the Air Force Social Work program.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

This chapter will focus first on the general characteristics of the sample of Air Force Social Work Officers (AFSWOs) who participated in the survey. The five study hypotheses will then be evaluated by use of the appropriate statistical procedures.

Assignment

A total of 149 AFSWOs responded to the survey. They were stationed at bases around the world. One hundred and thirteen (67%) were assigned to bases in the United States (CONUS). Of the remainder, 29 (20%) were assigned to Europe (USAFE) and 7 (4%) were assigned to the Orient (PACAF). Figure 4.1 presents this data graphically. Most were assigned to seven major commands in the Air Force (Figure 4.2).

Sex

As Figure 4.3 displays, 121 (81%) of the respondents were male while 28 (19%) were female. Given the male
FIGURE 4.1

LOCATION OF ASSIGNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Of Total Sample</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Overseas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 113</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 4.2

MAJOR USAF COMMAND ASSIGNMENTS

USAFE: United States Air Forces Europe
ATC: Air Training Command
MAC: Military Airlift Command
SAC: Strategic Air Command
TAC: Tactical Air Command
AFSC: Air Force Systems Command
PACAF: Pacific Air Forces
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GENDER OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of Total Sample

N = 121

N = 28
dominance of the organization, this is not a surprising distribution.

Size of Organizational Unit

Eighty-two (55%) reported that they worked in a medical facility on the base in which 1 to 300 other medical personnel were assigned. Twenty-two (15%) reported that they worked in medium sized facilities which had 301 to 500 personnel assigned and 45 (30%) worked in large medical settings to which more than 500 personnel were assigned (Figure 4.4).

Practice Setting

The majority, 102 (69%), reported that they worked in mental health settings. The remainder, 47 (31%), indicated that their job role was involved predominantly with such problem areas as substance abuse, family advocacy, corrections, and medical social work (Figure 4.5). It should be pointed out that the majority who identified mental health as their predominant area of practice are also involved to a lesser degree in these other areas of practice on a day-to-day basis.

Hours in the Work Week

One hundred and one (68%) worked between 45 and 55
FIGURE 4.4

SIZE OF FACILITY AS MEASURED BY NUMBER OF AIR FORCE PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO IT

% Of Total Sample

55% N = 82

15% N = 22

30% N = 45

1 to 300 301 to 500 Over 500
FIGURE 4.5

NATURE OF PRACTICE SETTING

% Of Total Sample

70 65 60 55 50 45 40 35 30 25 20 15 10 5 0

Mental Health 11% N=16
Substance Abuse 7% N=11
Family Advocacy 5% N=7
Corrections 2% Other
Medical Social Work 6% N=10

N=102
hours per week with the average work week consisting of 48.5 hours (Figure 4.6). Seventy-six (51%) worked more than 50 hours per week. As a whole, the respondents were working considerably longer than the normal 40 hour work week.

**Caseload**

Given the long hours they worked, it is not surprising that 53 (36%) thought that their caseload was too high. Nevertheless, the majority, 83 (56%) felt that their caseload was about right and only 7 (5%) felt that it was too low (Figure 4.7).

**Age**

Most of the respondents were between the ages of 30 and 40. Thirteen (9%) were under the age of 30, 108 (72%) were between the ages of 30 and 40, and 28 (19%) were over the age of 40. The mean age of the respondents was 36 years (Figure 4.8).

**Military Rank**

Of those who responded, 101 (68%) were junior officers (First Lieutenants and Captains) while 48 (32%) were senior officers (Majors, Lieutenant Colonels, and Colonels) (Figure 4.9).
FIGURE 4.6

HOURS WORKED IN A TYPICAL WEEK

% Of Total Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 55</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Total Sample Size
FIGURE 4.7

OPINION ABOUT SIZE OF CASELOAD

% Of Total Sample

56%

36%

N=83

N=53

Missing Data = 6

5%

N=7

Too High

About Right

Too Low

N=83

Sample: N=53

Missing Data = 6

N=7
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AGE OF RESPONDENTS

- 72% of the sample is 30 to 40 years old (N=108)
- 19% of the sample is over 40 years old (N=28)
- 9% of the sample is under 30 years old (N=13)

% Of Total Sample

80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10
0

Under 30 30 to 40 Over 40
FIGURE 4.9

MILITARY RANK OF RESPONDENTS

% Of Total Sample

N=12
First Lieutenant

N=40
Captian

N=89
60%

27%
Major

5%
Lieutenant Colonel

1% (N=1)
Colonel
Years of Commissioned Service

One hundred and seventeen (79%) had less than 10 years of commissioned service as social work officers, 30 (20%) had between 11 and 19 years of service, and only 2 (1%) had over 20 years of service (Figure 4.10). This is indicative of the fact that social work within the Air Force is a relatively new profession with 79% of the current corps having entered the Air Force within the last 10 years. The average length of service for the sample was 7.4 years.

Ethnic Background

The corps is predominantly caucasian, with 134 (90%) claiming that heritage. Only 15 (10%) identified themselves as being from the other five ethnic groups in this study (Figure 4.11).

Marital Status

One hundred nineteen (39%) were married while 30 (20%) reported that they were either divorced, separated, or never married at all. None identified themselves as widowed (Figure 4.12).

Income

The mean income was approximately $32,500 per year.
FIGURE 4.10

YEARS OF COMMISSIONED SERVICE AS AN AIR FORCE OFFICER

% Of Total Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 10</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 19</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=117

N=30

N=2
FIGURE 4.11

ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

% Of Total Sample

N=134

90%

4% (N=3)

2% (N=3)

1% (N=2)

1% (N=1)
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MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

% Of Total Sample

80%

N=119

11%

N=16

9%

N=14

Married

Divorced/ Separated

Never Married
with 89 (60%) reporting annual earnings between $25,000 and $35,000 (Figure 4.13).

**Educational Level**

In reference to their education, 126 (85%) possessed a Master's Degree in Social Work. This high percentage is the result of the Air Force requirement that all AFSWOS possess such a degree before they can be commissioned as AFSWOS. Twenty-three (15%) possessed a Doctoral Degree in Social Work (Figure 4.14).

**Professional Certification**

Eighty-five (57%) indicated that they possessed professional certification through the Academy of Certified Social Workers (ACSW) (Figure 4.15). Sixty-four (43%) indicated that they did not possess ACSW certification. Considering the increasing emphasis being placed on such certification by the Air Force, the number of non-ACSW respondents seems to be quite high.

**Professional Isolation**

In the Air Force social work officers are often assigned to bases where there are no other social workers. In many of these situations there are also no other mental health professionals such as psychiatrists, psychologists,
FIGURE 4.13

YEARLY INCOME OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>% of Total Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $20,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 to $25,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001 to $30,000</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 to $35,000</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,001 to $40,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $40,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 4.14

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS

% Of Total Sample

N=126

85%

N=23

Masters Degree

Doctoral Degree

15%
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PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION OF RESPONDENTS IN THE ACADEMY OF CERTIFIED SOCIAL WORKERS (ACSW)

% Of Total Sample

N = 85

N = 64

ACSW

NON-ACSW

27%

43%
or psychiatric nurses on the base. Of the sample, 68 (46%) reported that they were the only social workers on the base. Thirty-eight (26%) had no other professional mental health peers in their support system (Figure 4.16).

Utilization of Time on the Job

On the average, respondents indicated that 53% of their work time was spent in direct contact with clients. Administrative duties involving paperwork, reports, etc., accounted for the next highest use of time, 17%. The remaining 30% of their time was distributed among such items as travel, meetings, and other non-specified activities (Figure 4.17).

Feelings of Success

The majority of the respondents, 146 (98%), felt successful in their overall professional work. A slightly smaller percentage, 140 (94%), felt successful in their work with their clients (Figure 4.18). In both cases, a very small percentage reported feeling unsuccessful either in their profession or in their direct work with clients.

Job Stress

Often it is the work with clients that social workers identify as the source of stress in their lives. In
OTHER SOCIAL WORKERS AND MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS ON THE BASE

% Of Total Sample

1 2 or more

N=68 N=81

54%

Professional Social Workers Assigned to the Base

1 or More

N=38 N=111

Other Mental Health Professionals Assigned to the Base
(Not Social Workers)
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AVERAGE PERCENT OF WORK WEEK SPENT
IN VARIOUS ACTIVITIES
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17%
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FEELINGS OF SUCCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Unsuc.</td>
<td>N=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unsuc.</td>
<td>N=43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Suc.</td>
<td>N=103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Suc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>N=79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success With</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success In</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work With Clients</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=1 for all categories except N=2 for Very Unsuc.)
this sample, 128 (86%) reported a great deal or at least some job-related stress. Interestingly, only 62 (42%) reported that this stress had any real impact on their actual job performance (Figure 4.19). Eighty-seven (58%) actually felt that the stress only impacted to a minimal degree on their overall job functioning. It appears that while the stress may be experienced personally, it does not seem to transfer directly to the worker's performance.

Most Important Values

Social work as a profession depends on the quality of the interaction between the social worker and the client. Professionals should be more motivated by higher order needs. Therefore, as might be expected, 118 (80%) of the sample identified warm and loving relationships, self-respect, and a sense of accomplishment as their most important values. Conversely, safety and security, and financial security were identified as most important by only 30 (20%) of the respondents (Figure 4.20). These values correspond generally to Maslow's (1954) need hierarchy with warm and loving relationships, self-respect, and sense of accomplishment corresponding to his higher order needs and safety and security, and financial security values tending toward the lower order needs.
FIGURE 4.20

MOST IMPORTANT VALUES AS IDENTIFIED
BY RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>% of Total Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W/L R</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MISSING DATE = 1

W/L R = Warm and Loving Relationship
SR = Self-Respect
SA = Sense of Accomplishment
SS = Safety and Security
FS = Financial Security
Overall Satisfaction

A large majority, 130 (87%), report that they are either somewhat satisfied or very satisfied with their jobs as social work officers in the Air Force. Approximately the same number and percentage, 137 (92%), reported similar feelings of satisfaction with their life in general (Figure 4.21). Those who are not satisfied with either their jobs or their lives compose a very small percentage of the sample.

Career Commitment

Given the fact that the great majority are satisfied both with their work and their life in general, it is not surprising that 130 (87%) report that they have no intention at this time of leaving their Air Force careers as social work officers in the foreseeable future (Figure 4.22).

SUMMARY

Taken as a whole, this sample was composed primarily of young, white, male social workers who possess a Master's Degree in Social Work and who are members of the ACSW. They are junior officers with an average of 7.4 years commissioned service in the Air Force. They are assigned primarily to bases in the United States and work in smaller size medical facilities. Most spend about 48 hours per
FIGURE 4.21

OVERALL SATISFACTION

% Of Total Sample

3% Not At All Satisfied
10% Not Too Satisfied
12% Somewhat Satisfied
55% Very Satisfied
1% (N = 1) Not At All Satisfied
7% Not Too Satisfied
30% Somewhat Satisfied
62% Very Satisfied

N = 15
N = 82
N = 48
N = 11
N = 45
N = 92
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PROBABILITY OF LEAVING (RESIGNING COMMISSION) THE AIR FORCE WITHIN THE NEXT YEAR AS IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENTS

% Of Total Sample

Very Likely

Somewhat Likely

Not At All Likely

N = 130

N = 10

N = 9

87%

7%

6%
week in mental health settings and generally feel that their caseload is about right, or maybe a little high. Most are married and earn on the average about $32,500 per year. Most work in a setting which provides professional peer support but a significant number function alone. They spend most of their time in direct contact with clients and generally feel successful with their professional work. While the job imposes some stress on them, they seem able to override it and not allow it to impact negatively on their job functioning. Higher order needs motivate them. A great majority are satisfied both with their jobs in the Air Force and their life in general. Consequently, their career orientation in the Air Force is strong and very few plan on leaving the service in the foreseeable future. They seem to be a generally well-adjusted group.

HYPOTHESIS 1

This hypothesis held that the lack of another professional social worker or of other mental health professionals on the base (termed "professional isolation") would decrease the level of job satisfaction. For purposes of analysis this hypothesis was tested using Subprogram ONEWAY from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 1975).

Responses from question 27, which asked how many
AFSWOs (including the respondent) there were on the base, and question 28, which asked how many other mental health professionals such as psychiatrists, psychologists, psychiatric nurses (not including social workers) were on the base, were used in this analysis. Three groupings were formed. The first group was composed of those AFSWOs who reported that they were the only social work officers on the base and who also reported that there were no other mental health professionals on the base. This is the true professional isolation condition, commonly referred to in the Air Force as the "lone ranger" assignment. The second group was composed of those AFSWOs who reported that they were the only social work officers on the base and who also reported that there were other mental health professionals on the base. The third group was composed of those AFSWOs who reported that they were not the only social work officers on the base and who also reported that there were other mental health professionals on the base. These last two groups composed the peer support conditions.

The highest mean satisfaction scores were found among those AFSWOs who were the only social work officers assigned to the base, but who also had other mental health professionals assigned to the base. These other professionals formed the peer support condition. The next
best mean satisfaction scores were reported by those AFSWOs who were in the true professional isolation condition, the "lone rangers." The lowest mean satisfaction scores were reported by those AFSWOs who had both other social work officers and mental health professionals assigned to the base (Table 4.1).

The statistical analysis indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the mean satisfaction scores of these three groupings. The results did not support the hypothesis. In fact, the data suggests that the presence of other AFSWOs may have a somewhat negative impact on overall job satisfaction. This will be discussed further in the next chapter.

**HYPOTHESIS 2**

This hypothesis held that the size of the organizational unit to which the AFSWO was assigned (as measured by the number of medical personnel assigned to it) would be inversely related to the level of overall job satisfaction. The data relating to the number of personnel assigned to the medical facility was recoded into three groupings to correspond to small, medium, and large medical organizations. If the facility had 100 or less personnel assigned to it, it was considered to be a small medical unit. If there were between 101 and 500 personnel assigned, the unit
TABLE 4.1

PROFESSIONAL ISOLATION AND
JOB SATISFACTION

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS 1:

Professional isolation (as opposed to the professional peer support condition) will decrease the level of job satisfaction among AFSWOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Assigned</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One AFSWO and No Other Mental Health Professionals (Lone Rangers)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.346</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One AFSWO and Other Mental Health Professionals</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.523</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Than One AFSWO and Other Mental Health Professionals</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing Data = 12
was considered to be of medium size. If there were more than 500 medical personnel assigned, it was considered a large facility. Subprogram One-Way of SPSS (1975) was used for the statistical analysis of this data. While the mean job satisfaction scores showed an increase as the size of the facility diminished, the analysis indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the overall job satisfaction scores of the three groups (Table 4.2). The results did not support the hypothesis.

HYPOTHESIS 3

This hypothesis held that the location of the assignment, namely, in the United States (including Alaska and Hawaii) or overseas would have an impact on the overall job satisfaction level. Specifically, it held that overseas assignments would decrease the level of job satisfaction. For purposes of the analysis the data on assignment location was recorded so that respondents who reported being assigned to bases in the United States formed one group and those who were assigned to bases overseas formed the other group. Subprogram T-test from SPSS (1975) was used for the analysis. The t-test results indicated that there was a significant difference between the mean job satisfaction scores of the two groups in the direction
TABLE 4.2

ORGANIZATIONAL SIZE AND JOB SATISFACTION

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS 2:
The size of the organizational unit to which the AFSWO is assigned will be inversely correlated to the level of job satisfaction.

Size of Unit (as Measured by Number of Personnel Assigned to it)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Unit</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than 100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 500</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.394</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Than 501</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
predicted. Those assigned to bases in the United States had significantly higher job satisfaction scores than those assigned overseas. The difference was significant at the .011 level (Table 4.3). The results confirmed the hypothesis.

**HYPOTHESIS 4**

In this hypothesis the AFSWO's perception of the amount of role conflict experienced on the job was held to be inversely related to the overall level of job satisfaction. Data on the amount of perceived role conflict ranged from 4 (high role conflict) to 16 (low role conflict). For purposes of analysis the Subprogram Pearson Corr:Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients from SPSS (1975) was used. Results indicated that there was a slightly positive correlation between perception of role conflict and overall job satisfaction (Table 4.4). While the correlation was significant at the .001 level, the r of .258 indicates that the correlation is not very strong and that the perception of role conflict is relatively low. The results do support the hypothesis.

**HYPOTHESIS 5**

This hypothesis held that certain personal factors such as age, gender, marital status, and military rank
TABLE 4.3

LOCATION OF ASSIGNMENT AND JOB SATISFACTION

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS 3:

An overseas assignment (as opposed to one in the United States) is likely to decrease the level of job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Assignment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>T-Statistic</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.477</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.138</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.4

ROLE CONFLICT AND JOB SATISFACTION

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS 4:
The AFSWO's perception of role conflict will be inversely correlated to the level of job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Conflict</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4 to 16</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .001 level.
would not have any significant impact on the overall level of job satisfaction (the null hypothesis). For purposes of the analysis, each of these facets was treated separately as a distinct hypothesis.

HYPOTHESIS 5(a): AGE AND JOB SATISFACTION

Age was recoded into three groupings. They conformed to 10 year periods in the career of the AFSWOs. The traditional length of a military officer's career is focused on the 20 year point since this is the length of service required in order for the officer to qualify for a federal pension upon retirement. Therefore, the age groupings were divided into decades. The first grouping contained those who were 24 to 34 years of age. Age 24 was the age of the youngest respondent. This grouping contained those who were less than half way to their retirement. The second grouping contained those who were 35 to 45 years of age. They were more than half way to their retirement and some were within a few years of retirement from the military. The final grouping contained those who were 46 to 51 years of age. Age 51 was the age of the oldest respondent. This group contained those who probably could retire at any time they wanted, but had voluntarily chosen to remain on active duty. The basic question here was whether a significant difference existed in the levels of job satisfaction between those who had a relatively long
way to go to retirement, those who were, so to speak, in the home stretch, and those who could have retired at their own discretion, but chose to stay with the job. Subprogram One-Way of SPSS (1975) was used for the analysis. While the mean job satisfaction scores of the groups increased as the length of service increased results of the analysis revealed that the differences were not statistically significant. Age apparently does not impact significantly on the level of job satisfaction. The results supported the null hypothesis (Table 4.5).

**HYPOTHESIS 5(b): GENDER AND JOB SATISFACTION**

Gender was tested using the Subprogram T-Test from SPSS (1975). The results indicated that there was a significant difference between the mean satisfaction scores of the male and female AFSWOs. As might be expected in a predominantly male organization, the males had the higher job satisfaction scores. The difference was significant at the .004 level. The results did not confirm the null hypothesis and in this case the null hypothesis was rejected (Table 4.6).

**HYPOTHESIS 5(c): MARITAL STATUS AND JOB SATISFACTION**

Since the focus of this question was whether or not being married had an impact on job satisfaction, the data
### TABLE 4.5

**AGE AND JOB SATISFACTION**

**TEST OF HYPOTHESIS 5a:**

Age will not be significantly related to job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>P PATIO</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 to 34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.319</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 45</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.414</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.6

GENDER AND JOB SATISFACTION

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS 5b:

Gender will not be significantly related to job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>T-STATISTIC</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.495</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.964</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was recoded into two groupings. Those who were married formed one group, and those who were not (i.e., divorced, separated, never married) formed the second group. There were no respondents who identified themselves as widowed. Subprogram T-Test from SPSS (1975) was used for the analysis. While the married group had a slightly higher mean job satisfaction score than the unmarried group, the difference between the groups was not found to be statistically significant. The results confirmed the hypothesis and the null hypothesis was maintained (Table 4.7).

**HYPOTHESIS 5(d): MILITARY RANK AND JOB SATISFACTION**

While military rank is part of the military organizational structure, it was placed here under personal facets since rank is considered to be an attribute of the individual more than of the organization per se. For purposes of analysis, the data was recoded into two groups, junior officers (First Lieutenants and Captains) and senior officers (Majors, Lieutenant Colonels and Colonels). This division is based on the traditional military distinction between the two groups of officers. Subprogram T-Test of SPSS (1975) was used for the analysis. The t-test results indicated that there was a significant difference between the mean job satisfaction scores of senior officers and junior officers with the senior officers having the higher
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARITAL STATUS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>T-STATISTIC</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>married</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.403</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not married</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.366</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scores. The difference was significant at the .036 level (Table 4.8). The old military dictum that "rank hath its privileges" seems to be operative here and it appears that as one rises in the organization as an AFSWO, the organization provides higher levels of satisfaction. The results did not confirm the hypothesis and the null hypothesis was rejected.

FURTHER ANALYSIS

In the previous study by Jayaratne and Chess (1982) upon which this study is based, the authors performed two other analyses of their data, a t-test for gender differences on selected job satisfaction measures and a multiple regression analysis. Their results and a comparison to the results of this study will be discussed in the next chapter. To obtain the results upon which the comparison could be made, similar t-tests and a regression analysis were performed.

Table 4.9 presents the mean scores, standard deviations, and significance levels for the variables under consideration by gender for both the current study and the Jayaratne and Chess (1982) study. With the exception of the measure on the promotion system, the male AFSWOs report higher scores than their female counterparts on all measures. Male AFSWOs report a significantly higher level of challenge on the job than do the females. It is apparent
TABLE 4.8

MILITARY RANK AND JOB SATISFACTION

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS 5d:

Military rank will not be significantly related to job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILITARY RANK</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>T-STATISTIC</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant/Captain</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.316</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major/Lt. Colonel/Colonel</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.562</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4.9

**GENDER DIFFERENCES ON SELECTED VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>CURRENT STUDY</th>
<th>JAYARATNE AND CHESS STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>18.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Rewards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>10.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>9.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 - Indicates Greater Satisfaction

---

* p < .07
** p < .01
*** p < .005
that the female AFSWOs in this sample perceive their work situation to be less satisfying than their male colleagues do. These gender differences also occur on the measure of overall job satisfaction.

In order to determine the effects of various predictors on job satisfaction, a standardized multiple regression analysis was conducted. In the regression analysis the same set of predictor variables were used which Jayaratne and Chess (1982) used (Appendix J). The beta weights, $R^2$, F ratio, and significance level were obtained by use of the Multiple Regression Analysis: Subprogram Regression of SPSS (1975). The stepwise order of inclusion of the independent variables was determined by the degree to which these variables contributed to the explained variance. Table 4.10 presents the results of this analysis. As a group these predictors had an $r$ of .69 and accounted for 48% of the explained variance. Job challenge is the single most important predictor of job satisfaction and explains 39% of the variance. In addition, the comfort of the work setting and the overall pattern of financial rewards emerge as statistically significant predictors of job satisfaction and explain an additional 7% of the variance. While in the Jayaratne and Chess (1982) study the regression analysis was broken down by gender, this type of analysis was not conducted in the current study.
TABLE 4.10

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF JOB FACETS ON
JOB SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>27.573</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>2.588</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Reward</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>2.283</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>2.451</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings About Pay</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level.
because the highly male dominated (N = 121) sample left a female N of only 28. Such a small female N made the use of regression analysis with eight predictor variables statistically inappropriate.

Finally, correlations were run on a number of independent variables which, while included in the survey instrument, were not directly used in the hypothesis testing. They were explored to see if they did show any statistically significant relationships to job satisfaction. The results are presented in Table 4.11. Subprogram Pearson Corr. of SPSS (1975) was used in the analysis.

The first three variables in Table 4.11 focus on the social support system which the worker has in the work setting. The emotional support provided by co-workers on the job was relatively high with a mean of 12.746. A positive correlation of .45 indicates a moderately strong relationship between this emotional support and the AFSWO's job satisfaction. This was significant at the .001 level.

An even stronger relationship was found between the social support provided by interaction with co-workers on the job. A moderately high level of social support was found with a mean score of 9.536. The positive correlation of .49 again indicates that a moderately strong relationship exists between the support provided by social interaction on the job and the job satisfaction of the AFSWOs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker Emotional</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Low 4 to High 16</td>
<td>12.746</td>
<td>2.949</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Low 6 to High 24</td>
<td>17.775</td>
<td>4.910</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker Social</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Low 3 to High 12</td>
<td>9.536</td>
<td>2.148</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>External 0 to Internal 11</td>
<td>7.349</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4.11

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF SELECTED JOB FACETS WITH JOB SATISFACTION MEASURE
The correlation was significant at the .001 level.

The emotional support provided by the worker's supervisor did not seem to have as strong an influence on overall job satisfaction. The mean score for supervisory support is not quite as high proportionately as that of the other two support measures just reviewed. The positive correlation of .36 indicates a weaker relationship exists between the support provided by the supervisor and overall job satisfaction than is the case when the support of co-workers is considered. This correlation is significant at the .001 level.

Finally, the facet of locus of control was examined. The military organization by all appearances relies heavily on external control imposed by regulations and traditions. One might expect that there would be a negative correlation between internal locus of control and an organization which relates heavily on external control. The results really do not support such an assumption (Table 4.11). There is some degree of positive correlation between locus of control, which in this sample is tending toward the internal locus (mean = 7.349), and job satisfaction with an R of .288. This correlation is significant at the .001 level. Apparently, the persons in this sample, even though they are tending toward the internal locus on average, are able to use such a locus to help achieve levels of job satisfaction for themselves.
DISCUSSION

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The APSWOs who participated in this study were predominantly male (81%), caucasian (90%), junior officers in the military ranks of First Lieutenant and Captain (68%). The youngest was 24 years of age and the oldest 51 years of age. The majority (76%) were assigned to bases in the United States. They earned an average of $32,500 per year and 80% of them were married. Since the Air Force requires that a commissioned social work officer possess at least a master's degree in social work, the data reflects that the majority (85%) do possess such a degree and that the remaining 15% have either a Ph.D. or D.S.W. in social work. Fifty-seven percent claimed the ACSW professional certification.

Generally, this description portrays a rather homogeneous group of relatively young professionals who are white, married males and whose income and educational credentials place them in the middle class of American society. Since 87% expressed overall satisfaction with their job role in the Air Force, it is not surprising that
82% of them expressed a similar overall satisfaction with their life in general (Figure 4.22).

**Size of Organizational Unit**

The majority (55%) indicated that they worked in medical settings which had less than 300 medical personnel assigned to them. This size facility is considered small within the Air Force organization. Fifteen percent worked in medical settings that had between 300 and 500 personnel assigned to them. These are medium size facilities. The remaining 30% reported working in large medical settings which had more than 500 personnel assigned to them. The majority, then, work in smaller medical settings which generally correspond to the fact that most Air Force bases are of a size that a smaller medical facility is able to handle the medical program on the base. This also increases the probability that the AFSWO will be in a professionally isolated setting (Figure 4.14).

**Workload**

The amount of time spent on the job and the workload that they report indicates that the Air Force is getting more than expected output from them. They report that on the average 68% of them work between 45 to 55 hours per week with the average work week consisting of approximately
This is not an unexpected result since often such activities as being-on-call, record-keeping, and appointments require that extra time be given to the job. Again, the fact that the Air Force considers all of its personnel to be available for duty 24 hours per day influences the perception of the normal workweek and leaves it a bit more open-ended than in the usual 40 hour workweek. The "more for less" pattern seems to be working here. Thirty-six percent of the respondents felt that their caseloads were too high and this no doubt also adds to the requirement to spend extra hours on the job to complete other aspects of the job (Figure 4.17). Putting all of this together, and considering that there is no increased compensation for the extra time spent on the job, the fact that the AFWSOs in this sample still reported general satisfaction with their jobs indicates that they are a group who are apparently dedicated to their organization and to the job they have chosen to do.

Job Stress

The extra hours spent at work and the workload reported would seem to point toward and increased stress level among the AFWSOs. In fact, 86% did indicate that they felt their job imposed at least some degree to a great deal of stress on them (Figure 4.18).
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then, that they would also report that there were similar
degrees of negative impact on their job performance. Such,
however, is not the case. Surprisingly, only 42% felt
that the stress impacted in any substantial way on their
job performance. While this is no small percentage, it
must be compared with the fact that 58% reported that the
job stress did not substantially degrade their job perfor-
mance. While the stress is there, most have apparently
found adequate ways to deal with it. One could speculate
whether this is related to the relatively young mean age
(36 years) and the corresponding physical and psychological
resilience, or whether the close knit cohesion found in
the officers corps may account for this. That is a question
for further research.

Financial Issues

The social workers in this study placed some degree
of importance both on income and the entire package of
economic remuneration including such items as pay, job
security, and fringe benefits (Table 4.10). There seems
to be some discrepancy here with the findings of authors
such as Meinert (1975) who speculated that since social
workers are not normally paid as well as other profes-
sionals, they compensate for this by deriving symbolic
satisfaction from their professional roles and activities.
This could be related to the changing attitudes among social workers about the comparability of pay issue. It is also possible that this is related to the Air Force system in which pay is based on the rank of the person, not on the professional role of the individual in the organization. Thus, generally speaking, whether one is a social worker, medical doctor, psychologist, chaplain, lawyer, pilot, administrator, or any other role filled by an officer, all officers in the same rank receive basically the same pay. There are some special incentive payments that medical doctors, pilots, and certain hard to obtain specialties receive which the other officers do not. In general, though, rank determines pay. Since the system traditionally rewards pay in this manner, it is possible that AFSWOs differ with their civilian counterparts on this issue because a different expectation has developed within the organization. On the other hand, the profession may be developing its own sense of pay comparability with other professions which is now beginning to come to the fore.

**Peer Support**

The emotional and social aspects of the job were found to have a significant correlation with the worker's job satisfaction (Table 4.11). The emotional support provided by co-workers involves such items as being warm
and friendly, listening attentively, showing approval, and showing understanding. The same items were used to measure the support provided by the supervisor. In addition, the supervisor's support was also measured by whether expectations were clear on the job, and whether the supervisor was helpful in getting the job done. The social aspect of the job was measured by the opportunity to make friends, personal interest on the part of the co-workers, and the friendliness of co-workers. Favorable levels of such emotional and social support were found to be correlated with increased levels of job satisfaction. The person-to-person contacts in the work environment apparently were important factors for these social workers. It also corresponds with the finding that 34% of the sample reported warm and friendly relationships were their most important values (Figure 4.20). Previous research has identified the social aspect of the job as a source of job satisfaction for the worker (Macoby, 1975; Zaleznik et al., 1958; Cobb, 1975; Maslach, 1976).

**Locus of Control**

On the average, the respondents tended toward an internal locus of control (Table 4.11). This locus is positively correlated to increased levels of job satisfaction. Rotter (1960; 1966) and McClelland (1961) had
previously concluded that persons with an internal locus of control tended to be achievement oriented and were better able to cope with life situations in general than those who have an external locus. This may help to explain why it is that the AFSWOs tended to have internal loci, worked in an organization which uses a predominantly external locus for its control, and yet these AFSWOs reported being generally satisfied with their jobs. The internal locus, instead of causing a great deal of friction with the organization's philosophy, apparently has the opposite effect. It seems that it allows these social work officers to better cope with the organization because it makes them more alert to the environment and allows them to draw on their own internal resources to effectively deal with it. It evidently allows them to take the necessary steps which make the person-organization fit more compatible and helps meet the needs of both.

Eighty-seven percent of the respondents expressed overall satisfaction with their job role in the Air Force. Correspondingly, 92% report being generally satisfied with their life (Figure 4.21). This relates positively to the fact that 87% have no plans to leave the Air Force in the foreseeable future (Figure 4.22). Despite the demands of the job and the organization, the Air Force holds sufficient professional appeal to keep the AFSWOs within the organization.
HYPOTHESES

This study was designed not only to describe some of the characteristics of the social work corps in the Air Force, but also to test some hypotheses related to the level of job satisfaction. Since this study is very exploratory in nature, zero order correlations were used in the hypotheses testing to obtain a basic level of data. Further research will take these basic findings and look into them in greater detail and with controls as the dynamics of this group of professional workers is better understood.

Hypothesis 1

This hypothesis stated that professional isolation (as measured by the absence of other social workers or mental health professionals on the base) would lead to decreased job satisfaction. This hypothesis was not supported by the results (Table 4.1). No significant differences in the mean satisfaction scores were found. It is interesting to note that those who reported being the only social work officers on the base and who reported that there were other mental health professionals on the base reported the highest satisfaction scores. This seems to affirm some of the previous research (Macoby, 1975; Cobb, 1975; Maslach, 1976). Contrary to what had been hypothesized, the "long rangers" did not have the lowest satisfaction scores. It was the AFSWOs who reported both other social work officers and other mental
health professionals on the base who had the lowest satisfaction scores. It appears that the presence of both of these classes of professionals in one place at the same time may result in the competition for the sharing of professional power and the "turf conflicts" that often result in such settings. All of this may lead to decreased levels of job satisfaction. Being the only social work officer on the base and not having any other mental health professionals assigned may have some drawbacks, but it apparently produces higher levels of job satisfaction. True professional isolation may be somewhat preferable to having too many other mental health professionals around. The most satisfying situation seems to involve being the only social work officer, but having the support of other mental health professionals to fall back on. This situation may provide the AFSWO with the best of two worlds. Not only are there other professionals present who form the necessary peer support condition, but the AFSWO benefits from being the only social work officer by having increased visibility, higher status, increased importance in the organizational structure, and the centralization of professional power in one person. This is a question for further research.

Hypothesis 2

This hypothesis held that the size of the organizational unit to which the AFSWO was assigned (as measured by
the number of medical personnel assigned to it) would be inversely related to the level of job satisfaction. Simply put, the larger the organizational unit, the less job satisfaction would be reported by the respondent and vice-versa. There was considerable previous research to support the hypothesis that smaller work units produce higher job satisfaction (Worthy, 1950; Viteles, 1953; Porter, 1963; Talacchi, 1960). However, such was not the case in this study. The hypothesis was not supported by the results (Table 4.2). There were no statistically significant differences between the mean satisfaction scores of the three groupings. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that as the size of the organization increased, the mean satisfaction scores did decline. While there were some factors in the organizational settings which apparently led to slightly higher satisfaction in smaller settings, it was not all that great and apparently did not make much of a difference to these AFSWOs.

**Hypothesis 3**

This hypothesis stated that location of the assignment in the United States would be related to increased job satisfaction whereas overseas assignments would be related to decreased levels of job satisfaction. The reasons for this is straightforward and uncomplicated. Overseas assignments do produce some rather positive benefits
such as travel and new cultural experiences. On the other hand, there are negative effects such as culture shock, unreimbursed moving expenses, higher costs of living, separation from either the nuclear or extended family, or probably both, and the stresses imposed by the general disruption of stable life patterns. All in all, the negatives should outweigh the positives. Very little research has been previously conducted directly on the impact of the geographical location of the job and job satisfaction. Most has centered on either the actual work environment of the job (Herzberg et al., 1957), or such environmental issues as city size (Katzell et al., 1961; Cureton and Katzell, 1962), and community economics (Hulin, 1966).

The results from the current study confirmed the hypothesis (Table 4.3). Those assigned to bases in the United States had statistically significant higher mean job satisfaction scores than their counterparts overseas. This indicates that in some situations such as the military or other jobs that involve significant job-related moves, the geographic location should not be overlooked when studying the overall level of job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4

This hypothesis held that the amount of perceived role conflict would be inversely related to the overall
level of job satisfaction. The job description of the Air Force Clinical Social Worker as contained in Air Force Regulation 36-1 (AFR 36-1) is contained in Appendix C. Previous research has concluded that increased levels of role conflict were associated with increased levels of job dissatisfaction (Kahn et al., 1964; Rainey, 1979; Lyons, 1971). Additionally, Kahn et al. (1964) had found that boundary spanning tasks in supervisory positions led to increased perceptions of role conflict. AFR 36-1 does not leave very much room for role ambiguity. However, as can been inferred from the contents of the regulation, the AFSWO is required to fulfill a number of roles both within the medical organization and on the base at large. It is as a result of these various duties which at times place the social worker on the boundaries between the hospital and other base organizations, the needs of the clients and the needs of the Air Force, and the social worker's own needs and those of others to whom he/she is responsible, that role conflict can often emerge. This hypothesis was conformed by the results (Table 4.4). A relatively small positive relationship was found between levels of role conflict and levels of job satisfaction. The relationship was significant at the .001 level. While at first thought one might expect the relationship to be stronger, it is possible that AFSWOs have learned to balance the needs of
the organization, their clients, and themselves to the degree that it does not impact as strongly on job satisfaction as one would anticipate.

Hypothesis 5

This hypothesis stated that personal factors such as age, gender, marital status, and military rank would not have any statistically significant impact on job satisfaction. The null hypothesis was proposed for these four factors.

Hypothesis 5(a)

Some previous research had found a positive linear relationship between age and the level of job satisfaction (Benge and Copell, 1947; Gibsen and Klein, 1970; Bernberg, 1954). Other research had presented a more mixed picture of the real relationship between these two variables (Lawrence, 1972). The age groupings used to test this hypothesis were discussed in the previous chapter. In the current study, the 20-year retirement point was assumed to be the focus of the AFSWO's career plans. With that in mind, it was thought that as the AFSWO progressed steadily toward that 20-year point (at which time voluntary retirement and military pension became important factors), the level of job satisfaction would increase both for the
reasons just mentioned as well as the fact that the AFSWO would have risen to higher levels of both rank and influence in the organization. Once one reached the 20-year point, it was assumed that those who stayed on active duty did so because they enjoyed their position and job role and consequently those over age 45 should have the highest levels of job satisfaction. While the mean satisfaction scores did increase in the direction predicted, the differences between these three age groups were not found to be statistically significant (Table 4.5). The results supported the original hypothesis and the null hypothesis was maintained.

**Hypothesis 5(b)**

Previous research on gender and job satisfaction had produced equivocal results at best (Peck, 1936; Chase, 1951; Cole, 1940; Stockford and Kunze, 1950). Some authors have studied gender as it relates to the other factors which then form the constellation of gender-related items such as differentials in pay, job level, and opportunity (Hulin and Smith, 1964). Jayaratne and Chess (1982) concluded from their study that gender, while it produced no significant differences in overall job satisfaction, did lead to different perspectives between the male and female social workers about the sources of overall job satisfaction.
The results from this current study are compared to their results. In this hypothesis gender was examined to see if female social workers who work in a predominantly male organization had any significantly different levels of job satisfaction.

Due to the nature of the regulations and laws both in the Air Force and in the federal government it was assumed that there were no differentials in pay, job level, or opportunity which could be attributed directly to gender alone. This assumption was made because any such purposeful discrimination within the Air Force organization would be in direct conflict with federal legislation and Air Force regulations. The results of the data did not support the null hypothesis (Table 4.6). Gender was found to be significantly related to differences in the mean job satisfaction scores between the male and female AFSWOs. As might be expected in a military organization that has a male value system, a male history, and is still predominantly male in composition, males had the higher mean satisfaction scores.

These results are different from those achieved by Jayaratne and Chess (1982). In their study the overall scores between the males and females were not significantly different. It was the specific items which led to the overall satisfaction which were different for males and
females. In the current study there were significant differences in the overall level of job satisfaction. This is probably related to the fact that Jayaratne and Chess (1982) used a national sample of members of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) which had a more balanced ratio of males to females. Often in civilian settings it is the male who practices social work in an organization which employs more female social workers. In the military, the picture is reversed and the females are in the minority. Given the reversal of roles, the fact that the females do not achieve as much job satisfaction as the males in the Air Force is not very surprising. This entire issue of gender differences and the influence of such gender-specific organizations as the military needs much further study.

Hypothesis 5(c)

Comparatively few studies have attempted to directly examine the relationship of overall job satisfaction and marital status. The few that have been conducted have focused on marital status as related to females and their job satisfaction (Wild and Dawson, 1972; Tropman, 1968). One study found that there was no relationship between marital status and job satisfaction (Herman et al., 1975). Marital status did not have any statistically significant
relationship to job satisfaction among AFSWOs, although the married officers did have a slightly higher mean satisfaction score (Table 4.7). The null hypothesis was confirmed in reference to marital status.

**Hypothesis 5(d)**

This hypothesis held that military rank would not have any significant impact on overall job satisfaction. Rank was considered a personal facet because it was bestowed on the individual and remained with that person. Military rank as such was not found to have been studied in previous job satisfaction research. A corrolary, job level, was found to be related to job satisfaction in some previous studies (Bergmann, 1981; Gurin et al., 1960; Saleh and Hyde, 1969). However, it is not clear at all that military rank is really the same as job level in an organization. The results did not support the null hypothesis (Table 4.8). Military rank was found to be significantly related to overall job satisfaction with the higher ranking officers having the higher mean job satisfaction scores. Since higher rank usually allows the officer to rise in the organizational hierarchy, these findings do seem related to those that had previously found positive relationships between higher job level and higher job satisfaction (Gurin et al., 1960). One can surmise
that higher job levels tend to fulfill more higher order needs and thereby produce higher job satisfaction (Cummings and El Salmi, 1970; Saleh and Hyde, 1969; Porter, 1963). It is possible that these findings also add weight to the argument that military rank really should be considered to be substantially the same concept as job level in a civilian organization. There are other factors associated with military rank, such as status in the organization, increased responsibility, and organizational power that may well be the actual forces leading to higher expressed levels of job satisfaction. These were not directly tested in this survey, but certainly need to be considered in future job satisfaction research which involves military officers.

COMPARISONS TO THE JAYARATNE AND CHESS (1982) STUDY

Jayaratne and Chess (1982) had conducted an analysis of some of their data by gender. The results of their study and of the current study are found in Table 4.9. As can be seen, they found that generally civilian male social workers had higher satisfaction scores than female social workers. In their study there were no significant differences by gender on the measure of overall job satisfaction. They did report that female social workers had significantly higher workloads and lower levels of comfort on the job.
Females were also significantly less satisfied with financial rewards and promotional opportunities than the males. In general, they concluded that the males and females in their study had similar levels of overall job satisfaction, but that there were different facets for each gender which went into determining the overall job satisfaction. They speculated that there may be different frames of reference which are used by males and females in assessing their own levels of job satisfaction. They suggested that this be considered in future research.

Their suggestion was followed and in this current study the same set of t-tests was conducted and the results are found in Table 4.9 for comparison purposes. There are some similarities and differences. The major difference is in the measure of overall job satisfaction. In the current study there were significant differences in the level of overall job satisfaction between male and female AFSWOs. In the current study males were more satisfied. The Air Force is an organization that is primarily male. It has a male value system and a tradition of male dominance. Even when one considers the societal changes of recent years, female social workers apparently are still experiencing more problems in the Air Force in having their needs met by the organizational structure. Role stresses associated with being female in a basically male setting
are probably part of this pattern.

Another difference is interesting. The female social work officers had a slightly more positive attitude toward the promotion system in the Air Force. The difference was not statistically significant but it may be saying something about the Air Force system. Females in the military may feel better about their promotion opportunities because they may have a better chance at promotion in the military than they might have in the civilian sector where males have long held a substantial monopoly on the movement to higher level positions in the organizational structure. Even in this male dominated military system, females may perceive that federal law and Air Force regulations give them a better opportunity at promotion.

In order to determine the effects of various job facets on job satisfaction, a standardized multiple regression was conducted. Originally, a comparison of the regression analysis was planned with those which Jayaratne and Chess (1982) had conducted. In their analyses they had controlled for gender and marital status. Similar regression analyses were not feasible in the current study because the data contained insufficient female and unmarried respondents. The smaller than desireable N of these two groups made use of the data with eight predictor variables in the regression analysis statistically inappropriate and results
would not be reliable. Consequently, a regression analysis was conducted using the same predictors as Jayaratne and Chess (1982) without controlling for either gender or marital status. The results are found in Table 4.10. The correlation matrix is found in Appendix K. The regression analyses of the Jayaratne and Chess study are found in Appendix J.

The most important predictor of job satisfaction for AFSWOs is the challenge of the job. This one variable alone explains 39% of the variance. In addition, the comfort of the job setting and the financial rewards of the job also emerge as statistically significant predictors, if not highly substantive predictors. As a group, these predictors account for 48% of the explained variance indicating that this model does have some usefulness in explaining the job satisfaction of AFSWOs.

Challenge measured items such as opportunities to develop abilities, interesting work, freedom of decision on the job, facing problems on the job that require significant use of personal and professional abilities, and the ability to see the results of one's work. In the Jayaratne and Chess (1982) study, both male and female social workers reported job challenge as the most important predictor of job satisfaction. In their study it explained 41% of the variance for males and 33% for the females. They speculated
that challenge substituted and compensated for the absence of such factors as high pay, status, and prestige which social work often experiences in relationship to other professions. This may not be the case in the Air Force.

In the Air Force pay is based on rank, not profession. Officers as a group have increased status within the organization. Prestige is difficult to measure, but it can be assumed that medical officers have a reasonable amount of prestige in the organization. The results from the current study may be saying something else. Perhaps the work in the Air Force, which is really more akin to industrial social work, does provide the diversity, ability to influence outcomes, and ability to be creative which in turn leads to the creative challenge of the job. This facet needs to be studied in greater detail in order to find just what it is that makes the job challenging.

Next in importance as a predictor was comfort. This measured such items as travel, amounts of work, physical surroundings, sufficient time to get the work done, freedom from conflicting demands, and hours spent on the job. These facets seem more closely related to lower order needs. This may well indicate that the AFSWOS want both the internal challenge and the type of external setting which has some level of comfort. It should be noted, however, that comfort added only about 5% to the explained variance.
This is a small amount in comparison to challenge.

The other significant predictor, financial reward, measured such items as pay, job security, and fringe benefits. In an organization in which officers are not segregated by profession in matters of pay, it is understandable that the AFSWOs would place emphasis on this facet. It is possible that social workers in the civilian sector are placing an increased emphasis on this facet. The results of the Jayaratne and Chess (1982) study indicated that financial rewards was a significant predictor for males, but not females. Possibly, this is related to the traditional role of the "male as breadwinner." Females, on the other hand, may have placed less emphasis on financial rewards because of their traditional role as "second income earners" in families. These gender differences need further study.

In the current study, the five remaining predictors were not found to contribute significantly to the explained variance. This model leaves approximately 56% of the variance unexplained. There are obviously some substantial issues involved in the job satisfaction of AFSWOs which were not directly addressed by the instrument used in this study. There may be something in the "personality" or environment of the organizational structure that accounts for this unexplained variance. This is fertile ground for further research.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, LIMITATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

SUMMARY

This study was undertaken for the general purpose of assessing the overall job satisfaction level of AFSWOS. The instrument used to measure this job satisfaction as well as the various facets involved in such satisfaction was the Professional Satisfaction Inventory originally developed by Jayaratne and Chess (1982) for their study of the work satisfaction and job stress among professional social workers in the United States. The instrument was only slightly modified for use in the current study to meet certain organizational and terminology needs of the Air Force setting. In all substantive respects, however, it remained unchanged. This approach was used in order to see if any significant differences existed between Air Force social workers and the civilian sample of social workers used by Jayaratne and Chess (1982).

Because the sample was dispersed throughout the world, the mailed questionnaire format was used. This included an original mailing and then two separate mailings which were sent to non-respondents. Confidentiality was
maintained by using a postcard returned under separate mailing to indicate that the questionnaire had been completed and mailed back. No identifying coding or information was on the questionnaire itself.

The dependent variable, overall job satisfaction, was measured by using a Likert scale which measured the respondent's global perception of how satisfied he/she was with his/her job as an Air Force Social Work Officer. The independent variables were measured, for the most part, in the same manner so that the social worker's perceptions of various job, personal, and organizational facets were examined.

Along with the general descriptive nature of this study, five hypotheses were tested using t-tests, f-tests, correlation, and standardized multiple regression.

CONCLUSIONS

Hypothesis 1

Professional isolation (as opposed to the professional peer support condition) will decrease the level of job satisfaction among AFSWOs.

Results: There was no statistically significant evidence to support the hypothesis. This held true under conditions where the AFSWO was the only social worker on the base and also in the situation where there were
other mental health professionals on the base.

**Hypothesis 2**

The size of the organizational unit to which the AFSWO was assigned will be inversely related to the level of job satisfaction.

**Results:** When the data was grouped into small, medium, and large size medical facilities, no statistically significant evidence was found to support the hypothesis that organization size has any real impact on the level of job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 3**

An overseas assignment (as opposed to one in the United States) is likely to decrease the level of job satisfaction.

**Results:** The results of the statistical analysis indicated that there was a significant difference between the mean job satisfaction scores of those AFSWOs assigned to bases in the United States and overseas. The difference was in the direction predicted with those in the United States having the higher mean satisfaction scores. The hypothesis was confirmed.
Hypothesis 4

The Air Force Social Work Officer's perception of role conflict will be inversely related to the level of job satisfaction.

Results: Statistically significant evidence was found that the level of perceived role conflict did have an effect on the level of job satisfaction. The data revealed that there was a mild positive relationship between role conflict and job satisfaction with lower levels of role conflict being related to higher levels of job satisfaction. The results confirmed the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 5

Personal factors such as age, gender, marital status and military rank will not be significantly related to job satisfaction scores (the null hypothesis).

Results: Age was divided into three groupings, those with ten or less years service, those with 11 to 20 years of service, and those with more than 20 years of service who could retire from the Air Force with full pensions at their discretion. No statistically significant evidence was found to support the relationship between age and job satisfaction. There was no apparent relationship and the null hypothesis was maintained.

Gender was found to have a statistically significant relationship with the level of job satisfaction. The
males had higher overall mean job satisfaction scores than their female counterparts. The null hypothesis was rejected in this case.

Marital status was not found to be significantly related to the level of job satisfaction. The null hypothesis was confirmed in this case.

Military rank was found to be significantly related to the level of job satisfaction. Senior officers (Majors, Lieutenant Colonels, and Colonels) had higher mean satisfaction scores than did the junior officers (First Lieutenants and Captains). The null hypothesis was rejected in this case.

COMPARISON TO THE PREVIOUS STUDY

The evidence from this study was compared to that from the Jayaratne and Chess (1982) study. The current study found significant differences in the overall level of job satisfaction and challenge on the job between the male and female AFSWOs. In both cases the males had higher mean satisfaction scores. In the previous study, males and females did not have significantly different levels of overall job satisfaction. They did, however, report significant differences in comfort, financial rewards, workload, and the promotion system. In all cases the males in their study had the higher mean scores on these items.
The results of the multiple regression analysis indicated job challenge was the best predictor of overall job satisfaction followed by comfort of the work setting and the entire package of financial rewards. Comparisons of the current study with the previous one in which multiple regression analysis was conducted while controlling for gender and marital status was not feasible in the current study because of insufficient female and unmarried N to make the statistical results reliable.

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT

The findings of this study bear directly on the institutional-occupational model shift discussed in Chapter 1. Since it appears that the military is shifting toward the occupational model, the study of job satisfaction of the organization's personnel takes on greater importance because the current personnel are bringing to their military roles a different set of values and expectations about the workplace itself and the significance of that work to their healthy psychological functioning. Granted, there is no direct evidence that increased job satisfaction leads to any increases in productivity on the job. A strong case can be made, however, that increased job satisfaction does improve the quality of the product or service rendered. AFSWOs are in a predominantly people-changing role. The
more that the Air Force organization can do to increase the job satisfaction of the personnel involved, presumably, the people-changing process will be more effective. This, in turn, may improve the overall level of functioning of the Air Force at large.

Within this development, two study findings deserve more study and follow-up. First, the concept of job challenge needs to be studied in greater detail. This one factor proved to be the strongest predictor of overall job satisfaction among AFSWOs. It also has gender implications in that males reported higher levels of challenge than their female counterparts. This is important. There is something in the role of Air Force social worker that challenges people professionally. If the Air Force can zero in on what it is, it can be effectively used to improve the job satisfaction of those on active duty and to attract competent social workers to an Air Force career.

Second, gender needs to be studied more closely. The general pattern that emerged in this study was that female social work officers were less satisfied in just about all aspects of their job role. This is not conducive to overall effective functioning of the Air Force. Approximately 20% of the active duty social workers are females. Finding and reducing the sources of dissatisfaction for these women can only have a positive effect on the overall
functioning of the social work program and the effectiveness of the social work corps to the overall Air Force mission.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

There is clear need for additional research efforts to follow up on the results of this study. In addition to exploring in further detail the facets used in this study to better understand their relationship to job satisfaction, future studies should attempt to identify the facets which account for better than 50% of the variance left unexplained by those in this study. Some recommendations for further study are as follows:

1. Some of the important variables in this study need further investigation. Specifically, job challenge needs to be investigated in further detail since it had such a strong impact on job satisfaction in both studies. The same can be said for role conflict, and military rank as related to job satisfaction.

2. The gender issue needs further examination. In most civilian settings males work as social workers in organizations often numerically dominated by females. The opposite is the case in the Air Force. Since females are a minority in
the Air Force Social Work Corps, this should be investigated separately to try to identify facets of the job that impact specifically on female AFSWOs. Since female AFSWOs consider job challenge to be important, further study is necessary to determine whether subtle barriers exist in the Air Force preventing women from fully participating in the most challenging assignments or tasks.

3. A similar study should be considered for social workers in other branches of the military services to see if similar results are achieved across organizational boundaries. Since different branches of the military have different missions and organizational milieus, it would be of interest to determine if such differences are identified and if they have any influence on the military social workers in these organizations. In connection with this, it may be that women, regardless of the branch of the service they are in, may be less satisfied with the military than males.

4. There is a need for some open-ended questions in surveys such as this to allow respondent's the opportunity to make more individualized
statements about the variables under study. This might allow these variables to be studied in greater detail using methods such as content analysis.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

When evaluating the results of this study, certain limitations need to be kept in mind.

1. The sample was limited to social workers in a specific branch of the military, namely the Air Force. In addition, the sample is composed predominantly of white, male social work officers. The results should be generalized to other non-Air Force or non-military settings with considerable caution.

2. This sample was not randomly selected. It is a sample of a pre-existing group although almost all the special population was sampled. The very fact that all respondents had voluntarily chosen to enter the Air Force could have produced a sample that has a self-selection bias. The same can be said for the fact that those who choose to respond to the survey. The results may have been quite different for those who did not choose to respond.
3. The limited number of female and unmarried respondents prevented the investigator from conducting some of the statistical analyses which were originally planned.

4. This is an ex post facto correlational study. While it is able to show whether or not there are any correlations between the independent variables and the dependent variables, no causal interpretations should be attempted since the investigator had no prior control over the independent variables.

5. The geographically dispersed nature of the population makes the mailed survey method the most practical one. However, such instruments usually require simpler questions and do not normally allow deeper investigation of the respondent's answers. Survey methods such as this one also only allow measurement of the variables at a specific point in time. This study is not able to measure any processes which may be occurring over time and which might produce different results.

CONCLUDING STATEMENTS

This study forms a basis for further research. The
investigator does not contend that all important factors which influence the job satisfaction of AFSWOs have been identified in this study. It is important to recognize that the hypotheses tested in this study, as well as any that may result directly from this study, are in need of much more research. Hopefully, identification and understanding of the factors which go into raising the overall level of job satisfaction will assist AFSWOs and their program managers in the Air Force to improve the usefulness of the Air Force Social Work Officer to their clients, the Air Force community, and the overall mission of the Air Force. It should be underscored that, in general, the AFSWOs in this study were quite satisfied with their jobs. The values of social workers, at least this self-selected group of them, do not seem to be on a collision course with the modern military organization.
APPENDIX A

U.S. Air Force Survey Approval Letter
 Request for Survey Approval (Capt Jablonski)

1. The Study of Job Satisfaction of Professional Air Force Social Workers (AFSWO) questionnaire contains some well designed questions that should allow you to obtain some interesting and significant data in regards to professional isolation and level of job satisfaction among AFSWOs. After a review by both this office and MPC/SG, this instrument has been approved for administration. The survey control number USAF SCN 83-62 (expires 31 Oct 83) has been assigned and should be referenced in all correspondence pertaining to the survey.

2. Questions regarding this matter may be directed to Sandra Paulson, AUTOVON 487-2449. Best of luck in your survey effort.

FOR THE COMMANDER

BERT K. ITOGA, Lt Col, USAF
Chief, Research & Measurement Div
APPENDIX B

Jayaratne and Chess Approval Letter
Mr. Daniel W. Jablonski
11133-A Pinehurst Drive
Austin, Texas 78747

Dear Mr. Jablonski:

Please excuse my delay in responding to your letter. I wanted to discuss your request with the other two authors prior to responding. I was able to do this at the recent meeting of the Council on Social Work Education in Fort Worth. We are all delighted with your interest and you have our permission to use the instrument, and we stand ready to assist in any other way possible.

Recently, I also discussed the matter with Cathy and suggested that she have you call me (405) 325-2821. The instrument is loaded with scales most of which have been used in other national studies. I'll give you the key to these scales when you call. The conceptual framework is a modification of the work done by Robert P. Quinn and Graham L. Staines in their national studies of the Quality of Employment (see: The 1977 Quality of Employment Survey, Survey Research Center, The University of Michigan). The other main sources of our approach was borrowed from Robert D. Caplan (see: Job Demands and Worker Health, also of the Survey Research Center).

Our conceptual framework for studying job satisfaction and burnout is contained (Chapter 9) in a recently published book by Pergamon Press entitled Stress and Burnout in the Human Service Professions (edited by Barry A. Farber).

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Wayne A. Chess
Professor
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APPENDIX C

Air Force Regulation 36-1
CLINICAL SOCIAL WORKER

1. SPECIALTY SUMMARY

Explores the basic personality structure in relationship to the development of behavioral patterns, mechanisms, and symptoms. Applies the principles, knowledge, and practice of professional social work in providing social diagnostic, treatment, research, consultation, and preventive social service programs for individuals, families, groups, and organizations in the military community.

2. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

a. Plans, manages, and provides social service in mental health, medical, correctional, CHAP and Child Advocacy, and any other appropriate professional military setting. Utilizes social case work, individual/group/family therapy techniques, administration, community organization, consultation, teaching, research, planning, and coordinated military and civilian health, education, and welfare services in assisting eligible personnel. Supervises and directs social work staff in preparing social histories and providing social services within their level of competence. Develops social work staff training programs to ensure uniformly high standards for the social service activities of technicians personnel. Assesses and plans for the social needs of individuals, families, groups, and organizations in the military community.

b. Coordinates social service activities and maintains liaison with military and civilian resources. Provides consultation on the social aspects of policies, procedures, and services to medical staff, commanders, base agencies, volunteers, major commands, and other installations of assignment. Administers and oversees all assigned social service programs. Assists in or develops resources and social service programs.

c. Conducts research and training. Conducts and participates in research appropriate to professional training and expertise. Develops and maintains an active information program designed to apprise the community of their social needs and resources available to assist with these problems. Trains social work students in affiliation with a university graduate social work program, and engages in education and training of other professional medical personnel.

3. SPECIALTY QUALIFICATIONS

a. Knowledge. Knowledge of social services policies, procedures, and resources is mandatory.

b. Education. Master's degree in social work from an accredited graduate school of social work is mandatory for entry into this AFS.

c. Experience. A minimum of 24 months of professional social work experience is mandatory.

4. SPECIALTY DATA

a. Grade Spread. Second lieutenant through colonel.

b. Related DOD Occupational Group: 5H
APPENDIX D

Survey Instrument
PROFESSIONAL SATISFACTION INVENTORY

A STUDY OF JOB SATISFACTION
AMONG PROFESSIONAL
AIR FORCE SOCIAL WORK OFFICERS

USAF SCN 83-62
Instructions:

The questions in this survey are of two types and are straight forward in their construction. Most questions can be answered by placing a check (/) in the appropriate response box. You can ignore the numbers in the boxes as they are used only for coding purposes.

Example:

14. What is your highest earned degree?  [ ] MSW  [ ] PhD/DSW

In this example, if your highest earned degree is a masters in Social Work (MSW), you would place a check in the response box labeled "1" or MSW.

Some questions will require a written response. This will often be in the form of a number.

Example:

15. When did you receive your highest degree?  1973 Year

If you received your MSW in 1973, you would place that number in the blank space.

All responses are voluntary. Hopefully you will reply to all questions and thereby increase the usefulness of this data.

After you finish:

As indicated in the cover letter, please place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope and mail it back to me. Also, mail the enclosed postcard separately. This tells me you have completed and mailed the questionnaire and whether or not you wish a copy of the findings. This postcard is also the procedure used to avoid sending follow-up questionnaires to people who have already responded.

Comments:

I have provided a space at the end of this questionnaire for any comments you may wish to make regarding this research and this survey instrument. Such comments will be helpful in improving this instrument and in assessing your needs and interests in this research effort.

Thanks,

Daniel W. Jablonski, Ph.D.
USA, B.S.  1947  A.F.  1956  Ph.D.  1963
Clinical Social Worker
Here are some questions about your assignment.

3. To which State (or Country, if overseas) are you presently assigned? 

4. To which Command are you assigned? 

5. What is the size of the base to which you are currently assigned? (CHECK ONLY ONE)

6. How many personnel work at the particular facility to which you are assigned?

Now here are some questions about yourself:

7. What is your age? 

8. What is your sex? 

9. What is your military rank?

10. How many years of commissioned service do you have as an Air Force social worker? 

11. How many total years of military service do you have? 

12. What is your ethnic background:

13. Are you currently:

14. What is your personal income from your job per year before taxes?
20. Considering your education, knowledge, ability, experience, and how hard you work, do you think you are?

- OVERPAID A GREAT DEAL
- OVERPAID SOMEWHAT
- PAID ABOUT RIGHT
- UNDERPAID SOMEWHAT
- UNDERPAID A GREAT DEAL

21. What is your family income before taxes?
- LESS THAN $20,000
- $20,001 - $30,000
- $30,001 - $40,000
- $40,001 - $50,000
- $50,001 - $60,000
- OVER $60,000

24. What is your highest earned degree?
- MSW
- PhD/DSW

25. When did you receive your highest degree? _____ YEAR

26. Are you a member of the Academy of Certified Social Workers (ACSW)?
- YES
- NO

27. How many different social work positions including your current one have you held?

28. How long have you held your present position (current job title)? _____ YEARS

29. About how many hours per week do you work in a typical work week? _____ HOURS

30. What is your typical caseload (that is, the number of active cases) per month?

32. Do you consider this caseload to be too high, about right or too low?
- TOO HIGH
- ABOUT RIGHT
- TOO LOW

33. Which method of social work practice best characterizes your present work?

- CASEWORK
- COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION
- GROUP WORK
- SUPERVISION
- ADMINISTRATION
- OTHER (SPECIFY)

34. Which one of the following settings best characterizes your current practice situation?

- MENTAL HEALTH
- TRAFFIC PROGRAM
- MEDICAL SOCIAL WORK
- CORRECTIONS
- SUBSTANCE ABUSE
- TEACHING
- FAMILY VIOLENCE
- OTHER (SPECIFY)
24. Is there any group of people at your work place that you think of as your co-workers—people whom you see just about every day and with whom you have to work closely in order to do your job well?

1) Yes  2) No  3) Skip to Q. 27

25. About how many people are there in this work group?

26. How thinking about these co-workers, how true is it generally that they...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very True</th>
<th>Somewhat True</th>
<th>A Little True</th>
<th>Not At All True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. are warm and friendly when you are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>troubled about something?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. listen attentively to you when you need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to talk about something?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. show approval when you do something well?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. show understanding when you are upset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or irritable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Including yourself, how many social workers are assigned to your base?

28. How many other helping professionals (psychiatrists, psychologists, and mental health professionals, not social workers) are assigned to your base?

29. Of your total work time in your agency last week, indicate approximately what percentage of your time was spent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. in direct contact with your clients (in person or phone)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. in travel (to see clients or other agency-related work)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. in direct contact with other agency staff (staff meetings, supervision)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. in work with other base or community agencies (planning)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. in administrative duties (paperwork)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. in other activities (staff training, professional reading, etc)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 100 PERCENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Here are some statements that describe the work situation. Please indicate how true you feel each statement is of YOUR JOB (CHECK ONE BOX PER STATEMENT).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Description</th>
<th>Very True</th>
<th>Somewhat True</th>
<th>A Little True</th>
<th>Not At All True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I am given a lot of chances to make friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The chances for promotion are good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I have the opportunity to develop my own special abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Travel to and from work is convenient.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I never seem to have enough time to get everything done on my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Very True</td>
<td>Somewhat True</td>
<td>A Little True</td>
<td>Not At All True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The work is interesting.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The pay is good.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. I am given a lot of freedom to decide how to do my own work.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. I am given a chance to do the things I do best.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. The job security is good.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. On my job, I can't satisfy everybody at the same time.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. My fringe benefits are good.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. The physical surroundings are pleasant.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. I can see the results of my work.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. I can forget about my personal problems.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. I have enough time to get the job done.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. I am free from the conflicting demands that others make of me.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. The hours are good.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Promotions are handled fairly.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. The people I work with take a personal interest in me.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. I have too much work to do everything well.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. My employer is concerned about giving everybody a chance to get ahead.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z. To satisfy some people on my job, I have to upset others.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa. The people I work with are friendly.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. In thinking of your work this past year, how would you rate...

- a. your knowledge of the subject matter in your area of practice? | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
- b. your enthusiasm about doing this same work next year? | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
- c. your colleagues in the agency on their effectiveness as social workers? | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
- d. your mastery of the practice method(s) relevant to your job? | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
32. Thinking about your performance last year, how successful would you say you were in your professional work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Successful</th>
<th>Somewhat Successful</th>
<th>Somewhat Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Very Unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Is there one particular person you think of as your supervisor (someone directly over you)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Skip to Q. 37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. How true is it that this supervisor... (Check one box per statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. is warm and friendly when you are troubled about something?</th>
<th>Very True</th>
<th>Somewhat True</th>
<th>A Little True</th>
<th>Not At All True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. listens attentively to you when you need to talk about something?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. shows approval when you do something well?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. shows understanding when you are upset or irritable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. has clear expectations of you in your job performance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. is helpful to you in getting the job done?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Is this supervisor a man or a woman?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Woman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Is this supervisor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>Chicano/Mexican-American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Afro-American</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. Do you feel in any way discriminated against on your job because of your race, age, sex, or for other reasons? (Check one box per statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Age</th>
<th>Feel This Way Frequently</th>
<th>Feel This Way Sometimes</th>
<th>Never Feel This Way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
39. How many professional conferences or workshops did you attend last year (do not include your \textit{facility}-s training workshops or seminars)?

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
NUMBER & IF MORE SKIP TO Q. 41 \hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

39. How many of these meetings were:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
1 & In-state & NUMBER & 3 & In-country & NUMBER \hline
2 & Out-of-state & NUMBER & 4 & Out-of-country & NUMBER \hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

40. Approximately how many dollars of reimbursement did you obtain from the NSF for attending these conferences or workshops and what percent of the total cost of these conferences did this reimbursement cover?

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
DOLLARS & PERCENT \hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

41. Here are some questions about how people feel about themselves and their job. When you think about yourself and your job these days, how much of the time do you feel this way? (CHECK ONE BOX PER STATEMENT)

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
Never Or Little Of Some Of A Good Part Of Most Of & The Time & The Time & The Time \\
\hline
a. feel nervous? & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \hline
b. feel irritated? & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \hline
c. feel jittery? & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \hline
d. feel calm? & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \hline
e. feel unhappy? & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \hline
f. feel good? & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \hline
g. feel angry? & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \hline
h. feel depressed? & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \hline
i. feel fidgety? & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \hline
j. feel blue? & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \hline
k. feel cheerful? & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \hline
l. feel sad? & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does your job involve direct contact with clients?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here are some statements of job-related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and decide how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement. Place a check on the number on the scale that comes closest to your feelings.

a. I can easily understand how my clients feel about things.

b. I feel I treat some of my clients as if they were "impersonal" objects.

c. I deal very effectively with the problems of my clients.

d. I have become more callous toward people since I took this job.

e. I feel I am positively influencing people's lives through my work.

f. I feel that this job is hardening me emotionally.

g. I feel very energetic.

h. I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my clients.

i. I feel exhilarated after working closely with my clients.

j. I feel clients blame me for some of their problems.

k. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.

l. In my job, I deal with emotional problems very calmly.

m. I feel "burned-out" from my work.

n. When I am unsuccessful with a client, it is usually my fault.

o. I don't really care what happens to some clients.

Thinking about the clients you served last year, how successful would you say you were in your professional work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
46. Taking everything into consideration, how likely is it that you will make a genuine effort to resign your commission and leave the Air Force within the next year?

1. VERY LIKELY
2. SOMEWHAT LIKELY
3. NOT AT ALL LIKELY

47. Why is that?

48. Read each of the following pairs of statements. Please select the one statement of each pair, which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you are concerned. Obviously, there are no right or wrong answers. (CHECK EITHER BOX 1 OR 2 IN EACH PAIR)

a. 1. Without the right breaks, one cannot be an effective leader.
   OR-
   2. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

b. 1. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
   OR-
   2. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

c. 1. What happens to me is my own doing.
   OR-
   2. Sometimes I feel I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

d. 1. Knowing the right people is important in deciding whether a person will get ahead.
   OR-
   2. People will get ahead in life if they have the goods and do a good job; knowing the right people has nothing to do with it.

e. 1. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
   OR-
   2. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

f. 1. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
   OR-
   2. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyway.

g. 1. In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
   OR-
   2. Many times, we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

h. 1. People who don't do well in life often work hard, but the breaks just don't come their way.
   OR-
   2. Some people just don't use the breaks that come their way. If they don't do well, it's their own fault.

i. 1. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
   OR-
   2. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck play an important role in my life.
5. In the long run, the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
6. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.
7. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
8. There really is no such thing as "luck."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. trouble breathing or shortness of breath?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. pains in back or spine?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. becoming very tired in a short time?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. having trouble getting to sleep?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. finding it difficult to get up in the morning?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. find your heart pounding or racing?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. hands sweating so that they feel damp and clammy?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. poor appetite?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. spells of dizziness?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. having trouble staying asleep?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. having an upset stomach?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. having headaches?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. All in all, how much stress would your job impose on you?
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
   A Great Deal | Some Degree | Very Little | None At All |

51. How much would you say this stress impacts on your work performance in a negative way?
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
   A Great Deal | Some Degree | Very Little | None At All |

52. Here is a list of things that many people look for or want out of life. Please study the list carefully and indicate which one of them is the most important and which one of them is the least important to you.

   MOST IMPORTANT (RANKED)
   LEAST IMPORTANT (RANKED)

   1. SENSE OF SAFETY AND SECURITY
   2. WARM AND LOVING RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHERS
   3. SELF-RESPECT
   4. FINANCIAL SECURITY
   5. SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT
53. Here are some statements about how people feel. Some people agree with them, others disagree with them. Please indicate by placing a check in the appropriate box whether you strongly agree, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, or strongly disagree with the item. (CHECK ONE BOX PER STATEMENT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. I wish I could have more respect for myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. At times, I think I am no good at all.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. Overall, how satisfied are you with your life these days?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Too Satisfied</th>
<th>Not At All Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire. Please feel free to write any comments in the space below.
APPENDIX E

CODING MANUAL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Item Description and Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Respondent's ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STCNT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>State or Country of Assign-ment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>036</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
038 Oregon
039 Pennsylvania
040 Rhode Island
041 South Carolina
042 South Dakota
043 Tennessee
044 Texas
045 Utah
046 Vermont
047 Virginia
048 Washington
049 West Virginia
050 Wisconsin
051 Wyoming

Overseas

Europe (USAFF)
060 Great Britain
061 Greece
062 Italy
063 Netherlands
064 Portugal
065 Spain
066 Turkey
067 West Germany

Orient (PACAF)
070 Guam
071 Japan
072 Okinawa
073 Phillipines
074 South Korea

USAF Major Command to Which Assigned

Major Air Force Commands
01 Tactical Air Command (TAC)
02 Strategic Air Command (SAC)
03 Military Airlift Command (MAC)
04 Air University (AU)
05 Air Training Command (ATC)
06 U.S. Air Forces Pacific (PACAF)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Size to Base to Which Assigned</td>
<td>1 to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAB</td>
<td>Personnel Assigned to the Base Medical Facility</td>
<td>1 to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGF</td>
<td>Respondent's Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFX</td>
<td>Respondent's Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANK</td>
<td>Military Rank of Respondent</td>
<td>1 to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YC</td>
<td>Years of Commissioned Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYS</td>
<td>Total Years of Military Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHN</td>
<td>Ethnicity of Respondent</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Marital Status of Respondent</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Personal Income of Respondent</td>
<td>1 to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAP</td>
<td>Feelings About Pay*</td>
<td>1 to 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>Respondent's Family Income</td>
<td>1 to 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reverse Coded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HED</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Highest Earned Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDF</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>When Degree was Earned (Year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACSW</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Respondent's Professional Certification Through the Academy of Certified Social Workers*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSWPH</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Number of Social Work Positions Held in Career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCP</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Time Held Current Position (Years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTW</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hours in a Typical Work Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STCM</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Size of Typical Caseload per Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Consider Caseload Right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOP</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Method of Social Work Practice Range: 1 to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Setting of Current Practice Range: 1 to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Have Work Group (Co-Workers)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWG</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Number in Work Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWWF</td>
<td>26a</td>
<td>Co-Workers Warm and Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWLA</td>
<td>26b</td>
<td>Co-Workers Listen Attentively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWSA</td>
<td>26c</td>
<td>Co-Workers Show Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWSU</td>
<td>26d</td>
<td>Co-Workers Show Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOB</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Social Workers on the Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHPOB</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Other Mental Health Professionals on the Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTDC</td>
<td>29a</td>
<td>% Time in Direct Client Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTT</td>
<td>29b</td>
<td>% Time in Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCAS</td>
<td>29c</td>
<td>% Time in Contact With Agency Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reverse Coded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTBCA</td>
<td>29d % Time in Base/Community Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTAD</td>
<td>29e % Time in Administrative Duties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTOA</td>
<td>29f % Time in Other Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMF</td>
<td>30a Chance to Make Friends*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPG</td>
<td>30b Changes for Promotion Good*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODSA</td>
<td>30c Opportunity to Develop Special Abilities*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWG</td>
<td>30d Travel to Work Convenient*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFT</td>
<td>30e Never Enough Time on Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAEAW</td>
<td>30f Not Asked to do Excessive Amounts of Work*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>30g Work is Interesting*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>30h Pay is Good*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFD</td>
<td>30i Given Freedom to Decide How To Work*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDB</td>
<td>30j Change to do Things I Like Best*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSG</td>
<td>30k Job Security is Good*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESHE</td>
<td>30l Problems Expected to Solve Are Hard Enough*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCSFT</td>
<td>30m Can't Satisfy Everybody at Same Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCJ</td>
<td>30n Supervisor is Competent in Job*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBG</td>
<td>30o Fringe Benefits Good*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>30p Physical Surroundings Pleasant*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRW</td>
<td>30q Can See Results of Work*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPP</td>
<td>30r Can Forget Personal Problems*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Card Number 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Respondent's ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTJD</td>
<td>30s Enough Time to Get Job Done*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCD</td>
<td>30t Free From Conflicting Demands*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HG</td>
<td>30u Hours Are Good*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHF</td>
<td>30v Promotions Handled Fairly*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI</td>
<td>30w People Take Personal Interest*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWDW</td>
<td>30x Too Much Work to do Well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECFC</td>
<td>30y Employer Concerned About Giving Fair Chance*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reverse Coded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSOU</td>
<td>30z</td>
<td>To Satisfy Some, Others Upset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWF</td>
<td>30aa</td>
<td>People at Work Friendly*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSM</td>
<td>31a</td>
<td>Knowledge of Subject Matter*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESW</td>
<td>31b</td>
<td>Enthusiasm for Same Work Next Year*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>31c</td>
<td>Colleague's Effectiveness*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPM</td>
<td>31d</td>
<td>Mastery of Practice Method*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSJP</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>How Successful in Professional Work*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>One Person as Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWF</td>
<td>34a</td>
<td>Supervisor Warm and Friendly*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>34b</td>
<td>Supervisor Listens Attentively*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>34c</td>
<td>Supervisor Shows Approval*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSU</td>
<td>34d</td>
<td>Supervisor Shows Understanding*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF</td>
<td>34e</td>
<td>Supervisor Has Clear Expectations*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHJD</td>
<td>34f</td>
<td>Supervisor Helpful in Getting Job Done*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Supervisor's Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Supervisor's Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAGF</td>
<td>37a</td>
<td>Age Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRACF</td>
<td>37b</td>
<td>Race Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSFX</td>
<td>37c</td>
<td>Sex Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOTHER</td>
<td>37d</td>
<td>Other Type Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCWA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Professional Conferences Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>39a</td>
<td>How Many In-State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOS</td>
<td>39b</td>
<td>How Many Out-of-State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC</td>
<td>39c</td>
<td>How Many In-Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOC</td>
<td>39d</td>
<td>How Many Out-of-Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOLLS</td>
<td>40a</td>
<td>Dollars Reimbursed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCR</td>
<td>40b</td>
<td>% Reimbursed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td>41a</td>
<td>Feel Nervous*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>41b</td>
<td>Feel Irritated*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reverse Coded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FJ</td>
<td>41c</td>
<td>Feel Jittery*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>41d</td>
<td>Feel Calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUH</td>
<td>41e</td>
<td>Feel Unhappy*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>41f</td>
<td>Feel Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>41g</td>
<td>Feel Angry*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD</td>
<td>41h</td>
<td>Feel Depressed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>41i</td>
<td>Feel Fidgety*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>41j</td>
<td>Feel Blue*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCH</td>
<td>41k</td>
<td>Feel Cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>41l</td>
<td>Feel Sad*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWJ</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Satisfaction With Job*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIDCC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Job Involves Direct Client Contact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUCL</td>
<td>44a</td>
<td>Easily Understand How Clients Feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCIO</td>
<td>44b</td>
<td>Treat Some Clients as Personal Objects*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPC</td>
<td>44c</td>
<td>Deal Effectively with Problems of Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMC</td>
<td>44d</td>
<td>Become Callous With Job*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIPL</td>
<td>44e</td>
<td>Positively Influencing People's Lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHF</td>
<td>44f</td>
<td>Job is Hardening Me Emotionally*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>44g</td>
<td>Feel Energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECRAC</td>
<td>44h</td>
<td>Easily Create Relaxed Atmosphere with Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWC</td>
<td>44i</td>
<td>Exhilarated by Work With Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBPM</td>
<td>44j</td>
<td>Clients Blame me for Problems*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWJ</td>
<td>44k</td>
<td>Accomplished Worthwhile Things on the Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWEP</td>
<td>44l</td>
<td>Deal with Emotional Problems Calmly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>44m</td>
<td>Feel Burned-Out*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUCMF</td>
<td>44n</td>
<td>When Unsuccessful with Clients, It's My Fault*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCHSC</td>
<td>44o</td>
<td>Don't Care What Happens To Some Clients*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSJC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>How Successful Are You on Job With Clients*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSNJ</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>How Likely That You Will Leave the Service Next Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reverse Coded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBTO</td>
<td>48a</td>
<td>Right Breaks or Take Advantage of Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWMD</td>
<td>48b</td>
<td>What Will Happen Will or Make Decision to Take Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODNC</td>
<td>48c</td>
<td>My Own Doing or No Control Over Direction of Life*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPGJ</td>
<td>48d</td>
<td>Knowing Right People or Do Good Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Card Number 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent's ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLMM</td>
<td>48e</td>
<td>Bad Luck or Mistakes Made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWMF</td>
<td>48f</td>
<td>Make Plans Work or Matter of Fortune*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLFC</td>
<td>48g</td>
<td>Little To Do With Luck or Flip a Coin*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBOF</td>
<td>48h</td>
<td>No breaks of Own Fault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINC</td>
<td>48i</td>
<td>Little Influence Over Things or Not Luck That Plays Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGLA</td>
<td>48j</td>
<td>Bad Balanced By Good or Lack of Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHNL</td>
<td>48k</td>
<td>Accidental Happenings or No Such Thing as Luck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>49a</td>
<td>Trouble Breathing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>49b</td>
<td>Pains in Back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TST</td>
<td>49c</td>
<td>Tired in Short Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGS</td>
<td>49d</td>
<td>Trouble Getting to Sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGUM</td>
<td>49e</td>
<td>Difficult to Get Up in Morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPR</td>
<td>49f</td>
<td>Heart Pounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>49g</td>
<td>Hands Sweating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>49h</td>
<td>Poor Appetite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>49i</td>
<td>Dizzy Spells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSA</td>
<td>49j</td>
<td>Trouble Staying Asleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>49k</td>
<td>Upset Stomach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>49l</td>
<td>Headaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIBJ</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Stress Imposed by Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIWP</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Stress Impacts Work Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reverse Coded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MID</th>
<th>52a</th>
<th>Most Important Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LID</td>
<td>52b</td>
<td>Least Important Dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPW</td>
<td>53a</td>
<td>Feel I'm A Person of Worth*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNGQ</td>
<td>53b</td>
<td>Feel I Have a Number of Good Qualities*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>53c</td>
<td>Feel I'm a Failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDGAO</td>
<td>53d</td>
<td>Feel I Do Things as Well as Others*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMPO</td>
<td>53e</td>
<td>Feel Not Much To be Proud Of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPATM</td>
<td>53f</td>
<td>Take Positive Attitude Toward Self*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWM</td>
<td>53g</td>
<td>Satisfied with Myself*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMRM</td>
<td>53h</td>
<td>Wish More Respect for Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUAT</td>
<td>53i</td>
<td>Feel Useless at Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGAA</td>
<td>53j</td>
<td>No Good At All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSWL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Overall Satisfaction With Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Card Number 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBScales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SC26</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>Emotional Support of Co-Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Score = total of 26a+b+c+d</td>
<td>Range: 4 to 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Score = more emotional support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SC30CMF</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Score = total of 30d+f+p+r+s+t+u</td>
<td>Range: 7 to 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Score = greater comfort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SC30CEL</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Score = total of 30c+g+i+j+1+q</td>
<td>Range: 6 to 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher Score = greater challenge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reverse coded
SC30FR  30  Financial Rewards
*Score = total of 30h+k+o
Range: 3 to 12
Higher Score = greater financial rewards

SC30RWC  30  Social Relationship With Co-Workers
*Score = total of 30a+w+aa
Range: 3 to 12
Higher Score = better relationship

SC30PRCM  30  Promotions
*Score = total of 30b+v+y
Range: 3 to 12
Higher Score = better feelings about the promotion system

SC30RC  30  Role Conflict
*Score = total of 30e+m+x+z
Range: 4 to 16
Lower Score = higher role conflict

SC30SUPC  30  Supervisory Competence
*Score = 30n
Range: 1 to 4
Higher Score = higher competence

SC34SFS  34  Supervisor Emotional Support
*Score = total of 34a+b+c+d+e+f
Range: 6 to 24
Higher Score = more support

SC44IPRS  44  Impersonalization
*Score = total of 44b+d+f+o
Range: 4 to 28
Lower Score: more impersonalization

*Reverse Coded
SC44PACC 44  
Personal Accomplishment  
*Score = total of 44a+c+e+g+h+i+k+l  
Range: 8 to 56  
Higher Score = more feeling of accomplishment

SC44ATT 44  
Attribution  
*Score = total of 44j+n  
Range: 2 to 14  
Lower Score = more attribution of blame

SC41EWL 41  
Emotional Wellness  
*Score = total of 41a thru 1  
Range: 12 to 48  
Lower Score = more emotional distress

SC48LOC 48  
Locus of Control  
*Score = total of 48a thru k  
Recode: a, b, d, e, h, i, j, k (1=0; 2=1)  
Recode: c, f, q (1=1; 2=0)  
Range: 0 to 11  
Higher Score = internal locus of control

SC49PHWL 49  
Physical Wellness  
*Score = total of 49a thru 1  
Range: 11 to 48  
Lower Score = more physical distress

SC53SF 53  
Self-Esteem  
*Score = total of 53a thru j  
Recode: a, b, d, f, g  
Range: 10 to 40  
Higher Score = more self-esteem

* Reverse Coded
APPENDIX F

Follow-Up Letter 1
I am on an AFIT assignment at the University of Texas as a doctoral candidate in social work. As my dissertation topic I have chosen to examine the level of job satisfaction among the professional social work officers in the Air Force. This study has the approval of the USAF (SCN 83-62).

The enclosed questionnaire asks questions about you, your work environment, and your job. It will take about 30 minutes of your time to answer the questions. While I am fully aware that this is a significant time commitment, I believe that you will find the questions interesting and worthwhile.

I need to have completed questionnaires from everyone in order to accurately assess the dimensions of our work role in the Air Force and its impact on levels of job satisfaction.

Your answers to all of the questions are, of course, voluntary and will be kept strictly confidential. The answers which you provide will be pooled with those of the other respondents and no identifying information of any kind will be used in the study results.

I would appreciate your completing the questionnaire and returning it to me as quickly as possible. I have enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope for this purpose. There will be no way for me to identify any of the returned questionnaires. I am asking you, therefore, to mail the enclosed postcard to me separately so that I will know that you have completed and returned the questionnaire. This will help me save both time and expense as I will be able to determine who has not responded and then mail follow-up questionnaires only to those people. There is also a place on the postcard where you can indicate whether you want to receive a summary of the findings of this study. In a small way sharing these findings about our profession will be my way of saying "thanks" for your time and help.

Your answers are very important to the goals of this study. I really appreciate your assistance.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Daniel W. Jablonski, Capt, USAF BSC
Clinical Social Worker
Doctoral Candidate in Social Work
APPENDIX G

Privacy Act Statement
APPENDIX G

PRIVACY STATEMENT

In accordance with AFR 12-35, paragraph 8, the following information is provided as required by the Privacy Act of 1974:

a) Authority:

(1) 5 U.S.C. 301, Departmental Regulations, and/or

(2) 10 U.S.C. 8012, Secretary of the Air Force, Powers, Duties, Delegation by Compensation; and/or

(3) DOD Instruction 1100.13, 17 April 68, Surveys of Department of Defense Personnel; and/or

b) Principal Purposes. The survey is being conducted to collect information to be used in research aimed at illuminating and providing inputs to the solution of interest to the Air Force and/or DOD.

c) Routine Uses. The survey data will be converted to information for use in research of management related problems. Results of the research, based on the data provided, will be included in a written master's thesis or doctoral dissertation and may also be included in published articles, reports, or texts. Distribution of the results of the research, based on the survey data, whether in written form or presented orally, will be unlimited.

d) Participation in this survey is entirely voluntary.

e) No adverse action of any kind may be taken against any individual who elects not to participate in any or all of this survey.
APPENDIX H

Follow-Up Letter 2
About a month ago I sent you a questionnaire which I am using to gather data about our corps and which will be used to complete my APIT sponsored doctoral dissertation. To date, I have not received a response from you. I realize that it is possible that, if you did respond, the letter has been lost in the postal system. If you did previously respond, you can ignore this package and discard it. Let me say now, "thanks" for your assistance. If, however, you didn't get around to completing the questionnaire or have lost it, I've enclosed another one. Please consider taking some time to complete it.

Your answers will be voluntary and are strictly confidential. All answers will be pooled with those of all the other respondents and no identifying information of any kind will be in the study results. I have enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope for you to use in returning the questionnaire to me. Since there will be no way for me to know who has returned a questionnaire, I have also enclosed a stamped, addressed postcard which you can complete and return to me separate from the survey questionnaire. In this way I will be able to determine who has completed and returned the questionnaire.

From past experience I know just how hard it can be to take the time to complete another questionnaire during an already busy day. I understand and can only assure you that your responses are very important to this study.

Once again, "thanks" for taking the time to help in completing this study. I hope in some way that it will benefit all of us.

Sincerely,

Daniel W. Jablonksi, Capt., USAF
Clinical Social Worker
Doctoral Candidate in Social Work
APPENDIX I

Follow-Up Letter 3
A few weeks ago I sent you a follow-up survey package which I am using to obtain data on the social work corps in the Air Force. This data will be used to complete my AFIT sponsored doctoral dissertation. To date, I still have not received a response from you. If you have not yet taken the time to complete the questionnaire, I am asking that you take the time to do so. I assure you that your responses are important to this study and to the responses of the Air Force to the study results. It really won't take that much time to complete.

Keep in mind that this survey is both confidential and participation is voluntary. In no way will you be identified as an individual. All the data will be pooled with that of the other respondents. After completing the survey, please sign and return the enclosed postcard separately so that I will know you have completed the questionnaire. Your questionnaire should be mailed separately in the enclosed stamped and addressed envelope.

I know from my own past experiences how many demands our roles as social workers in the Air Force can make on our limited time resources. But if we are to understand in a better way the role and needs of Air Force social workers, information from persons such as you are of the utmost importance. Please consider completing the survey questionnaire as soon as you can.

Sincerely,

Daniel W. Jablonski, Capt, USAF
Clinical Social Worker
Doctoral Candidate in Social Work
APPENDIX J

Regression Analysis from Jayaratne and Chess Study
APPENDIX J

CORRELATES OF JOB SATISFACTION

Table 2
Regression Analysis of Job Facets on Job Satisfaction by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t-statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-0.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>6.980***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>0.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Rewards</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>3.623***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.913**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.304*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-0.277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p .05
** p .005
*** p .001

R = .74
R^2 = .55
R = .65
R^2 = .42
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Correlation Matrix
APPENDIX K

ZERO ORDER CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DEPENDENT AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status (MS)</th>
<th>-0.126</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feelings About Pay (FAP)</td>
<td>0.175 0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge (SC30CHL)</td>
<td>0.621 -0.114 0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort (SC30CMF)</td>
<td>0.451 -0.032 0.134 0.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Rewards (FR)</td>
<td>0.438 -0.031 0.501 0.461 0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions (SC30PRO)</td>
<td>0.439 -0.027 0.075 0.498 0.276 0.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict (SC30RC)</td>
<td>0.268 -0.090 0.045 0.132 0.541 0.048 0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload (CCR)</td>
<td>0.149 0.091 0.055 0.072 0.403 -0.019 0.008 0.311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Feelings About Pay</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
<th>Financial Rewards</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Caseload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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