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The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between social work supervision and employee job satisfaction. The study analyzed the facets of job satisfaction in order to ascertain which facet was the best predictor of job satisfaction for social workers.

Research was conducted through mailing questionnaires to members of the National Association of Social Workers, North Georgia Unit in metropolitan Atlanta. The study participants were selected through the systematic and stratified processes. A total sample of 121 respondents were utilized in this study. The independent variables of the study were gender, age, education, ethnicity, years of experience and professional orientation. The questionnaire consisted of three instruments. Carlton Munson’s Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire, Alfred Kadushin’s Supervisor Satisfaction Questionnaire and the Job Description Index which was developed by Patricia Smith, Lorne Kendall and Charles Hulin. The Job Description Index
measured the five facets of job satisfaction: work, pay, promotional opportunities, co-workers and supervision.

The findings of the study indicated a statistically significant relationship between supervision and job satisfaction; there was no statistically significant relationship between gender, ethnicity, age, educational level and years of experience and job satisfaction of social workers. Findings further revealed that there was no statistically significant relationship between gender, ethnicity, age, educational level and professional orientation of the supervisor and job satisfaction of the social worker; and of the five facets, promotional opportunities was found to be the best predictor of job satisfaction.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The need for supervision has long been recognized in the field of social work. Professional social workers have indicated that a lack of supervision is a major contributor of low job satisfaction, which in turn is a major contributor to job related stress or burnout. It is well understood that job related stress and burnout can result in ineffective social work practice. Because supervision has been directly associated with the level of social worker job satisfaction, the overall effectiveness of social work practice can be impacted by the relationship between the supervision and social worker job satisfaction.

Social work practice began in the early 1800s and was built on a foundation of supervision. During the nineteenth century Charity Organization Movement, middle-aged women known as "friendly visitors" voluntarily visited indigent families in their homes. According to Brieland (1993), the friendly visitors' activities were influenced by the English Poor Laws. The Poor Laws, which were not codified until 1901 but were widely accepted in the American colonies, required local governments to: take responsibility for the assistance of the indigent; return needy individuals to
their place of birth; obtain aid for the needy; and disqualify "sturdy beggars," i.e., individuals who were considered to be able-bodied and employable. The friendly visitors were what would now be considered direct service social workers.

Charity organization societies customarily assigned the friendly visitors to work with a limited number of families. The friendly visitors were difficult to recruit, however, and were easily discouraged or frustrated with their tasks. According to Kadushin (1985), "limited caseloads coupled with high turnover of volunteers meant that the agencies faced a continuous problem of recruiting, training and directing new visitors." Therefore, the societies employed "paid agents" to provide administrative guidance and training. The paid agents' responsibilities also included providing support and stimulation to discouraged visitors. Kadushin (1985) indicated that one way of showing supervisory support was to applaud the visitors for accomplishments with the client system or families with whom they were working. He described the paid agents as displaying sensitivity and concern for the needs of the visitors. These paid agents were what could be considered modern day supervisors. In the late 1800s, there were a total of 78 charity organization societies, 174 paid agents and 2,017 volunteer friendly visitors (Burns, 1958).
Still, the "case" was clearly the focus of supervision during the early years of social work. Casework-oriented supervision remained the norm until the beginning of the twentieth century. As the scope of social work practice broadened, however, the purpose of supervision was reconceptualized. Its focus shifted from helping clients to developing and training workers.

Social worker-focused supervision was first called for in 1901 by Zilphia Smith, General Secretary of the Boston Associated Charities, who later became the Director of the Smith College Training School of Psychiatric Social Work. As one of the first to write on supervision and staff training, Smith urged the paid agents to "look over the records of visited families frequently to see if the work is satisfactory or if any suggestions can make it so" (Kadushin, 1976).

During the early twentieth century, social work supervision, nevertheless, involved a different process from that of which we are familiar with today. Supervision in social work usually involved administrative supervision to agencies by a governmental board or licensing authority. The agencies were usually accountable to those organizations for public funds and for service delivery. Back then, the term "supervisor" often referred to the examination of programs and institutions. Contemporary social work supervision, on the other hand, operates from a much smaller
scope. It usually involves the supervision of individual workers within a program, with more direct contact and client involvement.

Without question, supervision in the social work field remains as important as ever. Even the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) places such an emphasis on supervision that licensing and credentialing rely heavily on the supervisory process. Supervision is also a criterion for social work credentials. Moreover, in states where the bachelor’s level credential is offered, two years post-graduate supervision is required. Furthermore, Licensed Master’s Social Work (LMSW) and Licensed Clinical Social Work (LCSW) credentialing also requires intense social work supervision for, at the least, two years and four years, respectively.

Many factors contribute to the social work practitioner’s need for supervision today. For example, social workers are often forced to define and redefine their role in the face of comparisons to the roles of others with related professions (e.g., psychology, psychiatry, sociology, nursing, etc.). In a hospital setting -- particularly large teaching hospitals with many staff members and various professional training programs -- these comparisons are even more likely to occur. In such an environment, social workers must distinguish their role from that of professionals serving in other capacities who share
the common goal of providing patient service and care, albeit from different standpoints.

Still, in other settings, e.g., corporations, social workers can work closely with a variety of professionals from unrelated fields who are often unclear of the social worker’s role, level of expertise and skill. It is in those particular instances that social work supervision can be even more critical.

Statement of the Problem

The field of social work is increasingly faced with the loss of adequately trained social work supervisors. In the current climate of managed care systems and organizational budget cuts, the role of the social work supervisor has eroded. Today, a great deal of public funding intended for social programs is being decreased and even eliminated. Within the social service setting, departments have been downsized and merged with other units. The supervisors in these departments are often inadequately trained and have very little understanding of the skills and job functions of the professional social worker. This can have a major impact on social worker job satisfaction.

Meanwhile, the inherent complexities, demands and stressful nature of issues faced by social workers loom large. Social workers regularly confront issues of confidentiality; informed consent; and conflicts among the needs and desires of clients, families and other
professionals. According to Harkness and Poertner (1989), supervisors can provide assistance with problem solving, guidance, encouragement and support to maintain a social work perspective in settings often dominated by other disciplines. These arguments challenge the argument that Master's level social workers (MSW) have the knowledge and skills necessary for independent practice, i.e., practice with little or no supervision.

A lack of strong, competent supervision can result in job dissatisfaction and, ultimately, ineffective social work practice. That is, if adequate social work supervision is not in place, and job dissatisfaction exists in the social service setting, the client might not receive adequate service. At the very least, the practitioner continues to practice with underdeveloped social work skills and techniques.

Although the quality of supervision is a significant factor in the social work profession in relation to job satisfaction and job turnover (Kadushin, 1992), there is a dearth of information concerning the relationship between supervision and employee job satisfaction in this field. This study examined the relationship between social work supervision and job satisfaction by eliciting social workers' perception of that relationship. It evaluated various factors (work satisfaction, pay satisfaction, promotional opportunities, co-worker satisfaction and
supervision satisfaction) to determine the best predictor of job satisfaction.

The social work profession will benefit from findings revealed by this study. This investigation should lead to increased program effectiveness which, in turn, should result in increased funding for various social service agencies and further research. At the least, it enables managers and supervisors to understand how employees form attitudes that affect their job satisfaction and performance.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to obtain data to analyze and explain the relationship between social work supervision and the job satisfaction of social workers. The study adds to the current body of knowledge concerning this relationship by evaluating the influence of factors such as professional orientation, years of experience, gender, ethnicity and age of both the social worker and the supervisor.

Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) suggested five facets essential for measuring job satisfaction: work satisfaction, pay satisfaction, co-worker satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction and promotional opportunities. This study also analyzed these facets to ascertain which one is the best predictor of job satisfaction for social workers.
For the purpose of this study, supervisor was defined as one who is responsible for the supervision, guidance and direction of bachelor's level social workers (BSW) and master's level social workers (MSW), and MSW interns. Supervision was defined as a process that involves the guidance, direction and support for an employee in the effort to reach organizational goals while enhancing the worker's professional and personal growth. Job satisfaction was defined as an attitude that an employee possesses regarding his or her job.

Research Questions

The research questions of the study were as follows:

1. What is the relationship between supervision and job satisfaction of social workers?

2. What is the relationship between the years of experience, gender, ethnicity, age and educational level of social workers and the job satisfaction of social workers?

3. What is the relationship between the professional orientation, gender, ethnicity, age and educational level of the supervisor and the job satisfaction of social workers?

4. Of the facets of job satisfaction (work satisfaction, pay satisfaction, co-worker satisfaction, promotional opportunities and
supervisor satisfaction) which is the best predictor of job satisfaction?

Hypotheses

The null hypotheses for this study were as follows:

1. There is no statistically significant relationship between supervision and job satisfaction of social workers.

2. There is no statistically significant relationship between the years of experience, gender, ethnicity, educational level and age group of the social worker and job satisfaction of social workers.

3. There is no statistically significant relationship between the professional orientation, gender, ethnicity, educational level and age group of the supervisor and job satisfaction of social workers.

4. Of the facets of job satisfaction (work satisfaction, pay satisfaction, promotional opportunities, co-worker satisfaction and supervisor satisfaction), supervision is not the best predictor of job satisfaction.

Rationale

Social work practitioners and administrators would benefit from information concerning the relationship between social work supervision and job satisfaction. This study
provides data for social work practitioners advocating for more skilled and qualified supervisors. It also serves as a source of information on professional orientation, ethnicity, years of experience, educational level and age group in relation to supervision and job satisfaction of the employee.

Those responsible for the ongoing supervision and development of social work skills and techniques must utilize the appropriate models to help them work for social change and identify what may be considered as success in their efforts and give workers encouragement, sufficient skill and understanding to achieve a level of professional success. This study can assist management in making critical decisions concerning the appropriate supervisory models and supervisory efforts that result in maximum employee job satisfaction.

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. The dependent variable of job satisfaction was defined and the independent variables were identified in Chapter I. Chapter II consists of the empirical literature relating to supervision and job satisfaction and the applicable theoretical frameworks. In addition, Chapter II establishes the need for the study. Chapter III identifies the methods and procedures utilized to conduct the study. Chapter IV provides an analysis of the study findings. Lastly, Chapter V presents the conclusions of the study.
**Definition of Key Study Terms**

Important variables are identified and defined as they are utilized in this study. The dependent variable is defined as job satisfaction. The independent variable is defined as supervision.

**Supervisor** - an individual who is responsible for the guidance and direction of BSW and MSW level social workers and MSW interns.

**Supervision** - a process that provides the guidance, direction and support to an employee in the effort to reach organizational goals while enhancing professional and personal growth.

**Job Satisfaction** - an employee's level of gratification, contentment and/or pleasure derived from the job.

**Employee** - an individual who works for wages or salary and acts under the direction and control of an employer.

**Employer** - one who pays wages for the service of others.

**Hospital or Medical Social Worker** - one who possesses a BSW or MSW degree and provides social services in a hospital setting.

**Co-worker** - individual(s) with whom one works, including one's supervisors and other supervisors, peers and subordinates.

**Pay** - the dollar remuneration and fringe benefits a worker earns.
Work - a specific task, assignment, duty or function assigned to an individual usually in a place of employment.

Promotional Opportunity - the chance for an employee to become advanced into a position in the work place. This advancement usually involves more responsibility and an increase in pay.

School Social Worker - one who possess an MSW degree and provides social services in a school setting.

Mental Health or Psychiatric Social Worker - one who possess an MSW or BSW degree and provides counseling, group work and social services in a mental health setting or environment.

Supervisory Satisfaction - satisfaction with supervision rather than other factors in the work place.

Social Worker - an individual who holds a BSW or MSW degree and provides social services, counseling and therapy to those in need.

Professional Orientation - an individual's professional field of discipline.

Ethnicity - the racial category in which one considers him/herself to be a member.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to present the information considered most relevant to this study through a review of the empirical literature relating to supervision and job satisfaction. The objective of this chapter is to review the current literature on supervision and job satisfaction, and how they relate to the field of social work.

The literature review is divided into seven sections: (1) conceptualization of supervision; (2) conceptualization of job satisfaction; (3) the social work field; (4) the impact of supervision on job satisfaction; (5) the role of supervision in the social work field; (6) job satisfaction in the social work field; and (7) social work supervision and job satisfaction. This chapter also presents the theoretical frameworks relating to supervision and job satisfaction. The theoretical frameworks discussed are: Contingency Theory, Motivator-Hygiene Theory and Path Goal Leadership Theory. These theories were integrated with the study variables supervision and job satisfaction.
Conceptualization of Supervision

Supervision has been conceptualized in various ways in the literature. Barker (1995) defined supervision in the Social Work Dictionary as "an administrative and educational process used in social agencies to help social workers further develop and refine their skills and to provide quality assurance for the clients." Supervisors assign cases to the appropriate social worker, discuss assessment and plans of intervention and review worker/client ongoing contact. Supervisors are also noted to help the social worker better understand agency policy and the philosophy of social work, maximize self-awareness and knowledge of resources. Barker stated that another function of supervision is to enhance staff morale.

Walsh (1990) defines supervision as a component of management with the functions of management being those of planning, organizing, motivating and controlling professional activities for the benefits of the clients, the agency and the agency employees.

Ross (1992) indicated that supervisors offer understanding, objectivity, theoretical knowledge and the wisdom of experience. These qualities are particularly significant in hospital-based practice. She asserts that supervisors provide relief from feelings of inadequacy and failure and they appreciate a job well done.
Fox (1989) defined supervision as "an intensive interpersonal relationship that facilitates the development of therapeutic competence. The goal of supervision is to develop self-awareness so that more disciplined and closely directed work is established." He stated that the impact of supervision relies heavily on how well the supervisor uses himself or herself and employs sensitivity to guide the worker on the journey in the development of professional self.

Kadushin (1976) defined supervision as:

A member of the administrative staff offering an indirect service which includes administrative, educational and supportive functions. The supervisor's ultimate objective is to deliver to clients the best possible service, both quantitatively and qualitatively, in accordance to agency policies and procedures. (p.21).

In 1992 Kadushin identified three functions of supervision: administration, education and support. He identified providing supportive supervision as the way in which the supervisor attempts to "allay anxiety, reduce guilt, increase certainty and conviction, relieve dissatisfaction, fortify flagging faith, affirm and reinforce the worker's assets, replenish depleted self-esteem, nourish and enhance capacity for adaptation, alleviate psychological pain, restore emotional equilibrium, and comfort, bolster and refresh."

Rue and Byars (1992) defined supervision as a process of work that involves the guidance or direction of a group
of people toward organizational goals or objectives. They indicated that the functions of supervision include: planning, organizing, staffing, and motivating. Motivating staff involves guiding subordinates to meet performance standards, rewarding subordinates based on performance, praising accomplishments, and discussing employee issues.

Williams (1997) indicated that in many cases the goals of supervision are similar to the goals of the therapeutic relationship. The author stressed that both supervisory and therapeutic relationships involve focusing on learning, personal growth and empathy. He noted that the learning relationship for the client or the supervisee places him or her in a subordinate role, thereby, increasing a likelihood of the occurrence of transference issues.

According to Williams (1997), supervisors have two primary purposes. The first purpose is to ensure that the employee maintains organizational standards. The other purpose is to assist the supervisee to increase professional skill.

Personal growth in the supervisory relationship was noted to require the supervisee’s involvement of self. This process can also involve the supervisor’s use of self. Casement (1985) defined empathy as a process in which the supervisor places himself or herself in the role of the supervisee in an effort to experience what the supervisee describes.
The need for supportive supervision has been recognized for many years in the social work profession. According to Pretzer (1929), in 1927 a study of caseworkers identified "unhappiness in work" as the second most common reason for job turnover. Another early study found that "support and encouragement" and "appreciation of efforts" ranked second in results.

An empirical investigation revealed that the expressions "supervision" and "leadership" were similarly defined or in many cases used interchangeably. The following conceptualizations of leadership found in the literature support this assertion.

Dublin (1989) stated that supervision is leadership and that the functions of supervisors and leaders are synonymous. He indicated that leadership may relate to a position, a supervisor's behavior and actions, or to an individual's qualities or characteristics. He also noted that the function of supervisors and leaders involve the empowering or influencing of others to achieve an organizational goal.

Leadership has been defined as the "process of influencing others to act in a way that will accomplish the objectives of the leader or the organization" (Munson, 1979). Bennis and Naus (1985) observed that "leadership is not so much the exercise of power itself as the empowerment of others." Preston and Zummerer (1976) saw leadership as a
process of influencing others to act in a way that will accomplish the objectives of the leader or the organization.

A leader’s behavior or style of leadership may influence the subordinate’s job satisfaction. Ivancevich and Matteson (1993) define leadership behavior as the ability of a leader to influence subordinates in performing at the highest level within an organization.

The field of social work has historically equated supervision with leadership. In 1935, Dorothy Hutchinson indicated that the supervisor is also a leader. Dublin (1989) observed that the function of supervision and the function of leadership are synonymous. They both involve the empowering or influencing of others to accomplish some organizational aim. This writer will also use the terms "supervision" and "leadership" synonymously.

For the purpose of this study, supervision was defined as a process that involves the guidance, direction and support of an employee in the effort to reach organizational goals while enhancing professional and personal growth. However, it is acknowledged that the act of supervising also entails planning, organizing, motivating and controlling as indicated by Walsh (1990).

Conceptualization of Job Satisfaction

The literature on job satisfaction is expansive and broad. Many studies have been conducted and several conclusions have been drawn. Steven Pool (1997) defined job
satisfaction as "an attitude that individuals maintain about their jobs." He indicated that this attitude is developed from people's perceptions of their jobs. Poulin (1995) saw job satisfaction as a multidimensional construct.

Rosseau (1978) identified characteristics of the organization, job task factors and personal characteristics as the three components of job satisfaction. Weismann, Alexander and Chase (1980) conceptualized job satisfaction as the degree of positive effect toward the overall job or its components.

Reinemer (1995) stated that most workers are "cautiously optimistic about their jobs." A survey of 4,336 workers by Watson Wyatt Worldwide found that baby boomers have more negative attitudes than older or younger workers. The survey also found that race, gender, and income are likely to influence worker attitudes. According to the survey's findings, the key to satisfied workers is good communication between employees and managers.

Hughes and Dodge (1997) conducted a study which examined relationships between African American women's exposure to certain of occupational stressors, including two types of racial bias -- institutional discrimination and interpersonal prejudice -- and their evaluations of job quality. The study findings suggested that institutional discrimination and interpersonal prejudice were more important predictors of job quality among the participants.
than were other occupational stressors such as low task variety and decision authority, heavy workloads, and poor supervision. Racial bias in the workplace was most likely to be reported by workers in predominantly white work settings. The findings also revealed that black women who worked in service, semiskilled, and unskilled occupations reported significantly more institutional discrimination (but did not report an increased level of interpersonal prejudice), than did women in professional, managerial, and technical occupations.

Leong, Furnham and Cooper (1996) examined the effect of organizational commitment as a moderator of the stress-outcome relationship. A total of 106 professional and administrative officers (39 males, 67 females) from various departments of a public sector organization each completed questionnaires. The results indicated stress as a significant predictor of all four dependent variables: job satisfaction, mental ill-health, physical ill-health and intention to quit.

Saige and Weisberg (1996) conducted a study to analyze the internal structure of work norms and their relationship with work attitudes, organizational commitment and job satisfaction. A definition of work norms was developed, and it was suggested that people's work norms are more highly associated with organizational commitment than with job satisfaction. Data were drawn from 138 Israeli managers and
workers in order to explore the construct validity of this definition. Three facets of the norm definition -- norm referents, behavior modality, and norm type -- were verified, and people's work norms were found to be more highly correlated with organizational commitment than with job satisfaction.

A study was conducted by Winefield and Barlow (1995) to investigate client and staff satisfaction in a child protection agency. A total of 24 clients and 21 staff members participated through use of interviews and self-administered questionnaires. The results indicated that the agency staff were relatively content with their jobs and demonstrated little sign of burnout, which has been recognized as a risk for child protection workers. The agency staff felt committed to their work, and the current clients expressed a great deal of satisfaction with both the services and staff.

A study was conducted by Eisenbuerger, Cummings and Stephen (1997) to investigate: (a) whether the relationship between the favorableness of job conditions and perceived organizational support (POS) depends on employee perceptions, and (b) whether POS and overall job satisfaction are distinct constructs. The favorableness of high-discretion job conditions was found to be more closely related with POS than was the favorableness of low-discretion job conditions.
No such relationship was found between job conditions and satisfaction.

In 1997, Black and Gregerson conducted a study which tested two hypotheses about the relationships between decision-making processes and satisfaction and performance. The authors developed the following hypotheses:

1. Involvement in each of the five decision-making processes (identifying problems, generating alternative solutions to the problem, selecting a specific solution, planning the implementation of the selected solution and evaluating the results of the implementation (Locke and Scheiger, 1979; Marquilies and Black, 1987) will be positively related to satisfaction and performance; involvement in identifying problems will have a relatively weaker relationship with satisfaction and performance than the other processes; involvement in evaluation will have a relatively stronger relationship with satisfaction than with performance.

2. Individuals with above average involvement in all five decision-making processes will have higher satisfaction and performance than individuals with below average involvement in all five decision-making processes.
Questionnaires were distributed to employees in a manufacturing organization in northeastern United States. The subjects were current members of employee involvement groups. The questionnaires were distributed to 395 employees and 370 were returned, with a 94% response rate. The results indicated a significant positive relationship between each of the decision processes, work satisfaction and performance.

Bozionelos (1996) investigated the relationship between organizational, promotional and career satisfaction. Data were obtained from 190 administrative employees in two universities in northwest England. The significant difference in career satisfaction between the two samples was not present when statistically controlled for number of promotions. In addition, number of promotions was the only variable which accounted for a significant amount of variance in career satisfaction.

George and Jones (1996) proposed that work experience is a strong factor for increasing of turnover intentions and other organizational related outcomes. Research in subjective well-being and other areas suggest that there are three important aspects of the experience of work: attainment of values, attitudes, and moods. The authors hypothesized and found that the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions is jointly moderated by value attainment and employee positive mood. The findings
indicated that the job satisfaction-turnover intention relationship was strongest when workers' jobs did not help them to accomplish terminal values and positive moods were experienced; and the relationship was most tenuous when jobs helped workers to accomplish terminal values and positive moods were experienced.

David Abramis (1994) utilized meta-analytic methods to examine studies of two correlations of work role ambiguity: (a) job satisfaction (global and intrinsic), and (b) job performance (self- and independently-evaluated). A total 88 studies were examined, 39 of which were included in the meta-analysis. The results suggested that role ambiguity is significantly and negatively related to job satisfaction, and significantly and negatively related, although weakly, to job performance. The studies also suggested that the effects of the role ambiguity vary depending upon other variables. Results were consistent with previous research and suggested that role ambiguity is seen as a valid construct in organizational research and is frequently associated with related to lower job satisfaction.

A research effort was conducted by the Kentucky Department of Corrections in 1996. A total of 2,246 questionnaires were distributed to full-time employees in the eleven prisons that were operated by the Kentucky Department of Corrections. A total of 1,330 questionnaires were completed with a 55% response rate. The findings of
the study indicated that a strong positive relationship existed between the variables empowerment and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was also positively associated with age, tenure, salary and supervisory status. The results also indicated a slightly significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and education. This means that individuals with more education were found to be slightly more satisfied. A negative correlation was found to exist between stress and empowerment. This means that the less stress an employee experienced, the more empowered he or she felt. The study also revealed that nonwhites felt slightly less empowered than whites. Age was positively associated with tenure, salary, supervisory status and education. Education was significantly associated with salary, age, supervisory status and the shift worked (day, evening or night).

Bedeian, Ferris and Kaemar (1992) stated that employee prestige and confidence would possibly increase with age. The authors found that older employees are more likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction. Younger employees were generally found to not hold positions of authority and are more likely to be mobile and possess lower psychological investments in the organizations. This, the author indicated, can have a direct impact on job satisfaction.

Mueller and Wallace (1996) conducted a study to examine the paradox that women are as satisfied with their jobs as
their male counterparts. This is called a paradox because research on job satisfaction and gender reveals that women are satisfied with their jobs even though they usually experience lower pay, less leadership responsibilities, less autonomy and overall worse work conditions than men. The objective of the study was to evaluate and test the hypotheses stated by Jo Phelan in 1994. The authors surveyed 2,251 lawyers in Canada. The sample population appeared to possess the population characteristics of those in Phelan’s study. The findings revealed that men and women do not differ significantly in their levels of job and pay satisfaction.

Dodd-McCue and Wright (1996) investigated attitudinal commitment to determine its origin and whether it differs for men and women. Attitudinal commitment and workplace experiences were measured using subject’s evaluation of organizational involvement and job satisfaction. The findings revealed that women are less committed to their organizations than men. Men and women reported a lower organizational involvement with higher satisfaction. The results indicated that although women were under represented in the upper management, they could have increased organizational involvement and job satisfaction, by adjusting organizational control and other factors that impact the job experience.
Burke (1996) examined the sources of levels of job satisfaction among the employees of a large professional service firm. Anonymous questionnaires were completed by 829 women and 766 men. The participants reported being only moderately satisfied. The author found that the men reported significantly higher organizational levels than the women. Both women and men found to be at higher organizational levels were more satisfied than those at lower levels.

Hellman (1997) conducted a study in which meta-analytic procedures were applied to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to leave one's place of employment. Overall job satisfaction was the independent variable in the study. Age and tenure were identified as the dependent variables. The author divided the studies into two groups: Group 1 = U.S. federal employees and Group 2 = private sector employees. The study revealed that the more dissatisfied employees become, the more likely they are to consider other employment opportunities. The results also indicated that older employees and employees with more tenure are less likely than younger employees and employees with less tenure to leave the U.S. federal agency environment.

In a recent study, Schappe (1998) examined the effect of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior.
Questionnaires were completed by 130 employees of a mid-Atlantic insurance company. Data drawn were procedural justice, job satisfaction, organizational commitment. The findings revealed that when job satisfaction, organizational commitment and fairness perception were considered simultaneously, only organizational commitment had a significant amount of variance.

Orpen (1997) conducted a study to examine the relationship between quality of communication and employee job satisfaction and work motivation. The sample population consisted of 135 managers for 21 different industry firms in the United Kingdom. The study participants were first level supervisors who reported to senior level management. Job involvement was measured by using the Lodahl and Kejner (1965) Scale. Job satisfaction was measured through the use of a 10-item version of the Action Tendency Scale (Hartman, Grigsby, Crino and Chhokar, 1989). Work motivation was measured by using six items from the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hasckman and Oldman, 1975). The findings of the study suggested that among the participants, job satisfaction and work motivation were positively affected by the quality of communication within their firms. The results also indicated that the effects of communication quality on job satisfaction and on work motivation were moderated by job involvement. For the purpose of this study job satisfaction
was defined as the level of gratification, contentment and/or pleasure derived from the job.

The Social Work Field

The Social Work Dictionary (Barker, 1995) defines social work as "the applied science of helping people achieve an effective level of psychosocial functioning and effective societal changes to enhance the well-being of all people." According to the National Association of Social Workers (1973), "social work is the professional activity of helping individuals, groups or communities enhance or restore their capacity for social functioning and creating societal conditions favorable to this goal."

As previously discussed in Chapter I, social work practice began in the early 1800s with "friendly visitors." These middle-aged women visited indigent families in their homes. Brieland (1995) reported that friendly visitors were influenced by the English Poor Laws, which were codified in 1901. The Poor Laws were widely accepted in the American colonies and required the local government to take responsibility for the assistance of the indigent; to return needy individuals to their place of birth to obtain aid; and disqualified "sturdy beggars" who were considered to be able-bodied and employable.

Today, there are a number of social work fields of practice. Medical social work, psychiatric social work and child welfare were the first three fields to have formal
courses and training, with a separate curriculum. Medical
and psychiatric social work had developed in hospitals and
institutions under physicians. Social workers only managed
the child welfare agencies (Brieland, 1995).

**Medical Social Work**

Medical social work was initiated at the Boston
Massachusetts General Hospital by Dr. Richard Cabot in 1905.
Ms. Ida Cannon was said to be the first medical social
worker. Originally, medical social workers were nurses
desiring a more independent status (Breiland 1995). Cannon
(1923) indicated that social work provided an understanding
of the psychic and social conditions that might cause the
patient distress of the body or mind.

**Psychiatric Social Work**

The psychiatric social worker was said to follow the
patient in the home while supervising his or her activities.
Psychiatric social work was imperative because it took into
account the individual’s social environment as well as his
or her mental and physical condition. In 1908, the first
formal courses with psychiatric content were offered by Dr.
William Healy at the Chicago School of Civics and
Philanthropy.

**Child Welfare and Family Casework**

The purpose of casework training was the development of
skills in differential diagnosis. The focus was no longer
on the worthiness or unworthiness of the poor, but on assistance for acceptance of those in need. Differential diagnosis had a major impact on child welfare. In the 1900's the Boston Children's Aid Society provided a two-year training program in Child Welfare and Family Casework.

School Social Work

The area of school social work developed during the time of settlement houses in New York. Visiting teachers began to assist in improving the school performance of those children with problematic life situations. School social workers eventually began to address obstacles in the school systems that impacted children's educational experience.

The field of social work is also represented by a professional organization, the National Association of Social Workers (NASW). In 1955, seven social work membership organizations combined to form NASW. This organization facilitated the development of standards and guidelines for social work practice. It also initiated recommended minimum salary requirements, personal standards and the NASW Code of Ethics within the field of social work. The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) is the organization that focuses primarily on the development and standards of social work education. This organization sets forth curriculum policy and accreditation standards within schools of social work on a national level.
The National Association of Social Workers (NASW) reported a total of 335,465 social workers in the work force as of April 1998. The same organization reported a 1998 membership consisting of 155,314 social workers. A total of 13,504 of those members were listed as administrators/managers and 4,746 were listed as supervisors. On the local level, the Executive Director of the Georgia chapter of NASW reported a total membership of 2,501 (April 1998). The metropolitan Atlanta NASW membership was reported as 1,550. Of those, 249 represented themselves as supervisors or administrators.

According to the Georgia Department of Labor (1998), there are approximately 11,570 employed social workers in the state of Georgia. This Department predicted that a total of 16,190 social workers will be employed in the year 2005.

The Georgia Department of Labor reported that 4,840 social workers are currently employed in the metropolitan Atlanta area. It has been projected by the same organization that by the year 2005, there will be approximately 6,850 employed in metropolitan Atlanta.

For the purpose of this study, a social worker is defined as an individual who possesses a Bachelor of Social Work or Master of Social Work and provides social services, counseling and therapy to people in need. The social workers provide services in a variety of settings. Some of
those settings include: social service agencies, treatment centers, hospitals, school systems and in private settings.

The Impact of Supervision on Job Satisfaction

Sandy Jeanquart-Barone (1996) established that Supervisory Satisfaction related to satisfaction with supervision rather than other conditions or individuals in the work place. The supervisor-subordinate relationship is becoming increasingly important due to the shift from managing work to managing people. Jeanquart-Barone (1996) conducted an empirical study which examined 202 traditional supervisory relationships (subordinates reporting to a male supervisor) and 48 nontraditional supervisory relationships (subordinates reporting to a female supervisor). The sample consisted of a predominantly Caucasian population. Four of the five variables theorized, predicted a high level of variance in supervisory satisfaction in both traditional and nontraditional relationships. However the predictors were not different for the two groups.

Stephen Pool conducted a study in 1995 that examined the relationship of job satisfaction with substitutes of leadership, leadership styles and work motivation. He found that leadership behavior and work motivation proved to be powerful predictions of job satisfaction. He also found that substitutes of leadership had a positive impact on job satisfaction.
Rauktis and Koeske (1994) conducted a study to investigate the direct and moderating effects of supportive supervision on the relationship between work load and job satisfaction for social workers. The respondents consisted of 111 social workers in the southwest division of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW). The results indicated that the greater the level of supervisor support, the greater the degree of job satisfaction.

Karasek, Triantis and Chaudhry (1982) conducted a study to measure the ability of social support to "moderate" or "buffer" the impact of job-related stress on physical and mental health. They identified several co-worker and supervisory support measures and tested their buffering effects by using a model of social support buffering. They found that supervisor support is more significant than co-worker support. The supervisor support variables had somewhat higher correlation's with the task strain composite. The direct effect of both emotional support and instrumental support from the supervisor were strong for all indicators except absenteeism.

Jayarante and Chess (1984) examined the relationship between work stress, strain, emotional support and supervisors. They found a negative relationship between perceived emotional support from a supervisor and feeling of strain. Supervisory emotional support did not moderate the relationship between stress and feelings of strain.
Koeske and Koeske (1991) observed that social support moderated the work load burnout relationship and under conditions of low co-worker support, work load produced significantly greater strain. They failed to find buffering effects for supervisor support.

Riordian and Saltzer (1992) conducted a review of the literature of the work-related stressors common to health care workers. The study identified the following stressors:

1. Inadequate communication between administrators and staff and between staff members;
2. Unrealistic expectations from administrators resulting in staff overload;
3. Conflicts and lack of support from co-workers;
4. Unrealistic expectations for patients;
5. Chronic anticipatory great and loss;
6. An unrealistic perception and expectations of professional performance by other staff members;
7. Feelings of isolation; and
8. Inappropriate motivations for choosing this field.

The authors found that open communication between staff and administration, including staff in decision making when possible, and giving consistent supervisory support as some of the methods for reducing employee stress.

A study conducted by Butler and Cantrell (1977) investigated the effects of perceived leadership behaviors on job satisfaction and productivity. The survey respon-
dents consisted of 467 graduate and under graduate organizational behavior students who formed 101 groups. In this study, leaders' behaviors were considered (consideration and initiating structure) and measured productivity was utilized in terms of units produced by each group. They found a strong relationship between leaders' initiating structure and consideration on both job satisfaction and productivity of group members.

Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) suggested five essential dimensions for measuring job satisfaction and developed the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). The JDI was designed to measure the five activities of work. They are as follows: work satisfaction, pay satisfaction, promotion opportunities satisfaction, co-workers satisfaction and supervision satisfaction. (1) Work satisfaction refers to the worker's satisfaction with the work or actual tasks performed; (2) pay satisfaction is concerned with the attitude toward pay and is based on the perception of the actual pay received and expected pay; (3) promotional opportunities reflect the employee's satisfaction with the organization's promotion policy and implementation of the policy; (4) co-workers satisfaction measures the employee's satisfaction with other workers in the organization; and (5) supervision satisfaction assesses the worker's level of satisfaction with his/her supervisor.
Ugorji (1997) conducted a study to identify specific career-impeding supervisory behaviors and to determine whether there was a relationship between ethnicity or gender and the likelihood that an employee would experience these behaviors. A sample of employees in three departments in the New Jersey state government were surveyed. The results indicated that African-Americans experienced career-impeding supervisory behaviors more than European-Americans, but that gender difference was not significant. In addition, the more that employees reported encountering career-impeding supervisory behaviors, the lower the employees' job satisfaction. Also, European-Americans were found to be more satisfied with their jobs than African-Americans, but gender difference was found to be insignificant.

Holdnack, Harsh and Bushardt (1993) found a positive relationship between the consideration leadership style which involves friendship and respect between the leader and subordinate and job satisfaction. The study suggests that the consideration in leadership style has a positive impact on subordinate's job satisfaction.

The Role of Supervision in the Social Work Field

According to Mary Burns (1958), segments of the supervisory process were actually mentioned in the literature as early as 1880 and 1890. Jeffrey Brackett authored the first social work document entitled, "Supervision and Education in Charity in 1904." This
work was concerned with the supervision of welfare agencies and other institutions by public boards and commissions.

In 1971, Irving Miller stated that social work supervision is essentially an administrative process for getting the work done and monitoring organizational accountability.

Reamer (1989) stated that social work supervision is essential to effective social work practice. Since the earliest days of social work, professional have recognized that competent, involved supervision is necessary to transmit the profession's values and methods to supervisees. It is essential, he says, for agency administrators to acknowledge the importance of enhanced supervision and to provide the necessary resources and staff assistance to make it feasible.

Poertner and Rapp (1983) conceptualized social work supervision by listing the tasks of the supervisor in a child welfare organization. They are: discusses caseload problems, assigns new cases, identifies potential service contractors, checks and approves forms, evaluates evidence for court and provides community groups information on youth needs.

Levin and Herbert (1995) examined the differentiation between BSW and MSW tasks and the amount of supervision in the hospital setting. They found that MSWs were assigned most often to counseling and referral of hospital staff,
hospital planning activities and supervision of staff and training. The responsibility of financial assistance was most often assigned to BSWs. The results indicated that BSWs tended to receive more supervision than MSWs.

Job Satisfaction in the Social Work Field

According to Siefert, Jayrante and Chess (1991), 31.9 percent of a random sample of National Association of Social Workers (NASW) members identified as working in health care setting were very satisfied with their jobs. A total of 51.4 percent were reportedly somewhat satisfied with their jobs.

Diane Vinokur-Kaplan (1991) conducted a survey of child welfare social workers. The results revealed that 66 percent of the population surveyed were quite satisfied or very satisfied with their current jobs.

A study was conducted by Marriott, Sexton and Staley to examine psychiatric social workers' job satisfaction experience. Questionnaires were completed by 188 psychiatric social workers. The findings indicated an overall positive level of job satisfaction. The principal correlate of position satisfaction was the professional respect received from other disciplines and not the specific tasks undertaken. These results disclosed the power of hospital team interactions on job satisfaction. In such settings, the social workers are most often so dependent on the quality of these team interactions in their work that it
can be difficult for them to keep subjectively clear the actual level of satisfaction with the work alone.

Koeske and Kirk (1995) examined the relationship of sociopsychological characteristics of human service workers to worker morale and employee retention. Eighty-two case managers, of which forty-two were social workers, were participants in a study. The major finding was that better personal well-being at the time of hiring was the most consistent and significant predictor of lower burnout, higher job satisfaction and overall higher worker morale at later career points. The workers from higher social class backgrounds and those with lower starting salaries were more likely to leave the job.

Vinokur-Kaplan, Jayarante and Chess (1994) examined a selected array of agency-influenced work and employment conditions and assessed their impact on social workers’ job satisfaction, motivation, and intention to seek new employment. The study made correlations with past empirical studies on job satisfaction and retention, with staff development concerns as stated in social work administration textbooks, and with conditions subject to administrators’ influence. Motivational issues included are salary, fringe benefits, job security, physical surroundings, and safety. The results demonstrate the contribution of certain factors to a prediction of job satisfaction or of intent to leave the organization.
Research on stress in the workplace has repeatedly demonstrated that effective supervision is a powerful antidote to stress. For this reason alone one should consider continued utilization, reviving, and/or expanding the use of supervision.

A study conducted in 1986 by Sze and Ivken of 686 social workers revealed that about 60 percent of the sample had experienced levels of stress over the past two years. Among those, 72.2 percent were hospital social workers.

Powell (1994) surveyed social workers in the state of Wisconsin and tested the hypothesis that the concepts of burnout and alienation are closely related. The findings supported the hypothesis and inferred that some areas of alienation may be significant predictors of burnout among social workers.

Pottage and Huxley (1996) examined stress in mental health social workers from what they called a developmental perspective. They found that the generic use of the term stress was not helpful to employees and asserted that, from the employee's perspective, there was a need to distinguish between stressful situations and stress reactions as different yet interrelated. The writers adopt a view in which the "person/environment fit" model assumes equal responsibility to interpersonal and biological factors in creating stress. They conclude that although the level of negative stressors in the work environment might be high,
the social work work force, so far, seems able to find a way to resist these stressors due to the fact the actual levels of stress reaction among the work force are still comparatively low.

Schulz, Greenley and Brown (1995) proposed a theoretical framework that conceptualized the environment context, organization structure, management processes, client severity and staff characteristics as predictors of work satisfaction and burnout. The authors surveyed 311 staff members in 42 community mental health service organizations. They controlled for individuals staff characteristics. The study results indicated that organization structure, culture, and management process were important to work environment which was directly related to job satisfaction and subsequently to burnout. The findings revealed that client severity was not associated with burnout nor to work dissatisfaction.

Supervision and Job Satisfaction in the Social Work Field

The job satisfaction literature is extensive and its relevance to social work professionals is well worth examining. Oliver and Kuipers (1996) conducted a study of stress and Expressed Emotion (EE) in which community mental health workers, who were all case managers, were sampled. The authors hypothesized that a range of EE ratings would be found in staff, and that they would have high levels of burnout and stress. Job satisfaction was also measured.
Thirty-nine percent of interviewees were rated as high EE (7/10 staff were high EE) with low EE interviews showing significantly more warmth. Personal accomplishment and job satisfaction were high.

M. Soderfeldt and B. Soderfeldt (1995) stated that social workers are a group who are considered at an above average level for job burnout. According to the authors, a literature search of MEDLINE, Psychological Abstracts, and Sociological Abstracts, revealed only 18 studies that reported any findings on burnout in social workers. Soderfeldt and Soderfeldt address the following questions: Are social workers burned out? What factors are associated with burnout in social workers? What strategies should be employed to address burnout in social workers? The authors' study of the literature revealed that social workers suffer less burnout than comparable occupational groups.

Bhana and Haffejee (1996) examined burnout and its relationship with job satisfaction, role conflict and role ambiguity among 29 child-care social workers in South Africa. The social workers were rated as moderate burnout associated with job satisfaction, role conflict and role ambiguity.

Poulin and Walter (1992) conducted a study of direct service social workers adequacy of organizational resources, supervisor support and level of trust among co-workers and found them to be significantly associated with job
satisfaction. John Poulin (1994) conducted a study to examine job satisfaction of social work supervisors and administrators. The results indicated that while both supervisors and administrators were considerably satisfied with their jobs, the administrators were significantly more satisfied than the supervisors.

Glisson and Durick (1998) found leadership to be significantly related to social worker's job satisfaction. Another job satisfaction study found that change in level of supervisor support and change in adequacy or organizational resources were significant organizational predictors of social workers' job satisfaction change over a one year period.

Poulin (1994) examined the effect change in job task and organizational characteristics have on social workers' job satisfaction change. Data from a 1989 survey and a 1990 follow-up study of 873 social workers were used to examine job satisfaction change. The results indicated that both change in job task and organizational characteristics contribute toward change in social workers' job satisfaction. The significant job task predictors were change in job autonomy and change in satisfaction with clients. The significant organizational predictors were change in professional development opportunities, change in supervisor support, and change in adequacy of organizational resources. He also found that change in level of supervisor
support and in adequacy of organizational resources were significant organizational predictors of job satisfaction of social workers over a one year period.

Stav, Florian and Shurka (1986) conducted a study and found that there was an elevated stress level among social workers working with physically disabled persons and bereaved families. It appeared that personal involvement was inevitable for social workers who spent their time dealing with problems of physical disability, illness and death. Lower stress levels were found among workers who indicated satisfaction with the supervision they received.

As previously mentioned, a research effort was conducted by the Kentucky Department of Corrections in 1996. A total of 2,246 questionnaires were distributed to full-time employees in the eleven prisons that were operated by the Kentucky Department of Corrections. A total of 1,330 questionnaires were completed with a 55% response rate. The findings of the study indicated a strong positive relationship existed between empowerment and job satisfaction. Job satisfaction was also positively associated with age, tenure, salary and supervisory status. The results also indicated a slightly significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and education. This means that individuals with more education were found to be slightly more satisfied. A negative correlation was found to exist between stress and empowerment. This means that the less
stress an employee experienced, the more empowered he or she felt. The study also revealed that nonwhites felt slightly less empowered than whites. Age was positively associated with tenure, salary, supervisory status and education. Education was significantly associated with salary, age, supervisory status and the shift worked (day, evening or night).

A study was conducted (Erera-Weatherley, 1996) to examine the coping strategies utilized by public welfare supervisors to manage organizational stress. Of the 14 supervisors examined, it found that two different coping categories were employed. They differed with regard to (a) their focus, (b) the source of stress, (c) the target person who is meant to benefit from them, and (d) the specific coping strategies actually utilized. The authors indicated that the first category is basically problem-focused, and serves the purpose of buffering subordinates from ambiguity of policy. The other category was presented as emotion-focused, and intended to buffer supervisors from stressful expectations of management and peers.

Waymer (1995) conducted a study to determine the relationship between work autonomy and job satisfaction of social workers. The study also analyzed the facets of job satisfaction to determine which facets were predictors of worker autonomy and job satisfaction of workers. He found that a statistically significant relationship existed be-
tween worker autonomy and job satisfaction and job satisfaction and pay of social workers. It was also determined that the supervision facet was a predictor of job satisfaction.

In a study conducted by Sharma, McKelvey and Hardy (1997), the job satisfaction of 29 social service workers in an urban child welfare agency was assessed using the Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS). The JSS measures satisfaction in seven areas of one's job (i.e., work, supervision, co-workers, pay and promotion, work environment, training, and position). The findings indicated that the staff were relatively satisfied, that satisfaction did not vary by staff position (family worker vs. social worker/supervisor), and that neither demographic factors nor prior experiences were predictors of job satisfaction.

Samantrai (1992) found that factors that influenced the decision of MSWs to leave jobs in public child welfare were poor relationships with immediate supervisors and inflexibility in job assignment. Himle, Jayarante and Thyness (1989) examined the effects of multiple types of supervisor support on psychological strains, job satisfaction and turnover among a sample of clinical social workers. They found that support from a supervisor moderated the relationship between various types of work stress and job satisfaction, while emotional support
buffered the relationship between role conflict and job satisfaction, and workload and turnover.

Dye (1991) examined climate factors and their impact on the perception of organizational climate and the work dimensions and their impact on the perception of overall job satisfaction. He found that perception of supervision was the variable highly predictive of job satisfaction.

Ajo (1986) conducted a study of job satisfaction in the management of human resources. He surveyed the employees of two non-profit organizations and found that job security was the best predictor of job satisfaction. Also, Ajo found that there was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and subordinate-superior relations.

As previously mentioned, Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) developed the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) to measure the five activities of work, which are: work satisfaction, pay satisfaction, promotion opportunities satisfaction, co-workers satisfaction and supervision satisfaction. This study examined the five facets of job satisfaction as suggested by Smith, Kendall and Hulin. In this study, the researcher will analyze which of the facets is the best predictor of job satisfaction. It was hypothesized that supervision satisfaction is the best predictor of employee job satisfaction in the current study.

An intense review of the literature reveals that an investigation of the relationship between social work
supervision and job satisfaction is needed. As reviewed previously, empirical evidence is available concerning supervision, job satisfaction, and the social work field, all independently. The review of the literature also indicated that there were some studies which addressed all three variables. The current study would like to contribute to the field of social work by obtaining data and analyzing variables such as age, ethnicity, professional orientation, education and gender of the employee and supervisor. This information provides a profile of those individuals and can possibly help researchers to understand what factors can actually impact employee job satisfaction. The current study also examined the five facets of job satisfaction (work satisfaction, pay satisfaction, co-worker satisfaction, promotional opportunities and supervisor satisfaction) and their relationship to the abovementioned variables. Finally, this research effort determined which of the five dimensions of job satisfaction is the best predictor of job satisfaction.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical frameworks for this study include the Contingency theory, Motivator-Hygiene theory and the Path-Goal Leadership theory.
Contingency Theory

Contingency Theory which is also referred to as the Situational Theory focuses on the utilization of the style of leadership that is most effective in given situations. The contingency theory suggests that there is not a global plan of supervision that can be implemented in the workplace. The contingency or situational perspective puts forth that universal guidelines and principles cannot be applied in all supervisory settings. This theory recognizes the uniqueness in individuals, circumstances and organizations.

A manager is presented with unique characteristics in each employee. This theory holds that these characteristics make it virtually impossible for a supervisor to effectively make management decisions based on universal principles. Each manager or supervisor also brings a set of unique characteristics and strengths to the supervisory experience. The thrust of this theory is that the manager must consider many elements when faced with each employee situation.

Fred Fielder, a pioneer in the contingency theory leadership approach, studied the relationship between the leader's personality and the situation in the workplace. He identified two leader personality traits: Task-motivated leaders and Relationship-motivated leaders. Task-motivated leaders were defined as leaders who gained satisfaction through the performance of tasks. Relationship-motivated
leaders were identified as those who gained satisfaction through relationship with others.

**Motivator-Hygiene Theory**

The motivator-hygiene theory, also referred to as the two factor theory, was proposed by Frederick Herzberg in 1959. Herzberg (1966) hypothesized that work satisfaction and dissatisfaction are separate and sometimes unrelated occurrences and that two different sets of factors affect work satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

This theory indicates that the basic needs of employees have generally been met in contemporary society. If these needs have not been met, job dissatisfaction is the result. He asserted that the fulfillment of basic needs does not produce job satisfaction, but the absence of that fulfillment does produce job dissatisfaction. Higher level needs such as self-actualization, sense of achievement, professional responsibility and personal development are only capable of producing job satisfaction. Failure to meet motivator needs in the workplace does not necessarily lead to job dissatisfaction.

There are two sets of needs included in the motivator-hygiene theory. The first set of needs are those that produce job satisfaction. Herzberg calls those needs the motivator needs. Satisfaction is influenced by motivational factors -- achievement, advancement, responsibility, growth and recognition. They motivate the worker to reach the
highest possible level of performance. These motivators are intrinsic to the actual job and include the person's sense of achievement, level of responsibility and personal development and advancement. According to Herzberg, these needs can only be satisfied by stimulating and challenging work.

The second set of factors produce job dissatisfaction. Dissatisfaction is influenced by hygiene factors. They have little power to produce job satisfaction. These needs include features of the work environment such as company policy and administrative practices, type of supervision, fringe benefits and working conditions, peers, subordinates and pay. These factors are extrinsic to the actual job responsibilities.

In the motivator-hygiene theory, the hygiene needs must be satisfied before the motivator needs are considered. According to Herzberg, satisfaction of hygiene needs will not result in job satisfaction; but an absence of dissatisfaction. Yet, job satisfaction cannot be reached or considered until after hygiene needs have been met.

Supervision has been identified as a hygiene need. Though Herzberg indicated that hygiene needs cannot produce job satisfaction, it is apparent that these basic needs must be satisfied before employee motivation can be met. According to the motivator-hygiene theory, job satisfaction can be accomplished when the motivator needs have
been met by stimulating and challenging work. In most cases, the supervisor would assign duties and responsibilities, would identify and encourage sources leading to a worker's sense of achievement and would have a direct impact on that employee's development and advancement in the workplace. The motivator needs can be satisfied only by stimulating and challenging work. In the social work setting, this work is usually facilitated and channeled through the supervisor.

Path-Goal Theory of Leadership

The Path-Goal Theory of Leadership was also selected as a theoretical framework for this study. This theory attempts to define the relationship between a leader's behavior and the worker's performance and work activities. The premise of the path-goal theory of leadership is that leader behavior influences the motivation of workers as it relates to the satisfaction of their needs and successful performance (Rue and Byars, 1992). In the path-goal theory, there are four basic types of leader behavior. They are as follows: role classification, supportive, participative and autocratic. Each of these leadership behaviors has a direct impact on worker performance and worker satisfaction, depending on the level of structure of the work tasks.

Role classification involves letting subordinates know what is expected of them; gives guidance as to what should be done and how; schedules and coordinates work among
subordinates; and maintains standards of performance. The **supportive leader** is a friendly, approachable leader who attempts to create a pleasant work environment for subordinates. The **participative leader** consults with workers and asks for their suggestions and involves them in the decision-making process. **Autocratic leadership** involves a leader who gives orders that are not to be questioned by workers.

According to the path-goal theory of leadership, each of the four leadership behaviors results in varying levels of job performance and worker satisfaction. This theory indicates a relationship between the behavior of the leader and worker outcomes.

Under the path-goal theory, role clarification leads to high satisfaction and performance for workers who are responsible for unstructured tasks. Supportive leadership is most satisfying to those who work in a highly structured environment. The behavior of the participative leader enhances worker performance and job satisfaction for those engaging in ambiguous tasks. Autocratic leadership was identified as the demonstrating behavior that has a negative impact on job satisfaction and worker performance with both structured and unstructured tasks.
CHAPTER III
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter is to present the methods and procedures that were used in conducting this study. This chapter details the following: research design, data analysis, research site, selection procedure, sampling, data collection, instrumentation, procedure for implementation.

Research Design

The correlational research design was utilized in this study. The research design reflects the procedures used for measuring the relationship among the variables. According to Babbie (1995), a research design is the method used to find answers to research questions. The correlational design measures the relationship between the variables. This study is designed to obtain data and analyze the relationship between the gender, years of experience, age, ethnicity, educational level and job satisfaction of social workers.

The study attempted to explain the relationship between supervision and job satisfaction of social workers. It analyzed the relationship between the professional orientation, gender, ethnicity, educational level and age
group of the supervisor and employee job satisfaction. The data were organized and analyzed through the use of descriptive statistics which included percentages, averages and frequency distributions. Descriptive statistics is a statistical method that involves descriptions of the data found in the study (Balian, 1982).

This study analyzed supervision and employee job satisfaction of social workers in a variety of workplace settings. The study also examined the facets of job satisfaction. These include: work satisfaction, pay satisfaction, co-worker satisfaction, promotional opportunities and supervisor satisfaction, which has been identified as an independent variable in the study. The analysis was conducted to explain which of these facets was best predictors of job satisfaction.

**Data Analysis**

The study utilized Multiple Regression, Chi-square, Cramer's V and Phi coefficient to explain the relationship between the variables. Multiple Regression is utilized when the researcher plans to examine relationships between one dependent variable and two or more independent variables. Chi-square tests the difference between nominal and ordinal data. Contingency coefficient tests the strength of the relationship between variables of nominal form (Balian, 1982). Phi coefficient is a characteristic of Chi square which is primarily used with 2 X 2 tables. Cramer's V is a
measure of association for nominal variables and is also a characteristic of chi square. Cramer's V is used with tables of any size (Elifson, Runyon and Haber, 1990). Computer analysis was also used to analyze the data.

Research Setting

The site of the study was the Atlanta metropolitan area, located in an urban area in the southeastern part of the United States. This site was chosen because of the large number of social workers employed in the area who are associated with Clark Atlanta University and other institutions. This location also affords accessibility to social workers who are members of the Georgia Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers.

Selection Procedure

The respondents in this study were drawn from members of the Georgia Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, North Georgia Unit. The membership of this organization consists primarily of professional social workers, but also includes a number of individuals of related professions working in the area of social service. A questionnaire and cover letter were sent to all persons selected. Follow-up letters and questionnaires were sent to persons who did not respond within two weeks of the first mailing.
Sampling

A total of 225 questionnaires were mailed. Of those, 135 (60%) were returned and 121 were properly completed and used in this study. The systematic and stratified sampling methods were utilized in this study. Through the use of systematic sampling, every fifth person on the NASW metropolitan Atlanta membership list was selected for inclusion in the sample. The stratified sampling method was utilized through the selection of the sample population from both north and south regions of the metropolitan Atlanta area. The participants were obtained from the NASW mailing list of professional social workers and social service workers. The sample consisted of social workers who possessed bachelors, masters, or doctoral degrees in social work.

Data Collection

The data was collected, recorded and analyzed by the researcher. These data were collected through the use of a self-administered questionnaire. The questionnaire was mailed to survey participants who completed them and returned them via mail and some were completed in the community and hand delivered to the researcher. The questionnaire was constructed using selected questions from instruments by Carlton E. Munson and Alfred Kadushin and the Job Descriptive Index which was developed by Patricia Smith, Lorne Kendall and Charles Hulin. The amount of time
required to complete the questionnaire was approximately five minutes.

Instrumentation

The instrument intended for use in this study was developed from the following surveys: Carton Munson's Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire, Alfred Kadushin's Supervisor Satisfaction Questionnaire, and the Job Description Index (JDI) which was developed by Patricia Smith, Lorne Kendall and Charles Hulin.

The JDI was developed while the authors conducted research often referred to as the Cornell Studies of Satisfaction (Smith et al., 1969). The instrument was designed to measure five facets of job satisfaction: work, pay, promotional opportunities, co-workers and supervision. The original JDI instructed the respondent to respond to a list of short phrases or adjectives which measured satisfaction with the five facets of job satisfaction through the use of "Y" for Yes or "N" for No. In this study, the items were placed on a four point Likert scale. The scale was as follows: strongly agree = 1, agree = 2, disagree = 3, and strongly disagree = 4.

Several advantages of utilizing the JDI have been noted. First, it was designed to specifically address certain areas of job satisfaction. The questions allow for several different areas of job satisfaction to be measured separately. This makes it possible for the researcher to
The JDI is very direct and requires participants to provide information that will assist in determining their level of job satisfaction.

Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) performed four studies which tested the validity of the Job Descriptive Index. The authors reported that an identical design was used in three of the studies and a different one was used for the forth. They found that all four studies showed good validity. Therefore, the JDI is considered an appropriate method of measurement of job satisfaction.

**Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire**

The Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire was developed by Carlton Munson. This assessment tool was designed to determine how one feels about the supervisory experience. A six-point Likert Scale was used. The codes for the responses were: strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, mildly disagree = 3, mildly agree = 4, agree = 5, strongly agree = 6.

**Supervisor Satisfaction Questionnaire**

The Supervisor Satisfaction Questionnaire was designed by Alfred Kadushin to measure the respondent’s satisfaction with the supervisory experience and relationship. A six-point Likert Scale was used. In order to determine the relationship between supervision and the independent variables, portions of this questionnaire were utilized and
coded as follows: strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, mildly disagree = 3, mildly agree = 4, agree = 5, and strongly agree = 6.

Procedure For Implementation

The process utilized in this study consisted of Topic Exploration, Approval, Preliminary Proposal, Research, Survey, Data Analysis, and Data Compilation and Reporting. The details for each process were as follows:

Topic Exploration Period

During this period, the researcher explored research interests and identified a specific topic of interest. This was done through extensive library searches, which included the use of the internet library services.

During this period, the researcher identified supervision and job satisfaction as the area of interest. The library searches revealed many research projects on job satisfaction existed, but very little research was found on the relationship between social work supervision and job satisfaction, including the variables examined in this study. Yet, a review of the literature indicated that supervision and job satisfaction appeared to be variables of great interest in the field of social work.

The library searches during this period were conducted at the Clark Atlanta University Robert W. Woodruff Library,
the Pulley Library at Georgia State University and the State of Georgia On-Line Library Internet System.

Next, the researcher began to develop research questions, theories and hypotheses. The specification of the meaning of concepts and variables intended for study were also determined. This period also involved the exploration of the literature, and the review of research methodology and statistical information.

Approval Period

Approval of the research topic was sought by the researcher and granted by the faculty of the Clark Atlanta University School of Social Work.

Preliminary Proposal Period

A preliminary proposal was submitted to the dissertation committee members. The proposal hearing was conducted and the proposed study was approved.

Research Period

This period involved an extensive literature review regarding the identified variables, selection of sample population and data collecting method. The circulation of the dissertation proposal and presentation of proposal to committee members for comments and recommendations also took place during this period. An appropriate questionnaire was developed by the researcher and reviewed by committee members for input and suggestions.
Survey Period

The survey period involved the completion of the final survey questionnaire for distribution. The questionnaire was mailed or hand-delivered and completed by identified target population in the metropolitan Atlanta area. Questionnaires were hand-delivered or returned in a self-addressed envelope to the researcher.

Data Analysis

During this period, data were organized, analyzed, interpreted and reported. The data were entered onto a computer through use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Macintosh (SPSS). This is a statistical system for data analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to organize and present the data.

Data Compilation and Reporting

The research findings, conclusions, implications and recommendations and appropriate tables were analyzed, compiled and presented in the final dissertation. The study was then finalized at that point.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

This chapter presents the results of the statistical analysis performed on the data obtained from the questionnaire, and discusses the findings of the study as they relate to the research questions, hypotheses and literature reviewed. The findings are divided into three sections which include: (1) demographic analysis of the data; (2) research questions and hypotheses; and (3) discussion.

Demographic Analysis of Data

The demographic information in this study was developed from a descriptive data analysis. The data were categorized and tabulated according to frequency distribution. Measures of central tendencies were summarized to provide descriptions of the personal characteristics of the respondents.

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics that were utilized to analyze the following variables: gender, age, marital status, ethnicity, education, employment, work setting, job function, gender of supervisor, education of supervisor, professional orientation of supervisor, ethnicity of supervisor, social work license, social work
membership, years worked in human services and total years worked in the field of social work.

A total of 121 of the 225 social workers who were sent a questionnaire completed the survey and returned it to the researcher. As noted in Table 1, the majority of the respondents were female 79.3% (96) and 20.7% (28) were male.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Job Satisfaction Respondents (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW-PHD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-Divorced</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Function</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm-Supervision</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-Clinical</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research-Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching (Col-Univ)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-Share</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Setting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School(K-12)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Svc. Agency</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/Univ.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts/Justice System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Health Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Practice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Work License</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Work Membership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Worked</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 6 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Social Work with Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 6 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also shown in Table 1, the ages of the respondents ranged from thirty to over the age of seventy. The majority of the respondents 27.3% (33) were between the ages of fifty and fifty-nine. The next highest number of respondents were between the ages of forty and forty-nine 26.4% (32).

A total of 52.9% (64) of the respondents were married, while 24.8% (30) never married and 20.7% (25) were separated or divorced. Only one respondent or .8% reported being widowed.

As shown in Table 1, a majority of the respondents 86% (104) reported having earned a Master of Social Work degree. Only 3.3% (4) of the respondents reported having a bachelors degree in social work, while 5% (6) reported having earned a Doctorate in Social Work (DSW) or Ph.D degree.

A total of 42.1% (51) of the respondents indicated that they were African American while 56.2% (68) of the respondents were members of the Caucasian race. Hispanic and American Indians were both represented by only one respondent or .8% each.

When examining the employment of the respondents, the largest number 82.6% (100) were employed full-time, 14.9% (18) were employed part-time and one respondent .8% was employed temporarily and another respondent indicated a job-share type of employment arrangement. One individual did not respond to this question.
As shown in Table 1, the majority of the respondents 28.1% (34) were employed in social services agencies. Of the 121 respondents, 19.8% (24) were hospital social workers, 14.9% (18) reported working in the school setting (K-12) and 7.4% (9) reported being employed in mental health facilities. A total of 8.3% (10) indicated employment in private practice, 5.8% (7) reported college/university work setting and 4.1% (5) indicated the courts or justice system as their place of employment. A total of 1.7% (2) of the respondents reported working in a Community Health Center and 9.9% (12) indicated other work setting as their places of employment.

Table 1 indicated that the majority of the respondents 69.4% (84) were in direct-clinical practice and 21.5% (26) were in administration or supervision. A total of 3.3% (4) reported teaching in the college or university setting as their job function, 2.5% (3) indicated that they provide consultation, one respondent reported Research-planning as a job function and 2.5% (3) of the respondents indicated that they were involved in other job functions not listed.

When asked if they held a social work license, a majority of the respondents 80.2% (97) indicated "yes" and 19.8% (24) indicated that they did not have a social work license.

A large majority of the respondents 80.2% (97) reported being members of a social work organization and 19% (23)
indicated that they did not have membership with a social work organization. One person did not respond to that question.

As seen in Table 1, the largest number of the respondents 27.3% (33) had worked in the field of social work for over 20 years. A total of 19.8% (24) had worked in the field for under six years, 19.8% (24) reported 6-10 years, 18.2% (22) reported 11-15 years in the social work field and 14% (17) reported between 16-20 years in the human service field. One individual did not respond to this question.

Table 1 also shows that 29.8% (36) of the respondents reported having under six years experience with a social work degree. A total of 17.4% (21) had between six and ten years, 16.5% (20) of the respondents indicated 11-15 years, 13.2% (16) indicated that they held a social work degree for 16-20 years and 21.5% (25) responded that they had over 20 years experience with a social work degree. Two individuals did not respond to the question.

In Table 2, an examination of the supervisor's gender revealed that 62.8% (76) of the respondents had female supervisors and 37.2% (45) had male supervisors.

When examining the age of the supervisors, Table 2 indicated that 41.4% (50) of the supervisors were between the ages of 40 and 49, 38% (46) were between the ages of 50 and 59, and 12.4% (15) of the respondents indicated that
their supervisors were between the ages of 30 and 39 years of age. A total of 8.3% (10) of the supervisors were between 60 and 69.

Table 2. Demographic Profile of Supervisors of Job Satisfaction Respondents (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor’s Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor’s Highest Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW-PHDI</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor’s Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor’s Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor’s Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 indicated that the majority of the supervisors 70.2% (85) were Caucasian and 27.3% (33) of the supervisors were African American. Of the respondents 2.5% (3) indicated that their supervisors were Hispanic.

The majority of the supervisors 47% (50) held a master of social work degree, 15.7% (19) of the supervisors held a doctoral degree and a total of 37.2% (45) of the respondents indicated that their supervisors held other degrees.

As shown in Table 2, 50.4% (61) of the respondents indicated that they were supervised by a social worker, 11.6% (14) reported being supervised by a counselor, 5% (6) indicated being supervised by a nurse and a total of 33% (40) reported that they were supervised by an individual of another professional orientation.
**Demographic Profile of Supervision and Job Satisfaction Respondents**

Demographically, most of the Supervision and Job Satisfaction respondents were females, 79.3% (96), between the ages of 50 and 59, 27.3% (33). The majority were married, 52.9% (64) and members of the Caucasian race, 56.2% (68). Most of the respondents held an MSW degree, 86% (104) and were supervised by social workers, 50.4% (61). A large proportion of the respondent's supervisors were Caucasian, 70.2% (85), females 62.8% (76) between the ages of 40 and 49, 41.3% (50) with an MSW degree, 47.1% (57). A majority of the respondents were in direct-clinical service 69.4% (84), employed full-time 82.6% (100) and worked in a Social Service Agency 28.1% (34). The majority held a social work license 80.2% (97). This is consistent with the number of respondents who were members of a professional social work organization 80.2% (97).

**Summary**

Demographically, those respondents most satisfied with supervision were African American females who were between the ages of 60 and 69, married and held an MSW degree. The majority were supervised by African American social workers. Those most satisfied with supervision did not hold a social work license and were not members of a professional social work organization. The largest proportion of those most
satisfied had earned their social work degree over 20 years ago.

**Codification of Job Satisfaction**

**Supervision Satisfaction**
Supr 1: Amount of Supervision
Supr 2: Fair Treatment of Supervisor
Supr 3: Overall Quality of Supervision

**Pay Satisfaction**
Pay 1: Amount of Pay
Pay 2: Fairness of Pay
Pay 3: Fringe Benefits

**Work Satisfaction**
Work 1: Kind of Work
Work 2: Amount of Freedom at Work
Work 3: Job Enrichment at Work

**Co-Worker Satisfaction**
Co-worker 1: Cooperation of Co-workers
Co-worker 2: People at Work
Co-worker 3: Interaction with Co-Workers

**Promotion Satisfaction**
Promotional 1: Promotional Opportunities
Promotional 2: Promotional Policies
Promotional 3: Promotional Selection Methods
Research Questions

In this study, there were four research questions. This section of the study is an analysis and discussion of these questions. This section will present each research question, the findings and method of analysis and discussion.

Research Question One: What is the relationship between supervision and job satisfaction?

Table 3 depicts the relationship between supervision and job satisfaction of social workers.

Table 3. Supervision and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPSAT</th>
<th>JOBSAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance = .00001 df = 1
The statistical test used to determine the relationship between supervision and job satisfaction was the Chi-square. The significance level of hypotheses testing was at the .05 level of probability. When the Chi-square test was applied, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Research Question Two: What is the relationship between the professional orientation, years of experience, gender, ethnicity, age and education and job satisfaction of social workers?

Table 4 depicts the relationship between gender and job satisfaction of social workers.

Table 4. Gender and Job Satisfaction of Social Workers (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Label</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phi = .01759, df = 1, p < .84655
The statistical test used to measure the relationship between gender and job satisfaction was the Phi test. Table 4 indicates that of the 121 respondents, 79.3% (96) were female and 20.7% (25) were male. A higher percentage of females (78.6%) than males (21.4%) were satisfied with their jobs.

When the Phi test was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted. As shown in Table 4, there was no statistical relationship (p < .84655) between gender and job satisfaction because the Phi had a probability of greater than .05.

Table 5 presents the education and job satisfaction of the study respondents.

**Table 5. Education and Job Satisfaction of Social Workers (N=121)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>BSW</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>DSW-PhD</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Label</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .11257, df = 3, p < .67463
Table 5 indicates that of the 121 respondents, 3.5% (4) held bachelor degrees (BSW), 86% (104) held master of social work degrees (MSW), 5% (6) held DSW-Ph.D., degrees and 5.8% (7) held other degrees.

The higher percentage of the MSW respondents 56% (58) were not satisfied with their jobs. Of the respondents, 7.1% (4) DSW-Ph.D., were satisfied with their jobs and 3.1% (2) were dissatisfied. 1.7% (2) held BSW degrees and were satisfied with their jobs and 1.7% (2) of the BSW respondents were also dissatisfied with their jobs.

When the Cramer's V test was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted because the Cramer's V had a probability of greater than .05. As shown in Table 5, the Cramer's V test indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship (p < .67463) between education and job satisfaction of social workers.

Table 6 presents the ethnicity and job satisfaction of the study respondents.
Table 6. Ethnicity and Job Satisfaction of Social Workers (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>African Amer. White</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Amer. Indian</td>
<td>Row Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34 52.3</td>
<td>31 47.7</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17 30.4</td>
<td>37 66.1</td>
<td>1 1.8</td>
<td>1 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>51 82.7</td>
<td>68 56.2</td>
<td>1 1.8</td>
<td>1 1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .25010, df = 3, p < .05582

As shown in Table 6, of the 121 respondents, 42.1% (51) were African American, 56.2% (68) were Caucasian, 1.8% (1) was Hispanic and 1.8% (1) respondent was American Indian. A higher percentage of the respondents experiencing job satisfaction were Caucasian (66%) and 30.4% (17) of the satisfied respondents were African American. One (1.8%) Hispanic was satisfied and 1.8% (1) American Indian was also satisfied. Of the 65 dissatisfied respondents, 52.3% (34) were African American and 47.7% (31) were Caucasian.

When the Cramer's V test was applied, the null hypothesis was rejected because the Cramer's V had a probability of less than .05. As shown in Table 6, the Cramer's V indicated that there was a statistically
significant relationship (p < .05582) between ethnicity and job satisfaction.

Table 7 depicts the relationship between age and job satisfaction of social workers.

Table 7. Age and Job Satisfaction of Social Workers (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Under 30</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-over</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Label</td>
<td>Value n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td>n n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 18.5</td>
<td>18 27.7</td>
<td>18 27.7</td>
<td>15 23.1</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
<td>1 1.5</td>
<td>65 53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 10.7</td>
<td>11 19.6</td>
<td>14 25.0</td>
<td>18 32.1</td>
<td>6 10.7</td>
<td>1 1.8</td>
<td>56 46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 14.9</td>
<td>29 24.0</td>
<td>32 26.4</td>
<td>33 27.3</td>
<td>7 12.2</td>
<td>2 3.3</td>
<td>121 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .24739, df = 5, p < .19220

Table 7 indicates that of the 121 respondents, 53.7% (65) indicated that they experienced job dissatisfaction and 46.3% (56) indicated that they were satisfied with their jobs.

Of the 46.3% satisfied, 32.1% (18) were between the ages of 50-59, 25% (14) were 40-49, 19.6% (11) were 30-39, 10.7% (6) were under 30, 10.7% (6) were 60-69 and 1.8% (1) respondent was 70-over. The highest proportion of job
dissatisfaction was between the ages of 30-39 and 40-49, both of which were 27.7% (18).

When the Cramer’s V test was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted because the Cramer’s V had a probability of less than .05. As shown in Table 7, the Cramer’s V test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (p < .19220) between the age and job satisfaction of the social worker at the .05 level of probability.

Table 8 depicts the relationship between years of experience and job satisfaction of social workers.

Table 8. Years of Experience and Job Satisfaction of Social Workers (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Under 6</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>Over 20</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Label</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 50.0</td>
<td>16 25.0</td>
<td>14 21.9</td>
<td>10 15.6</td>
<td>12 18.8</td>
<td>64 53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12 21.4</td>
<td>8 14.3</td>
<td>8 14.3</td>
<td>7 12.5</td>
<td>21 37.5</td>
<td>56 46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 71.4</td>
<td>24 39.3</td>
<td>22 36.2</td>
<td>17 28.1</td>
<td>33 56.3</td>
<td>120 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer’s V = .23776, df = 4, p < .14776

Table 8 indicates that of 120 respondents, 53.3% (64) reported job dissatisfaction and 46.6% (56) indicated that
they were satisfied with their jobs. A total of 20% (24) of the respondents indicated that they had under six years experience. Of those, 50% (12) indicated job dissatisfaction and the other 50% (12) indicated that they experienced job satisfaction. As Table 8 indicates, 20% (24) of the respondents had between six and nine years of experience. Of that number, 33.3% (8) out of 24 reported job satisfaction and 67% (16) out of 24 indicated job dissatisfaction. A total of 18.3% (22) of the respondents had between 11 and 15 years of experience. Of those, 36.3% (8) out of 24 indicated job satisfaction and 63.6% (14) indicated job satisfaction. As seen in Table 8, 14.2% (17) out of the 120 respondents reported having between 16 and 20 years of experience. Of those, 59% (10) indicated job dissatisfaction and 41% (7) indicated job satisfaction. A larger proportion of the respondents reported having experience of 20 years and over in the field of social work. A total of 63.3% (21) indicated job satisfaction and 36.3% (12) indicated job dissatisfaction.

When the Cramer's V test was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted because the Cramer's V had a probability of greater than .05. As shown in Table 8, the Cramer's V test indicated that there was no statistical relationship (p < .14776) between years of experience and job satisfaction at the .05 level of significance.
**Research Question Three:** What is the relationship between the professional orientation, gender, ethnicity, age and education of supervisors and job satisfaction of social workers?

Table 9 depicts the relationship between gender of supervisors and job satisfaction of social workers.

**Table 9. Gender of Supervisors and Job Satisfaction of Social Workers (N=121)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Label</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \Phi = 0.00595, \ \text{df} = 1, \ p < 0.94780 \)

Table 9 indicates that of the 121 respondents, 62.8% (76) were female and 37.2% (45) were male. A slightly higher percentage of females (78.6%) than males (21.4%) were dissatisfied with their jobs and a slightly higher percentage of males (46.7%) were satisfied with their jobs.
When the Phi test was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted because the Phi had a probability of greater than .05. As shown in Table 9, the Phi test indicated that there was no statistical relationship (p < .94780) between supervisor’s gender and job satisfaction of social workers.

Table 10 presents the relationship between education of supervisors and job satisfaction of social workers.

**Table 10. Education of Supervisors and Job Satisfaction of Social Workers (N=121)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>MSW</th>
<th>DSW-PhD</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Label</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
<td>n %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>9 47.4</td>
<td>21 46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>10 52.6</td>
<td>24 53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>19 15.7</td>
<td>45 37.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .14552, df = 2, p < .27772

Table 10 indicates that of the 121 respondents 47.1% (57) supervisors held master of social work degrees (MSW), 15.7% (19) held DSW-Ph.D, degrees and 37.2% (45) held other degrees.

The higher percentage of the MSW supervisors 61.4% (35) were not satisfied with their jobs. Of the respondents,
52.6% (10) DSW-Ph.D., were satisfied with their jobs and 47.4% (9) were dissatisfied.

When the Cramer's V test was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted because the Cramer's V had a probability of greater than .05. As shown in Table 10, the Cramer's V test indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship (p < .27772) between supervisor's educational level and job satisfaction of social workers.

Table 11 presents the relationship between the ethnicity of the supervisors and job satisfaction of social workers.

Table 11. Supervisor Ethnicity and Job Satisfaction of Social Workers (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>African Amer.</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Label</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .13305, df = 2, p < .34265

As shown in Table 11, of the 121 respondents, 27.3% (33) supervisors were African American, 70.2% (85) were
Caucasian and 2.5% (3) respondents were Hispanic. A higher percentage of the respondents experiencing job satisfaction were supervised by Caucasian (49.4%) and 36.4% of the satisfied respondents were supervised by African Americans. Two of the satisfied respondents were supervised by Hispanics. Of the 65 dissatisfied respondents, 32.3% or 21 were supervised by an African American, 66% or 43 were Caucasian and 1.5% or 1 respondent was supervised by a member of the Hispanic racial group.

When the Cramer’s V test was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted because the Cramer’s V had a probability of greater than .05. As shown in Table 11, the Cramer’s V test indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship (p < .34265) between supervisor’s ethnicity and job satisfaction.

Table 12 presents the relationship between the age of the supervisor and job satisfaction of social workers.
Table 12. Supervisor Age and Job Satisfaction of Social Workers (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9  60.0</td>
<td>30  60.0</td>
<td>20  43.5</td>
<td>6  60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6  40.0</td>
<td>20  40.0</td>
<td>26  56.5</td>
<td>4  40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>50  46.0</td>
<td>46  38.0</td>
<td>10  8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's V = .16085, df = 3, p < .37194

Table 12 indicates that of the 121 respondents, 53.7% (65) indicated that they experienced job dissatisfaction and 46.3% (56) indicated that they were satisfied with their jobs.

Of the 46.3% satisfied, 12.4% or 15 were supervised by individuals between the ages of 30-39, 41.3% or 50 were supervised by individuals between 40-49, 38% or 46 supervisors were 50-59 and 8.3% or 30 was for respondents supervised by individuals between the ages of 40 and 49. A total of 26 or 40% of the satisfied respondents were supervised by individuals between 50 and 59 years of age.

When the Cramer’s V test was applied the null hypothesis was accepted because the Cramer’s V had a probability of greater than .05. As shown in Table 12, the
Cramer’s V test indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship (p < .37194) between the supervisor’s age and job satisfaction of the social worker.

Table 13 presents the relationship between the profession of the supervisor and job satisfaction of the social workers.

Table 13. Supervisor Profession and Job Satisfaction of Social Workers (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Social Worker</th>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Nurse</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1 36 29.7</td>
<td>9 13.8</td>
<td>4 6.2</td>
<td>16 24.6</td>
<td>65 53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>2 25 20.6</td>
<td>5 8.9</td>
<td>2 3.6</td>
<td>24 42.9</td>
<td>56 46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>61 50.3</td>
<td>14 11.6</td>
<td>6 9.8</td>
<td>40 67.5</td>
<td>121 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer’s V = .19813, df = 3, p < .19105

Table 13 indicates that of the 121 respondents, 50.3% (61) indicated that they were supervised by social workers, 11.6% (14) indicated that they were supervised by counselors, 9.8% (6) were supervised by nurses and 33% (40) were supervised by other professionals.
Of the 50.3% (61) being supervised by social workers, 41% (25) indicated job satisfaction and, 59% (36) indicated dissatisfaction with their jobs. Of the 11.6% (14) who were supervised by counselors, 64% (9) indicated job dissatisfaction and 36% (5) indicated job satisfaction. Those respondents supervised by nurses indicated that 67% (4) were dissatisfied and 33% (2) experienced job satisfaction. Also, 60% (24) of the respondents supervised by nurses were satisfied with their jobs while 40% (16) were dissatisfied.

When the Cramer's V test was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted because the Cramer's V had a probability of greater than .05. As shown in Table 13, the Cramer's V test indicated that there was no statistically significant relationship (p < .19105) between the profession of the supervisor and job satisfaction of the social worker.

**Research Question Four:** Of the facets of job satisfaction, (work, pay, co-worker, promotional opportunities and supervisor satisfaction) which is the best predictor of job satisfaction?

In this study, the five facets of job satisfaction (work, pay, co-worker, promotional opportunities and supervision) were identified to determine which among them was the best predictor of job satisfaction. To make this
determination, the stepwise multiple regression statistical procedure was performed, as shown in Table 14.

Table 14. Multiple Regression of the Five Facets of Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotional</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Worker</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 shows a stepwise multiple regression analysis of the facets of job satisfaction. Promotional opportunities was entered first (R = .681, R² = .463 and F = .0001). Supervision satisfaction was entered second (R = .110, R² = .160 and F = .0001). Pay satisfaction was entered third (R = .049, R² = .081 and F = .0001). Co-worker satisfaction was entered fourth (R = .027, R² = .041 and F = .0001). There was no significant relationship found between work satisfaction and job satisfaction. Table 14 indicates that the variable highly predictive of job satisfaction was promotional opportunities. The coefficient of determination (R² = .463) indicated that a total of 46% of the variation
in job satisfaction can be explained by or predicted by promotional opportunities.

Table 14 also indicates that supervision was the variable with the second highest coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .160$). A total of 16% of the variation in job satisfaction can be explained by or predicted by supervision satisfaction. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 15 is a frequency distribution of 121 respondents of work satisfaction. This table indicates how satisfied the study respondents were with the work they were doing in their jobs or the job itself. Of the 121 respondents, 1.7% were strongly dissatisfied with the work they were doing on their jobs, 24.8% were dissatisfied, 83.5% indicated that they were satisfied and 16.6% were strongly satisfied.

Table 15. Frequency Distribution of Work Satisfaction (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.901 Standard Deviation = .676
A majority of the respondents indicated that they were dissatisfied with the work they were doing on their jobs. As shown in Table 15, the value 2.000 (dissatisfied) was the most frequent score of the distribution. The mean score was 2.901.

Table 16 is a frequency distribution of the 121 respondents of the sub-facets of work satisfaction. As indicated in Table 16, when the respondents were asked about the kind of work they did (Work 1), 2.5% indicated they were strongly dissatisfied, 10.7% were dissatisfied, 48.8% were satisfied and 38% were strongly satisfied. When they were asked about the amount of freedom on the job (Work 2), .8% were strongly dissatisfied, 9.1% were dissatisfied, 36.4% were satisfied and 53.7% were strongly satisfied. The respondents were also asked whether or not they experienced job enrichment (Work 3). A total of 5.8% were strongly dissatisfied, 23.1% indicated that they were dissatisfied, 43.8% were satisfied and 27.3% indicated that they were strongly satisfied with job enrichment.
Table 16. Sub-Facets of Work Satisfaction of Social Workers (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Work 1 - Kind of Work</th>
<th>Work 2 - Amount of Freedom</th>
<th>Work 3 - Job Enrichment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 2.5</td>
<td>1 0.8</td>
<td>7 5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13 10.7</td>
<td>11 9.1</td>
<td>28 23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59 48.8</td>
<td>44 36.4</td>
<td>53 43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46 38.0</td>
<td>65 53.7</td>
<td>33 27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>121 100.0</td>
<td>121 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Standard Deviation   | 0.736 | 0.693 | 0.858 |
| Mean                 | 3.223 | 3.430 | 2.926 |

As shown in Table 16, the majority of the respondents were satisfied with the kind of work that they did, a large proportion of them were strongly satisfied with the amount of freedom and the majority of the respondents were satisfied with job enrichment on the job.

Table 17 is a frequency distribution of the pay satisfaction of the study respondents. This Table indicates whether or not the respondents experienced pay satisfaction. Of the 121 respondents, Table 17 indicates that 24% were strongly dissatisfied with pay, 34.7% were dissatisfied with
pay, 30.6% were satisfied with their pay and 10.7% indicated that they were strongly satisfied with pay.

Table 17. Frequency Distribution of Pay Satisfaction (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.281         Standard Deviation = .951

A majority of the respondents indicated that they were dissatisfied with the pay on their jobs. As shown in Table 17, the value 2.000 (dissatisfied) was the most frequent score in the distribution. The mean score was 2.281.

Table 18 is a frequency distribution of the 121 respondents of the sub-facets of pay satisfaction.
Table 18. Sub-Facets of Pay Satisfaction of Social Workers (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Pay 1 - Amount of Pay</th>
<th>Pay 2 - Fairness of Pay</th>
<th>Pay 3 - Fringe Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Standard Deviation    | .991 | 1.058 | 1.045 |
| Mean                  | 2.438 | 2.479 | 2.744 |

As shown in Table 18, when the respondents were asked about the amount of pay they received (Pay 1), 21.5% indicated they were strongly dissatisfied, 28.1% were dissatisfied, 35.5% were satisfied and 14.9% were strongly satisfied. When they were asked about the fairness of pay (Pay 2), 22.3% were strongly dissatisfied, 27.3% were dissatisfied, 31.4% were satisfied and 18.2% were strongly satisfied. One respondent did not respond to this question. The respondents were also asked whether or not they were
satisfied with fringe benefits (Pay 3). A total of 14.9% were strongly dissatisfied, 24.8% indicated that they were dissatisfied, 32.2% were satisfied and 27.3% indicated that they were strongly satisfied with fringe benefits. One respondent did not respond to this question.

As shown in Table 18, the majority of the respondents were satisfied with the amount of pay, a majority of them were satisfied with the fairness of pay and the majority of the respondents were also satisfied with fringe benefits.

Table 19 is a frequency distribution of the co-worker satisfaction of the study respondents. This Table indicates whether or not the respondents experienced satisfaction with co-workers. Of the 121 respondents, Table 19 indicated that 2.5% were strongly dissatisfied with co-workers, 9.9% were dissatisfied with co-workers, 64.5% were satisfied with their co-workers and 22.3% indicated that they were strongly satisfied with their co-workers.
Table 19. Frequency Distribution of Co-worker Satisfaction (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 3.091  Standard Deviation = .671

A majority of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the co-workers on their jobs. As shown in Table 19, the value 3.000 (satisfied) was the most frequent score in the distribution. The mean score was 3.091.

Table 20 is a frequency distribution of the 121 respondents of the sub-facets of co-worker satisfaction.
As shown in Table 20, when the respondents were asked about co-worker cooperation (Co-worker 1), 1.7% indicated they were strongly dissatisfied, 5.8% were dissatisfied, 57% were satisfied and 33.1% were strongly satisfied. Three respondents did not respond to this question. When they were asked about the people at work (Co-worker 2), 3.3% were strongly dissatisfied, 6.6% were dissatisfied, 50.4% were satisfied and 38.8% were strongly satisfied. One respondent did not respond to this question. The respondents were also asked whether or not they were satisfied with co-worker
interactions (Co-worker 3). A total of 1.7% were strongly dissatisfied, 9.1% indicated that they were dissatisfied, 57% were satisfied and 31.4% indicated that they were strongly satisfied with co-worker interaction. One respondent did not respond to this question.

As shown in Table 20, the majority of the respondents were satisfied with the co-worker cooperation, a majority of them were satisfied with the people at work and the majority of the respondents were also satisfied with co-worker interactions.

Table 21 is a frequency distribution of the promotions satisfaction of the study respondents. This Table indicates whether or not the respondents experienced satisfaction with the promotional opportunities on their jobs. Of the 121 respondents, Table 21 indicated that 21.5% were strongly dissatisfied with promotional opportunities, 40.5% were dissatisfied with promotional opportunities, 26.4% were satisfied with the promotional opportunities and 9.1% indicated that they were strongly satisfied with the promotional opportunities on their jobs. A total of 2.5% of the respondents did not respond.
Table 21. Frequency Distribution of Promotions Satisfaction (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.306  
Standard Deviation = .990

A majority of the respondents indicated that they were dissatisfied with the promotional opportunities on their jobs. As shown in Table 21, the value 2.000 (dissatisfied) was the most frequent score in the distribution. The mean score was 2.306.

Table 22 is a frequency distribution of the 121 respondents of the sub-facets of promotional opportunities.
As shown in Table 22, when the respondents were asked about promotional opportunities (Promotion 1), 21.5% indicated they were strongly dissatisfied, 33.1% were dissatisfied, 30.6% were satisfied and 8.8% were strongly satisfied. Six respondents did not respond to this question. When they were asked about the promotional policies (Promotion 2), 15.7% were strongly dissatisfied, 38% were dissatisfied, 32.3% were satisfied and 8.3% were strongly satisfied. A total of seven respondents did not respond to this question. The respondents were also asked
whether or not they were satisfied with the promotional selection methods (Promotion 3). A total of 17.4% were strongly dissatisfied, 36.4% indicated that they were dissatisfied, 32.3% were satisfied and 8.3% indicated that they were strongly satisfied with the selection methods for promotions. Again, seven respondents did not respond to this question.

As shown in Table 22, the majority of the respondents were dissatisfied with the promotional opportunities on their jobs, the largest proportion of them were dissatisfied with policies for promotions and the majority of the respondents were also dissatisfied with the selection methods for promotions.

Table 23 is a frequency distribution of the supervision satisfaction of the study respondents. This Table indicates whether or not the respondents experienced satisfaction with supervision on their jobs. Of the 121 respondents, Table 23 indicates that 6.6% were strongly dissatisfied with supervision, 19.9% were dissatisfied, 48.8% were satisfied and 24.8% indicated that they were strongly satisfied with supervision on their jobs.
Table 23. Frequency Distribution of Supervision Satisfaction (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 2.917  Standard Deviation = .842

A majority of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the supervision on their jobs. As shown in Table 23, the value 3.000 (satisfied) was the most frequent score in the distribution. The mean score was 2.917.

Table 24 is a frequency distribution of the 121 respondents of the sub-facets of supervision satisfaction.
Table 24. Sub-Facets of Supervision Satisfaction of Social Workers (N=121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Supervision 1 - Amount of Support</th>
<th>Supervision 2 - Fair Treatment</th>
<th>Supervision 3 - Overall Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Standard Deviation | .862 | .746 | .957 |
| Mean              | 3.124 | 3.331 | 3.033 |

As shown in Table 24, when the respondents were asked about the amount of supervision on their jobs (Supervision 1), 5.8% indicated they were strongly dissatisfied, 14% were dissatisfied, 42% were satisfied and 38% were strongly satisfied. When they were asked about the fairness of supervisory treatment (Supervision 2), 2.5% were strongly dissatisfied, 6.6% were dissatisfied, 48.8% were satisfied and 39.7% were strongly satisfied. A total of three respondents did not respond to this question. The respondents were also asked whether or not they were
satisfied with the overall quality of supervision (Supervision 3). A total of 9.9% were strongly dissatisfied, 12.4% indicated that they were dissatisfied, 43.8% were satisfied and 32.3% indicated that they were strongly satisfied with the overall quality of supervision. Two respondents did not respond to this question.

As shown in Table 24, a large proportion of the respondents were satisfied with the amount of supervisory support they received, the majority of them were satisfied with fair treatment received from supervisors and the majority of the respondents were also satisfied with the overall quality of supervision.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION, SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes the discussion, summary and implications of this study. A brief discussion of the study purpose, methodology, literature review and theoretical frameworks are presented in this chapter. In addition, recommendations were made to urge the continuation of research concerning social work supervision and job satisfaction.

Discussion

The research questions of the study are as follows:

Research Question One:

What is the relationship between supervision and job satisfaction of social workers?

The statistical test used to determine the relationship between supervision and job satisfaction was the Chi-square. When the Chi-square was applied, the null hypothesis was rejected. The Chi-square had a probability of less than .05 (p < .0001). In this study, a significant relationship was found between supervision and job satisfaction.
The highest percentage of the study respondents (46.3%) reported that they experienced job satisfaction. A total of 68.6% reported that they were satisfied with supervision (see Table 23).

A majority of the respondents were satisfied with the amount of supervisory support (80%); fair treatment of the supervisor (89%); and the overall quality of supervision (76%) (see Table 24).

Previous research supports the findings that there is a relationship between social work supervision and job satisfaction. Poulin and Walter (1992) conducted a study of social workers and found a significant relationship between supervisor support and job satisfaction. Samantrai's study (1992) revealed that one of the factors that influenced public child welfare social workers to leave jobs was poor relationships with immediate supervisors. In 1998, Glisson and Durick found that there was a significant relationship between leadership and social worker job satisfaction. Rauktis and Koeske (1994) contend that the greater the level of supervisor support, the higher the degree of employee job satisfaction.

Research Question Two:

What is the relationship between the years of experience, gender, ethnicity, age and educational level of social workers and the job satisfaction of social workers?
This research question was addressed in five sections which were specific to the variables. To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between years of experience, gender, ethnicity, age and educational level of social workers and job satisfaction of social workers, the Chi-square test was utilized. Of the five identified independent variables, each indicated a probability of greater than .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

It was concluded that there was not a statistically significant relationship between years of experience, gender, age and educational level of social workers and job satisfaction. The Chi-square test indicated a $p < .84655$ level of significance for gender, $p < .67463$ for educational level, and $p < .14776$ for years of experience, $p < .19105$ for supervisor’s professional orientation and $p < .19220$ for age.

Gender

To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between gender and job satisfaction of social workers the Phi test was utilized. The null hypothesis was accepted indicating a probability of greater than .05 ($p < .84655$). It was concluded that there was not a statistically significant relationship between gender and social worker job satisfaction.
**Education**

To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between education and social worker job satisfaction the Cramer’s V test was employed and the null hypothesis was accepted. In the study, there was no statistically significant relationship found between education and job satisfaction of social workers indicating a probability of greater than .05 (p < .67463).

**Ethnicity**

To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between ethnicity and social worker job satisfaction the Cramer’s V test was applied and the null hypothesis was rejected indicating a probability of greater than .05. There was a statistically significant relationship found (p < .05582) between ethnicity and job satisfaction.

The greatest percentage of respondents experiencing job satisfaction were Caucasian (66%) and 30.4% of the satisfied respondents were African American. One Hispanic respondent was satisfied and one American Indian was also satisfied. Of the dissatisfied respondents, 52.3% were African American and 57.7% were Caucasian.

**Age**

To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between age and social worker job
satisfaction the Cramer’s V test was applied. The findings indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship \( p < .19220 \) between age and job satisfaction of social workers with a probability greater than .05. The null hypothesis was accepted.

The greatest proportion of respondents (28%) who were dissatisfied with their jobs were between the ages of 30 and 39 and 40 and 49. The highest proportion of respondents (32%) who were satisfied with their jobs were between the ages of 50 and 59.

**Years of Experience**

To determine whether or not there was statistically significant relationship between years of experience and social worker job satisfaction the Cramer’s V test was applied. When the Cramer’s V test was applied, the null hypothesis was accepted. It was concluded that there was no statistically significant relationship \( p < .14776 \) between years of experience and job satisfaction indicating a probability of greater than .05.

**Research Question Three:**

What is the relationship between the professional orientation, gender, ethnicity, age and educational level of the supervisor and the job satisfaction of social workers?
This research question was answered in five sections which were specific to the variables.

To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between the professional orientation, gender, ethnicity, age and educational level of the supervisor and the job satisfaction of social workers the Chi-square test was employed. Each of the five independent variables indicated a probability of greater than .05.

It was concluded that there was no statistically significant relationship between the supervisor's gender, ethnicity, educational level, age and professional orientation and social worker job satisfaction. The Chi-square test indicated the level of significance for supervisor's gender (p < .94780), supervisor's educational level (p < .27772), for supervisor's ethnicity (p < .34265), for supervisor's age (p < .37194) and for supervisor's professional orientation (p < .19105). For these five independent variables, the null hypothesis was accepted.

**Supervisor Profession Orientation**

To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between the supervisor's professional orientation and social worker job satisfaction the Cramer's V test was applied. The null hypothesis was accepted indicating a probability of greater than .05. It was concluded that there was no statistically significant
relationship \((p < .19105)\) between the profession of the supervisor and job satisfaction of the social work.

**Gender**

To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between the supervisor's gender and job satisfaction the Phi test was employed. The null hypothesis was accepted indicating a probability of greater than \(.05 (p < .94780)\). It was concluded that there was not a statistically significant relationship between the gender of the supervisor and social work job satisfaction.

**Education**

To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between the supervisor's level of education and job satisfaction the Cramer's V test was employed. The null hypothesis was accepted indicating a probability of greater than \(.05 (p < .27772)\). It was concluded that there was not a statistically significant relationship between the education and the supervisor and social work job satisfaction.

**Ethnicity**

To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between the supervisor's ethnicity and social work job satisfaction the Cramer's V test was utilized. The null hypothesis was accepted indicating a probability of greater than \(.05 (p < .34265)\). It was
concluded that there was no statistically significant relationship between the ethnicity of the supervisor and social work job satisfaction.

**Age**

To determine whether or not there was a statistically significant relationship between the supervisor's age and social work job satisfaction the Cramer's V test was employed. The null hypothesis was accepted indicating a probability of greater than .05 (p < .37194). It was concluded that there was not a statistically significant relationship between the age of the supervisor and social work job satisfaction.

An empirical review of the literature revealed that very little research has been conducted on these study variables and job satisfaction. However, the literature indicated that incompetent supervisors were more likely to exhibit behaviors of power and control (Eisikovits, Meier, Guttmann, Shurka, Levinstein, 1985). Fox (1989) indicated that the impact of supervision relies heavily on how well the supervisor uses himself and sensitivity during the supervisory experience.
Research Question Four:

Of the facets of job satisfaction (work satisfaction, pay satisfaction, co-worker satisfaction, promotional opportunities and supervisor satisfaction) which is the best predictor of job satisfaction?

To determine which of the five facets of job satisfaction was the best predictor of job satisfaction the stepwise multiple regression statistical procedure was performed. It was concluded that promotional opportunities was the variable most predictive of job satisfaction. Based on these results, we accept the null hypothesis and maintain that of the facets, promotional opportunities is the best predictor of job satisfaction. Table 14 shows that $R^2$ for promotional opportunities = .463, indicating that 46% of the variation in job satisfaction is explained by promotional opportunities.

Previous studies maintain varying results. Dye (1991) found that of the facets work, pay, co-worker, perception of supervision and promotional opportunities, perception of supervision was the variable highly predictive of job satisfaction. Waymer (1995) also determined that supervision was a predictor of job satisfaction. Yet, Bozionelos (1996) found that the number of promotions had a significant relationship with job satisfaction.
Summary

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between social work supervision and employee job satisfaction of social workers. This study attempted to add to the current body of knowledge concerning social work supervision and job satisfaction by examining the relationship between professional orientation, years of experience, gender, ethnicity and age of the worker and supervisor.

Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) suggested five facets essential for measuring job satisfaction. They are: work satisfaction, pay satisfaction, co-worker satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction and promotional opportunities. This study also analyzed the facets of job satisfaction as indicated by Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) to ascertain which facet was the best predictor of job satisfaction for social workers.

The study utilized multiple regression, Phi and Cramer’s V to explain the relationship between the variables. The site of the study is the metropolitan Atlanta area. This site was chosen because of the large number of social workers employed in the area and who are associated with Clark Atlanta University and other institutions.

The respondents in this study were drawn from members of the Georgia Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, North Georgia Unit. The membership of this organ-
ization consisted of professional social workers and some individuals of related professions working in the area of human service.

A total of 225 questionnaires were mailed. Of those, 135 (60%) were returned and 121 were considered usable and were actually used in this study. The systematic and stratified sampling methods were utilized in this study. Through the use of systematic sampling, every fifth person on the NASW metropolitan Atlanta membership list was selected for inclusion in the sample. The stratified sampling method was utilized through selecting the sample population from both north and south regions of the metropolitan Atlanta area.

The data were collected, recorded and analyzed by the researcher. These data were collected through the use of a self-administered questionnaire. The survey questionnaire was developed from items from instruments by Carlton E. Munson, Alfred Kadushin and the Job Descriptive Index which was developed by Patricia Smith, Lorne Kendall and Charles Hulin.

The study answered the following questions:

1. What is the relationship between supervision and job satisfaction of social workers?
2. What is the relationship between the professional orientation, years of experience, gender, ethnicity, age and education of social workers and the job satisfaction of social workers?

3. What is the relationship between the professional orientation, gender, ethnicity, age and education of the supervisor and the job satisfaction of social workers?

4. Of the facets of job satisfaction (work satisfaction, pay satisfaction, co-worker satisfaction, promotional opportunities and supervisor satisfaction) which is the best predictor of job satisfaction?

In Chapter II a review of the empirical and theoretical literature was conducted. The literature review revealed a significant number of studies had been conducted on job satisfaction and supervision. Ten studies were identified which revealed the relationship between social work supervision and employee job satisfaction. The empirical literature indicated that a relationship was found between supervision and employee job satisfaction. The literature review also revealed that research was conducted on the five dimensions of job satisfaction, and that the facets pay and supervision had been identified as the best predictors of job satisfaction.
The theoretical frameworks in this study were the Contingency Theory, Path-Goal Leadership Theory and Herzberg's Two Factor Theory.

**Contingency Theory**

Contingency Theory, which is also referred to as the Situational Theory, focuses on the utilization of the style of leadership that is most effective in given situations. The contingency theory suggest that there is not a global plan of supervision that can be implemented in the workplace.

**Motivator-Hygiene Theory**

The motivator-hygiene theory, also referred to as the two factor theory, was proposed by Frederick Herzberg in 1959. Herzberg (1966) hypothesized that work satisfaction and dissatisfaction are separate and sometimes unrelated occurrences and that two different sets of factors affect work satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

This theory indicated that the basic needs of employees have been met in contemporary society.

**Path-Goal Theory of Leadership**

The Path-Goal Theory of Leadership was also selected as a theoretical framework for this study. This theory attempts to define the relationship between a leader's behavior and the worker's performance and work activities. The premise of the path-goal theory of leadership is that
leader behavior influences the motivation of workers as it relates to the satisfaction of their needs and successful performance (Rue and Byars, 1992). In the path-goal theory, there are four basic types of leader behavior. They are as follows: role classification, supportive, participative and autocratic.

Role classification involves letting subordinates know what is expected of them; gives guidance as to what should be done and how; schedules and coordinates work among subordinates; and maintains standards of performance. The supportive leader is a friendly, approachable leader who attempts to create a pleasant work environment for subordinates. The participative leader consults with workers and asks for their suggestions and involves them in the decision-making process. Autocratic leadership involves a leader who gives orders that are not be questioned by workers.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study were as follows:

1. The lack of availability of a balance of social workers who were employed in a variety of work settings.

2. The data were self-reported, therefore, the validity and reliability of the information were dependent solely on the respondent's abilities to
accurately and honestly report events and perceptions.

3. Time and cost constraints limited the conditions under which the study was conducted.

Job Satisfaction was defined as the level of gratification, contentment and/or pleasure derived from the job. Supervisory satisfaction was defined as satisfaction with supervision rather than other factors in the workplace.

In this study, the five facets of job satisfaction (work, pay, co-worker, supervision and promotional opportunities) were codified by dividing each facet into three areas which yielded a total of fifteen sub-facets. This increased the validity of the measurements and made a more in-depth explanation of job satisfaction possible.

The findings of the study appear to indicate the following:

1. There was a statistically significant relationship between supervision and job satisfaction.

2. There was a statistically significant relationship between ethnicity and age and job satisfaction of social workers, while there was no statistically significant relationship between gender, education, supervisor’s profession and years of experience and job satisfaction of the social worker.

3. There was no statistically significant relationship between the gender, education, ethnicity, and age of
the supervisor and job satisfaction of the social worker.

4. Based on the strength of association the five facets of job satisfaction and job satisfaction of social workers, it was determined that promotional opportunities was the best predictor of job satisfaction for the social worker respondents in this study.

Implications

This study has implications for management and supervisors of human service organizations, social work practice and social work education. The study findings and conclusions indicate the need for social work administration, including managers and supervisors, to develop sensitivity to the satisfaction that direct service workers are deriving from their jobs. Administrators can benefit from creating work environments that recognize the importance of social workers and their job satisfaction. Social work supervisors and management can focus on the provision of quality supervision for social workers which, according to this study can result in job satisfaction. Social work administration can also reevaluate institutional policies, such as promotional opportunities, that might give workers a better sense of job satisfaction. Finally, management can promote job satisfaction through their support of direct service workers as they attempt to provide quality services to clients. Ongoing seminars and continuing education
focused on the need for and benefits of job satisfaction and communication in the work environment may also be worthwhile to both social workers and social work management.

This study also has implications for social work education. Social work students can develop an understanding of the relationship between social work supervisors and job satisfaction in the social work field. It is also important for students to understand that many of today's organizations are struggling for economic survival and may have policies in place over which they will have little or no control. These issues can result in job dissatisfaction, if the student does not put his/her place in the structure in context and focus on reaching goals. Social workers can also begin to teach students how to cope with stresses in the workplace and to set appropriate limits.

Recommendations

The investigation of the relationship between social work supervision and employee job satisfaction is necessary information for social workers, social work managers and the social work profession. Therefore, it is imperative that social workers continue to involve themselves in research that will benefit social work clients, as well as provide a significant contribution to the profession of social work. Additionally, it is significant to have an understanding of
the social worker's perception of the relationship between
the social work supervision and job satisfaction.

This writer recommends that social work professionals
continue to engage in research projects in the social work
field. Therefore, it is suggested that social workers
continue to conduct research on social work supervision and
job satisfaction. In addition, it is recommended that
research is conducted to determine the following:

1. Further research on the relationship between social
   work supervision and employee job satisfaction.

2. The impact of the professional orientation of the
   supervisor on the job performance of the social worker.

3. The relationship between the social worker's field of
   specialization and/or work setting and job satis-
   faction.

4. A comparison of job satisfaction of direct service
   social workers and job satisfaction of social work
   managers/administrators.

5. The impact of job satisfaction on social worker job
   performance.
APPENDIX A

Joi G. Showell  
7246 Raintree Loop  
Jonesboro, GA 30236  

August 30, 1998  

Dear Fellow Social Worker:  

I am conducting a study of social workers in the Atlanta metropolitan area and am writing to request your participation in a survey. The purpose of the study is to learn more about the relationship between social work supervision and employee job satisfaction. The results of this survey will be analyzed and included as part of my doctoral dissertation at the Clark Atlanta University School of Social Work.  

Social worker participation in this survey will help contribute to the existing body of research on the relationship between supervision and job satisfaction. Your input would be extremely valuable in analyzing how the job satisfaction of social workers in particular is impacted by supervision. Please take a moment right now to complete the attached questionnaire and mail the completed form in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Because we want to keep all responses confidential, please do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire. All survey forms are coded for response tracking purposes only. The information provided by participants in the survey will be anonymously compiled to protect individual identities.  

Thank you in advance for your assistance.  

Sincerely,  

Joi G. Showell, LCSW  
Doctoral Candidate  

Enclosures
Dear Fellow Social Worker:

Previously, I wrote to you requesting your participation in a survey. In case you did not receive the first mailing, I am writing again because I would really appreciate your views as a fellow social worker. I am conducting a study of social workers in the Atlanta metropolitan area. The purpose of the study is to learn more about the relationship between social work supervision and employee job satisfaction. The results of this survey will be analyzed and included as part of my doctoral dissertation at the Clark Atlanta University School of Social Work.

Social worker participation in this survey will help contribute to the existing body of research on the relationship between supervision and job satisfaction. Your input would be extremely valuable in analyzing how the job satisfaction of social workers in particular is impacted by supervision. Please take a moment right now to complete the attached questionnaire and mail the completed form in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Because we want to keep all responses confidential, please do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire. All survey forms are coded for response tracking purposes only. The information provided by participants in the survey will be anonymously compiled to protect individual identities.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Joi G. Showell, LCSW
Doctoral Candidate

Enclosures
Supervision and Job Satisfaction of Social Workers

Place a check mark (x) next to the appropriate answer. Please choose one answer for each question.

1. My gender is: 1) Male 2) Female
2. My supervisor is: 1) Male 2) Female
3. My highest degree is a: 1) BSW 2) MSW 3) DSW/Ph.D. 4) Other
   Specify
4. My supervisor's highest degree is a: 1) BSW 2) MSW 3) DSW/Ph.D. 4) Other
   Specify
5. My supervisor's professional orientation is: 1) Social Worker 2) Counselor 3) Nurse
   4) Other /Please List
6. My age group is: 1) Under 30 2) 30-39 3) 40-49 4) 50-59 5) 60-69 6) 70 or over
7. My supervisor's age group is: 1) Under 30 2) 30-39 3) 40-49 4) 50-59 5) 60-69 6) 70 or over
8. My marital status is: 1) Married 2) Never Married 3) Sep/Divorced 4) Widowed
9. The one racial or ethnic category that best describes me is:
   1) African American 2) White 3) Hispanic 4) Asian 5) American Indian 6) Other
10. The one racial or ethnic category that best describes my supervisor is:
    1) African American 2) White 3) Hispanic 4) Asian 5) American Indian 6) Other
11. My employment is: 1) Full-time 2) Part-time 3) Temporary 4) Job-share 5) Other
12. My work setting is:
    1) Hospital 2) School (K-12) 3) Government 4) Social Service Agency
    5) College/University 6) Court/Justice System 7) Community Health System
    8) Private Practice 9) Mental Health Facility 10) Other
13. My major job function is: 1) Adm/Supervision 2) Direct/Clinical 3) Consultation
    4) Research/Planning 5) Teaching (University)
14. I am a holder of a social work license: 1) Yes 2) No
15. I am a member of a professional social work organization: 1) Yes 2) No
16. I have worked in social services for ____ years. (Please indicate total number of years)

17. I have worked for ____ years, after receiving my social work degree.

Section II

How much do you agree with the following statements? Answer each of the following questions by circling the response category below each question that best describes how you feel about the question. The codes for the responses are:

- SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE
- D  = DISAGREE
- A  = AGREE
- SA = STRONGLY AGREE

18. My supervisor respects me as a professional and treats me as such.
   SD   D   A   SA

19. I think my supervisor is fair.
   SD   D   A   SA

20. Overall, I am satisfied with my supervisory experience.
   SD   D   A   SA

21. My supervisor is friendly and can be easily approached.
   SD   D   A   SA

22. My supervisor makes me feel at ease when talking with him/her.
   SD   D   A   SA

23. My supervisor expresses appreciation when I do a good job.
   SD   D   A   SA

24. My supervisor does not always make him/herself clear.
   SD   D   A   SA

25. My supervisor has helped to improve my efficiency as a practitioner.
   SD   D   A   SA

26. I am satisfied with the amount of support I receive from my supervisor.
   SD   D   A   SA
27. I am satisfied with the degree of fair treatment I receive from my boss.

SD  D  A  SA

28. I am satisfied with the overall quality of the supervision I receive in my work.

SD  D  A  SA

---

Section III

How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? Answer each of the following questions by circling the response category below each question that best describes how satisfied you are about your job. The codes for the responses are:

SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE
D = DISAGREE
A = AGREE
SA = STRONGLY AGREE

29. The kind of work I do on my present job.

SD  D  A  SA

30. The amount of pay I get on my present job.

SD  D  A  SA

31. The cooperation I get from my co-workers.

SD  D  A  SA

32. The opportunities I have for promotions.

SD  D  A  SA

33. The amount of freedom I have to do my job.

SD  D  A  SA

34. The amount of job enrichment I have on my job.

SD  D  A  SA

35. The degree to which I am fairly paid for the job I do.

SD  D  A  SA

36. The amount of fringe benefits I receive.

SD  D  A  SA
37. The people I work with on my job.
   SD  D  A  SA

38. The on-the-job interaction between my fellow workers.
   SD  D  A  SA

39. The promotional policies of my agency/organization.
   SD  D  A  SA

40. The method in which promotions are handled in my agency/organization.
   SD  D  A  SA
MISSING VALUES

- GENDER SUPGEN EDUC SUPEDUC SUPPROF AGEGRP SUPAGE MARITAL ETHNIC SUPETH
- EMPLOY WKSET JOBUC'T LICENSE MEMBER YRSWRK YRSDEG SURESPEC SUFAIR SUEXPER
- SUFRIEND SUATEASE SUAPREC1 SUCOMM1 SUHELPED SUPR1 SUPR2 SUPR3 WORK1 PAY1
- COWK1 POMOT1 WORK2 WORK3 PAY2 PAY3 COWK2 COWK3 POMOT2 POMOT3 (0).
- RECODE WORKSAT (1 THRU 1.99=1) (2 THRU 2.99=2) (3 THRU 3.99=3)
  (4 THRU 4.99=4) (5 THRU 5.99=5).
- RECODE PAYSAT (1 THRU 1.99=1) (2 THRU 2.99=2) (3 THRU 3.99=3)
  (4 THRU 4.99=4) (5 THRU 5.99=5).
- RECODE COWKSAT (1 THRU 1.99=1) (2 THRU 2.99=2) (3 THRU 3.99=3)
  (4 THRU 4.99=4) (5 THRU 5.99=5).
- RECODE POMOTSAT (1 THRU 1.99=1) (2 THRU 2.99=2) (3 THRU 3.99=3)
  (4 THRU 4.99=4) (5 THRU 5.99=5).
- RECODE SUPRSAT (1 THRU 1.99=1) (2 THRU 2.99=2) (3 THRU 3.99=3)
  (4 THRU 4.99=4) (5 THRU 5.99=5).
- RECODE JOBSAT (1 THRU 1.99=1) (2 THRU 2.99=2) (3 THRU 3.99=3)
  (4 THRU 4.99=4) (5 THRU 5.99=5).

BEGIN DATA

For Access to Data Base contact Author

END DATA.

FREQUENCIES /VARIABLES
- GENDER SUPGEN EDUC SUPEDUC SUPPROF AGEGRP SUPAGE MARITAL ETHNIC SUPETH
- EMPLOY WKSET JOBUC'T LICENSE MEMBER YRSWRK YRSDEG SURESPEC SUFAIR SUEXPER
- SUFRIEND SUATEASE SUAPREC1 SUCOMM1 SUHELPED SUPR1 SUPR2 SUPR3 WORK1 PAY1
- COWK1 POMOT1 WORK2 WORK3 PAY2 PAY3 COWK2 COWK3 POMOT2 POMOT3 WORKSAT PAYSAT
- COWKSAT POMOTSAT SUPRSAT JOBSAT
- /STATISTICS=

There are 499,920 bytes of memory available.
The largest contiguous area has 499,920 bytes.

Memory allows a total of 17,854 values accumulated across all variables.
There may be up to 2,231 value labels for each variable.
ID '000 Case'
GENDER 'Q1 Gender'
SUPGEN 'Q2 Supervisor Gender'
EDUC 'Q3 Highest Education Degree'
SUPEDUC 'Q4 Supervisor Education'
SUPPROF 'Q5 Supervisor Profession'
AGEGRP 'Q6 Age Group'
SUPAGE 'Q7 Supervisor Age'
MARITAL 'Q8 Marital Status'
ETHNIC 'Q9 Ethnicity'
SUPETH 'Q10 Supervisor Ethnicity'
EMPLOY 'Q11 Employment'
WRKSET 'Q12 Worksetting'
JOBFUCT 'Q13 Job Function'
LICENSE 'Q14 SocWrk License'
MEMBER 'Q15 SocWrk Membership'
YRSWRK 'Q16 Years Worked'
YRSDEG 'Q17 Years W/SocWrk Degree'
SURESPEC 'Q18 Supervisor Respects me'
SUFAIR 'Q19 Supervisor is fair'
SUEXPER 'Q20 Supervisory Experience'
SUFRiEND 'Q21 Supervisor is Friendly'
SUATEASE 'Q22 Supervisor is at ease'
SUAPRECi 'Q23 Supervisor is appreciative'
SUCOMMUi 'Q24 Supervisor communicates'
SUHELPED 'Q25 Supervisor helpful'
SUPR1 'Q26 Amount of Support'
SUPR2 'Q27 Fair Treatment'
SUPR3 'Q28 Overall Quality'
WORK1 'Q29 Kind of Work'
PAY1 'Q30 Amount of Pay'
COWK1 'Q31 Cooperation'
POMOT1 'Q32 Opportunities'
WORK2 'Q33 Amount of Freedom'
WORK3 'Q34 Job Enrichment'
PAY2 'Q35 Fairness of Pay'
PAY3 'Q36 Fringe Benefits'
COWK2 'Q37 People at Work'
COWK3 'Q38 Interaction'
POMOT2 'Q39 Promotion Policies'
POMOT3 'Q40 Selection Methods'
WORKSAT 'Work Satisfaction'
PAYSAT 'Pay Satisfaction'
COWKSAT 'Coworker Satisfaction'
POMOTSAT 'Promotions Satisfaction'
SUPRSAT 'Supervision Satisfaction'
JOBSAT 'Job Satisfaction'.

VALUE LABELS
GENDER
1 'Male'
2 'Female' /
SUPGEN
1 'Male'
2 'Female'
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