

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

### University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

73-7807

HULSHOFF, Gary Dean, 1932-  
ROLE CONCEPTS AND FUNCTIONS OF STATE  
ADMINISTRATORS OF REHABILITATION AGENCIES.

The University of Arizona, Ph.D., 1972  
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company , Ann Arbor, Michigan

ROLE CONCEPTS AND FUNCTIONS OF STATE ADMINISTRATORS  
OF REHABILITATION AGENCIES

by  
Gary Dean Hulshoff

---

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the  
REHABILITATION CENTER  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
In the Graduate College  
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 7 2

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

I hereby recommend that this dissertation prepared under my  
direction by Gary Dean Hulshoff  
entitled Role Concepts and Functions of State  
Administrators of Rehabilitation Agencies  
be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement of the  
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

DW Smith  
Dissertation Director

8-18-72  
Date

After inspection of the final copy of the dissertation, the  
following members of the Final Examination Committee concur in  
its approval and recommend its acceptance:\*

<u>Charles Rastetter</u>	<u>9-22-72</u>
<u>Donald R. Ror</u>	<u>8-22-72</u>
<u>Thomas J. Fisher</u>	<u>8-22-72</u>
<u>Don Smith</u>	<u>8/24/72</u>
<u>Ray B. B.</u>	<u>8/22/72</u>
<u>Marsden B. Stokes</u>	<u>8/25/72</u>
<u>Larry D. Stewart</u>	<u>9/22/72</u>

\*This approval and acceptance is contingent on the candidate's  
adequate performance and defense of this dissertation at the  
final oral examination. The inclusion of this sheet bound into  
the library copy of the dissertation is evidence of satisfactory  
performance at the final examination.

**PLEASE NOTE:**

**Some pages may have**

**indistinct print.**

**Filmed as received.**

**University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company**

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED

Gary R. Hulshoff

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this dissertation has been accomplished with the help and encouragement of many persons.

To Dr. David Wayne Smith, my dissertation director, I wish to express my appreciation for his guidance and assistance throughout my doctoral studies. I would also like to extend my appreciation to Dr. Donald R. Ross, Dr. Thomas L. Fisher, Dr. Marsden Stokes and Dr. Roy Blake as members of my dissertation committee. Gratitude is also expressed to Dr. Maure Hurt who spent many hours in assisting me in the preparation of the data.

To my special friends and classmates, I say thank you. The friends who were most influential in this research are: Dr. Josef Afanador, Dr. Kent Kloepping, Mr. Guy Spiesman, and Dr. Norman Tully.

Special thanks are also due to Mrs. Sue Shrode, and Mrs. Kathe Boop who typed various stages of the dissertation during its development.

I wish to thank my parents, Geert and Verna Hulshoff, who planted the seeds within me to undertake this endeavor. I love them dearly.

My most profound feelings of affection are reserved for my wife, Dorothy, who has assisted me through twelve years of marriage, has been a constant source of support and encouragement. She has evidenced her support by working for six years while I attended school, and bearing four lovely children, Eric, Kirk, Kristin and Kimberley. Words can never express my love and feelings for her sacrifices in my behalf.

Finally, I want to thank those state directors of rehabilitation and their administrative superiors who answered the questionnaires, without which this study could not have been completed.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	viii
ABSTRACT . . . . .	xi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Introduction to the Problem . . . . .	1
Problem . . . . .	5
Importance of the Problem . . . . .	7
Hypotheses . . . . .	9
Assumptions . . . . .	10
Limitations . . . . .	11
Definitions of Terms . . . . .	11
Summary . . . . .	12
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	13
Status of Public Administration . . . . .	13
Role Theory . . . . .	19
Role Perception and Expectation . . . . .	20
Role Conflict . . . . .	21
Role Model . . . . .	23
Administrative Functions . . . . .	25
Rehabilitation Administration . . . . .	29
The Growth of Vocational Rehabilitation . . . . .	31
The Growth of Rehabilitation Administration . . . . .	33
The Current Status of State Administration . . . . .	37
The Needs and Problems of State Directors of Rehabilitation . . . . .	38
Current University Training Programs . . . . .	40
Summary . . . . .	45
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	47
Introduction . . . . .	47
Construction of the Instrument . . . . .	48
Collection of the Data . . . . .	51
Method of Analysis . . . . .	54
Section I . . . . .	55
Section II . . . . .	55

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
Section III . . . . .	57
Section IV . . . . .	58
Section V . . . . .	59
Trend Analysis . . . . .	60
Summary . . . . .	60
IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	61
Introduction . . . . .	61
Descriptive Analysis . . . . .	61
Section I--Background Information . . . . .	61
Section II--Administrator Role . . . . .	64
Section III--Administrative Functions . . . . .	66
Section IV--Major Relationship Functions . . . . .	68
Section V--Selected Administrative Factors . . . . .	68
Hypotheses . . . . .	79
Hypothesis 1 . . . . .	79
Hypothesis 2 . . . . .	82
Hypothesis 3 . . . . .	82
Hypothesis 4 . . . . .	84
Hypothesis 5 . . . . .	85
Hypothesis 6 . . . . .	85
Hypothesis 7 . . . . .	86
Hypothesis 8 . . . . .	86
Hypothesis 9 . . . . .	87
Trend Analysis . . . . .	88
Correlation Factors . . . . .	88
Comparisons of State Directors and Their Superiors on the Role and Functions of State Directors . . . . .	92
Summary . . . . .	103
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	106
Summary . . . . .	106
Purpose . . . . .	106
Design . . . . .	108
Results . . . . .	109
Conclusions and Implications . . . . .	113
Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	116
APPENDIX A: COVER LETTER TO STATE DIRECTORS . . . . .	118
APPENDIX B: STATE DIRECTORS QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	119
APPENDIX C: LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT . . . . .	128

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
APPENDIX D: FIRST FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO STATE DIRECTORS . . . . .	129
APPENDIX E: SECCND FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO STATE DIRECTORS . . . . .	130
APPENDIX F: COVER LETTER TO ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERIORS . . . . .	131
APPENDIX G: ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERIORS QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	132
APPENDIX H: FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERIORS . . . . .	137
APPENDIX I: FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO UNNAMED ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERIORS . . . . .	138
APPENDIX J: BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON STATE DIRECTORS OF REHABILITATION AGENCIES . . . . .	139
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	148

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Role of State Directors . . . . .	65
2. State Directors Rank of Time Spent on Administrative Functions . . . . .	67
3. Percentage of Time Spent on Major Functions by State Directors . . . . .	69
4. Those Who Most Influence Budget Preparation Priorities . . . . .	70
5. Topics Discussed with Administrative Superiors by State Directors . . . . .	71
6. Topics Discussed with Legislative Committees by State Directors . . . . .	72
7. Specialized Roles of State Director . . . . .	74
8. Rehabilitation Agencies with Public Relations Functions . . . . .	75
9. State Directors' Attempts to Provide Information to Various Groups . . . . .	76
10. Skills Most Needed as State Directors . . . . .	78
11. Characteristics of State Directors . . . . .	80
12. Vocational Rehabilitation State Directors Meeting with Other State Agency Directors . . . . .	80
13. Present Role and Preferred Role of State Directors . . . .	81
14. Present Role and the Agency Preferred Role of State Director . . . . .	83
15. Administrative Superiors' Perception of the Present and Preferred Role of State Director . . . .	93
16. State Directors (SD) and Their Administrative Superiors' (AS) Perception of the State Directors' Present Role . . . . .	94

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

	Page
17. Preferred Role State Director (SD) Has Compared with Administrative Superiors (AS) . . . . .	96
18. State Directors (SD) and Their Administrative Superiors' (AS) Perception of the Role the Agency Would Like the State Directors to Take . . . . .	97
19. Time State Directors Spend on Administrative Functions as Perceived by Administrative Superiors . . . . .	98
20. Rank of Time Spent on Administrative Function Now: Comparison of State Directors and Their Administrative Superiors . . . . .	100
21. Rank of Time That Should be Spent on Administra- tive Function: Comparison of State Directors and Their Administrative Superiors . . . . .	101
22. Percentage of Time Spent by State Directors on Major Functions as Perceived by the Administrative Superior . . . . .	102
23. Percentage of Time Spent on Major Functions Now: Comparison of State Directors and Their Administrative Superiors . . . . .	104
24. Percentage of Time That Should be Spent on Major Functions: Comparison of State Directors and Their Administrative Superiors . . . . .	105
25. Age of State Directors . . . . .	140
26. Experience as State Director . . . . .	141
27. Years State Directors Have Worked in Field of Rehabilitation . . . . .	142
28. Highest Degree Held . . . . .	143
29. Courses State Directors Preferred for Further Training . . . . .	144

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

	Page
30. Membership in Professional Organizations . . . . .	145
31. State Minimum Educational Qualification for Position as State Director . . . . .	146
32. State Minimum Administrative Experience to Qualify for Position as State Director . . . . .	147

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the role and functions of state directors of rehabilitation agencies. The research asked the state directors and their administrative superiors how each perceived the state director's role and functions.

The specific questions examined were:

1. What is the educational and experiential background of persons currently employed as state rehabilitation administrators?
2. To what extent does the state director's perception of his present role differ from his preferred role?
3. To what extent does the state director's actual role differ from the role his immediate administrative superiors would like him to assume?
4. To what extent does the state director's actual role differ from the role he believes his superiors would like him to assume?
5. How much difference is there between the percentage of time state directors devote to various functions and the percentage of time they feel they should devote to these functions?
6. What factors, external to the job itself, affect the work of the state administrator?
7. How does the state director delegate his responsibility to other administrators in the rehabilitation agency?

8. To what extent do relationships with the federal government, state legislature, and state executive branch affect the role of the administrator?

9. How much difference is there between the percentage of time which administrators devote to researching and developing new programs and services and the percentage of time they feel they should devote to these tasks?

A questionnaire designed to examine the role and functions of the state directors was mailed to 90 directors and their administrative superiors. Usable questionnaires were returned by 68 state directors and 38 administrative superiors.

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the demographic data. The Wilcoxon signed-ranks test, the McNemar test and the t-test were used to test the hypotheses for significance at the .05 level.

Results of the study showed the typical state director held his position for 5.6 years. The director held a master's degree, belonged to the Council of State Administrators, and desired more training in administration.

The state directors rejected a political role model as their present or preferred role and preferred an apolitical role. The selection of the apolitical model appeared to present a role conflict.

The administrative functions performed by state directors were varied and the results showed the director currently spends too much time in making administrative adjustments, installing agency procedures and traveling. The directors preferred to spend more time in policy



planning, program and budget planning, public relations and organizing the agency's structure.

The state director preferred to spend more time developing legislative relationships and more sophisticated research and development functions. There was no significant difference between the state director and his administrative superior. Less than half of the states had a public relations function designed to mobilize program support.

The study indicated that the preparation of personnel for administrative positions within the state agency should emphasize the development of administrative skills such as: policy planning, program development, and budget planning. Additional training should be provided the state director to form more effective relationships with their executive branch superiors and the state legislature.

It was recommended that further research be directed towards an investigation of the complex elements of each administrative function. There appears need to examine the apparent conflict of role models preferred by state directors. Research should be conducted to examine legislative-administrative relationships and to determine the propriety of the public relations function within the agency.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Introduction to the Problem

Rehabilitation of the physically disabled and more recently the culturally, economically and educationally disadvantaged has grown in a half century, from a program with a national budget of \$750,000 in 1921 to a budget of \$600,000,000 in 1970. Arizona, for example, has grown from a staff consisting of a state vocational rehabilitation supervisor and a secretary/supervisor in 1930, to a staff of 148 persons in 1971. The state/federal expenditures in Arizona during the same forty-year period have increased from a \$10,000 budget in 1930 to an operating budget of \$7,000,000 in 1970 (Bleeker, 1971).

A comparison of the 1971 fiscal year budget with the 1930 budget of \$10,000 state and federal funds provides evidence of the tremendous growth in Arizona's vocational rehabilitation program over the forty-year period. In Arizona, Bleeker (1971) indicated that the additional caseload of culturally, economically and educationally disadvantaged as well as the physically disabled client and the increasingly complex role the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation is being called on to play will be significant factors in the future. He stated: "Society stands on the brink of committing vast resources and efforts to rehabilitation services. The role that vocational rehabilitation has played in Arizona during its fifty-year history may well seem

insignificant when compared with the responsibilities it seems destined to assume in the present decade" (Bleeker, 1971, p. 6).

Throughout the United States over the past 50 years the dramatic growth of vocational rehabilitation in budgeted funds for program and increased staff size emphasizes the need for an examination of the current role and functions of state directors of rehabilitation agencies. Increasing administrative responsibility, due to size of staff; number of kinds of rehabilitation services and programs; and the budgetary increases all emphasize the importance of analyzing the chief administrator's current role and functions. Undoubtedly the needs of rehabilitation during the 1970's, will further increase the importance of this role and the subsequent need to subject it to a critical analysis.

While there have been studies in business, education and public administration, as well as various efforts to develop administrative theory, little research has been done to define the role and functions of state administrators of rehabilitation agencies. Historically, administrators of state vocational rehabilitation programs have come from the related disciplines of professional and technical training such as education, administration, vocational education, business and other public administration positions. Recently, universities have developed programs for the preparation of administrative personnel for state programs in rehabilitation agencies.

The teaching of public administration in institutions of higher education generally reflects curricula including training in such accepted administrative skills as planning, organizing, directing and

controlling as well as selected subject-matter content, i.e., principles of administration, organization and personnel management. There are several universities now preparing administrators for vocational rehabilitation.

A review of Management and Personnel Abstracts (Dumas, 1968), an annotated bibliography of some 960 management and administrative studies, showed there were no studies describing the role and functions of vocational rehabilitation administrative personnel.

Consequently, there are no university training programs in rehabilitation administration based on the results of empirical studies of state rehabilitation administrators or agencies.

The present Federal Rules and Regulations, Title 45 of Public Welfare, Chapter IV, spell out the purposes, programs and organization for administration of state vocational rehabilitation programs. However, the state administrator's role does not reflect the knowledge or skills necessary to administer state programs. There are no available studies spelling out the specific role and functions of rehabilitation administrators. The Federal Rules and Regulations merely state (United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, [DHEW], 1968):

. . . there shall be a State administrator or other named official with primary responsibility for the direction of the administration of the vocational rehabilitation program of the State agency . . . and that such state administrator shall be required to devote his full time and efforts to the vocational rehabilitation program. . . . (p. 5)

The Illinois State Plan (1966), typical of many state plans, spells out the responsibilities of the state director complementing those mentioned by the Federal Rules and Regulations as:

. . . the Director is responsible for the coordination and integration of all activities, control of operation, development and interpretation of policies, rules, regulations, and standards, employment, training, supervision of staff, and direction of the Illinois Federal Disability Program in accordance with the agreement between the State Agency and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In carrying out these functions, the Director delegates to staff assistants . . . the requisite authority to maintain operations (p. 3).

Neither the federal guidelines nor the Illinois State Plan contain the knowledge, skills or qualifications necessary for the state administrator to ensure efficient and effective vocational rehabilitation services and programs.

Many authors have referred to the skills needed for successful administrative leadership. Katz (1958) referred to conceptual, technical and human relations skills. Simon (1962) relied heavily on decision-making skills. Other authors, Wildavsky (1964), Staats (1962), and Massey (1966), cited the need for programming and budgeting skills. Golembiewski (1966) and O'Donnell (1966) indicated the need for personnel administration skills. Other authors have cited communication skills, leadership styles, organizational skills based on modern organizational theory, administrative leadership, problem solving, research and strategy skills, management by objectives, and operational efficiency and effectiveness skills developed through the use of the computer, as necessary tools for a successful administrator. Numerous other studies have attempted to define the role and function of administrators (Barnard, 1938, 1948; Campbell, 1964; Carlson, 1962; Griffiths, 1964; Gross, 1964; Halpin, 1966; Hemphill, Griffiths and Frederikson, 1962; Lipham, 1964; Presthus, 1962; Simon, 1947, 1957b, 1962; Thompson, 1961).

Halpin (1966), however, argued that administrative studies have not led to an operational definition of administration. He defined the four components of a beginning framework of administrative theory as: (1) The Task, (2) The Formal Organization, (3) The Work Group (or Work Groups), and (4) The Leader (or Leaders). Halpin's (1966) suggested framework, within which administrative theory could be developed, has led to the present study of the role and functions of state directors of rehabilitation agencies (pp. 30-48).

With the continuing increases in the numbers of citizens who need vocational rehabilitation services and the relationships being considered by the United States Congress between the Employment Service and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, there is need for a cadre of state administrators prepared to meet the complex problems presented by an increasing rehabilitation staff (National Citizens Advisory Committee on Vocational Rehabilitation, 1968).

In order to educate and train personnel capable of handling the complex modern rehabilitation service delivery systems, the university faculty needs to know what the prerequisites are for effective state administration.

### Problem

With the ever increasing number of clients and the broadening of the Federal Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments in 1968 to include not only the physically disabled but also the culturally, economically and educationally disadvantaged, the role and functions of the state administrators of rehabilitation have become much more complex. The importance of having a well trained cadre of state administrators of

rehabilitation can be illustrated by listing several trends in programs throughout the nation. The federal laws related to rehabilitation services are increasing in number and scope. The dialogue between the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Labor, Office of Economic Opportunity, and Health, Education, and Welfare also have repercussions on state programs of vocational rehabilitation.

The purpose of this study was to obtain factual information from state directors of rehabilitation agencies and their immediate administrative superiors and to evaluate their views of the role and functions of state directors of rehabilitation. Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What is the educational and experiential background of persons currently employed as state rehabilitation administrators?
2. To what extent does the state director's perception of his present role differ from his preferred role?
3. To what extent does the state director's actual role differ from the role his immediate administrative superiors would like him to assume?
4. To what extent does the state director's actual role differ from the role he believes his superiors would like him to assume?
5. How much difference is there between the percentage of time state directors devote to various functions and the percentage of time they feel they should devote to these functions?
6. What factors, external to the job itself, affect the work of the state administrator?

7. How does the state director delegate his responsibility to other administrators in the rehabilitation agency?

8. To what extent do relationships with the federal government, state legislature, and state executive branch affect the role of the administrator?

9. How much difference is there between the percentage of time which administrators devote to researching and developing new programs and services and the percentage of time they feel they should devote to these tasks?

#### Importance of the Problem

Historically, the state's divisions of vocational rehabilitation attributed their administrative origin to vocational education (Obermann, 1967). The next step for some states was to move vocational rehabilitation under the jurisdiction of state boards of education. Many states have not recognized the conflict which existed between an educational system designed to habilitate youngsters and a rehabilitation agency designed to rehabilitate those, who for many reasons, needed services beyond what could be provided in the educational system. Thirty-eight states have now reorganized rehabilitation agencies independent of state departments of education.

In these reorganizations, the appointment of administrative personnel with commensurate rehabilitation and administrative experience, and educational background is now a concern of state legislators, state executives and public interest groups. Since there are no current data describing the role and functions of state directors of rehabilitation agencies based on empirical studies, it is apparent that there is a



need to study the state administrator's perception of his role and to define his present functions. These perceptions can then be compared with how he believes he should be doing his job. The information and data generated by such a study would then fill existing gaps in the literature and provide those who are in positions to appoint rehabilitation personnel with the criteria necessary for selection.

A second reason for conducting this research was to provide a framework within which other studies could review administrative role and functions in greater depth. Studies on organizational theory by Blau and Scott (1962) appeared to be a logical focal point for exploration in the field of rehabilitation administration. Within the limits of this research, both formal and informal organizational questions can be studied.

A third purpose for this research was to provide data from which a model rehabilitation administration curriculum could be designed and used to prepare future rehabilitation administrators. Formal curricular programs designed to prepare state rehabilitation administrators are very limited in the nation's universities and colleges today.

Historically, administrators of rehabilitation have been promoted from within the ranks of the agency, and often these promotions were political. A fourth purpose for this research, then, was that data from this study might be generalized to other social and rehabilitation service agencies administration and prove worthwhile in the preparation of administrators of these other agencies.

Lastly, the results of this study might be used in the development of standards by state personnel commissions for the selection of

state directors of rehabilitation. More specifically these results may prove useful in providing information about the prerequisite administrative experience and educational background necessary to effectively administer these state programs.

### Hypotheses

This research was based on the general hypotheses that the role and functions of state administrators of rehabilitation are not clearly defined. For statistical purposes, the following null hypotheses were examined:

1. There is no significant difference between the state administrator's present perception of his role and the role he would prefer, if he were free to choose.
2. There is no significant difference between the state administrator's present perception of his role and the role which he believes his superior would like him to assume.
3. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time which state administrators now spend on various functions and the percentage of time which they feel they should spend on these functions.
4. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators believe they should spend with the state legislature (legislators) and the percentage of time currently spent.
5. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators believe they should spend with the state's executive branch and the percentage of time presently spent.

6. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators believe they should spend with federal officials of rehabilitation programs and the percentage of time presently spent.

7. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators spend with agency supervisory and administrative staff on program problems and the percentage of time they believe they should spend.

8. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators spend with other groups (private, citizen and other public administrative agencies) and the percentage of time they believe they should spend.

9. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators spend in research and development of rehabilitation programs and the percentage of time they believe they should spend.

#### Assumptions

This research was based on three assumptions:

1. That an accurate assessment of the role and functions of state administrators of rehabilitation was obtained with the questionnaire used.

2. That the respondents answered the questions according to their beliefs.

3. That the population being studied was homogeneous and therefore information, if received from the non-respondents would not substantially alter the findings.

### Limitations

The scope of this research was to question all state and territorial administrators of rehabilitation and their immediate administrative superiors about the role and functions of a state director of rehabilitation.

The functions studied included those illustrated in the questionnaire (see Appendix B). Consideration was also given to those functions performed by state administrators which were not included in the questionnaire. The creation of an "other" category allowed the state directors the opportunity to indicate functions which were not adequately developed in the questionnaire.

### Definitions of Terms

Function: Functions are perceived stimulus situations which state administrators feel impelled to modify in order to realize some desired outcome (paraphrasing Halpin, 1966, p. 30). The terms tasks and functions were used interchangeably in this study.

Role: The concept of role was defined in this study as a role description. A "role description" is a report of behavior actually performed by role incumbents (Lipham, 1964, p. 120).

State Administrators of Rehabilitation: State and U. S. territorial directors of the state's Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and Division of Rehabilitation of Visually Impaired agencies.

Immediate Administrative Superior: The state officer to whom the state director is administratively responsible and to whom the state director reports.

### Summary

Chapter I has presented an introduction to the problem of defining the role and functions of state administrators of rehabilitation. The need for this study was based upon the rapidly changing and growing responsibilities of state rehabilitation programs. Several questions were posited and hypotheses stated to examine the directors' and their administrative superiors' perception of the role and functions of the state administrator of rehabilitation.

Chapter II presents a review of the literature in five areas: (1) the status of public administration, (2) role theory, (3) administrative functions, (4) growth of rehabilitation administration, and (5) current university training programs. Chapter III presents the methodology used in conducting this research. Chapter IV presents the results of this study and Chapter V presents a summary, conclusions and recommendations which have been suggested by the study.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presents a review of the literature and is divided into five sections. Section one presents the existing status of public administration. Section two describes current role theory. Section three reports a review of the literature relating to administrative functions. Section four discusses the growth of administration in the nation's rehabilitation programs and section five is a review of existing rehabilitation administration training programs. As in Chapter I, it is stressed that the empirical research examining the role concepts and functions of state administrators of public agencies are limited; thus the review of the literature reflects the case study approach of top echelon administrators as used by researchers.

#### Status of Public Administration

The study of public administration at the university level, has been discussed by authors for many years and there has been controversy over whether there is a theory of public administration or simply disconnected, intuitive mechanisms administrators use to accomplish their organizational objectives. Landau (1962) discussed this problem in attempting to develop a theory of administration. Landau further spelled out the historical problem of field studies and the subsequent imposed artificial categories designed to enable

description of observable events within a framework of discrete variation. He also stated that, as administration proceeded to move away from the abstract toward the practical, students of administration began to describe, without hypotheses, the administrator's activities. This attitude gained strength, and for a period of time theory was eschewed as trivial to the more experimental methods of gathering data. Halpin (1966) maintained that a theory of administration did not exist and proceeded to present an administrative paradigm in which empirical research could be studied and related. Indeed, Halpin (1966) described four components of organization: the task, the leader, the work group and the formal organization. Landau (1962) had earlier concluded that the age of intermingling field theory and directly observable activities to form hypotheses was now occurring.

Recent writers (Blau and Scott, 1962; Pfiffner and Presthus, 1967; and others) have differentiated Public Administration into formal and informal processes. Pfiffner and Presthus (1967) reported that the study of public administration has progressed from the study of factual and normative preferences to the study of behavior. The field of public administration has progressively drawn from the disciplines of political science, psychology and sociology for its knowledge of relationships and behavior patterns of key administrative personnel. Today a great deal of emphasis has been placed on the study of organizations through behavioral patterns of administration and staff interrelationships.

Though studies on public administration have been directed towards these staff interrelationships, Pfiffner and Presthus (1967)

have incisively concluded that public administration goes beyond the emphasis on human interaction and its effect upon the organization. Such studies have also reemphasized the controlling of human resources to shape and carry out public policy as " . . .the primary object of both organization and administration . . . (p. 7)." Pfiffner and Presthus (1967) continued their thesis by pointing out that as organization provided structure, this in reality was a method for establishing stability. Organization as a tool then provided a definable membership, regularized patterns of behavior, permanent hierarchical roles and finite boundaries. They went on to state that, these activities inherently implied change, as administration was a process and, was therefore concerned with the interpersonal aspects of public administration, i.e., policy making, coordinating individual and group effort, and encouraging morale. (The practice of public administration is, therefore, the means for implementing political values through the use of a staff who are specialists and control the mechanisms for carrying out value-laden public policy.)

Sayre (1958) and Pfiffner and Presthus (1967) have each discussed the highly political environment within which public agency personnel operate. Simon (1957a) contended that in this political environment decisions were made on the basis of both factual data and philosophical values held by administrators. As a result of observing administrative decision-making in the public arena, questions have continually arisen over the role and functions of the public administrator. One controversy has a focus on whether the higher echelons of administration should be staffed with administrative generalists or



specialists. Another controversy has focused on whether these same administrators should be political or apolitical in filling their role as top executives in public agencies (Sayre, 1958).

Pfiffner and Presthus (1967) reported there were federal administrators at high levels who, in fact, were specialists--more technicians than generalists, and that these administrators were involved in program tasks and scientific-technical activities rather than executive responsibilities. On the other hand, Pfiffner and Presthus stated that there were those administrators who were concerned with their political role as generalist administrator rather than with their role in specific program content areas.

Subsequently, Gross (1968) and Pfiffner and Presthus (1967) have raised the question about the movement of the specialist into the generalist administration role and how effective he would be in the performance of that role as leader and chief executive of his agency.

These observations led Gross (1968) to conclude that the emerging consensus in administrative thinking included the identification of administrative activity and its relationship to the governance of organizational activity as one of three major elements. He differentiated, in his concept: the governance activity; the difference between the administrator and the administered; and the consensus that administrators should be generalists rather than specialists.

Another prime concern of state public administrators was defined by Pfiffner and Presthus (1967) in the development of public administration within two basic executive branch models. The first executive governance described was the weak-executive model. In this

model, the governor was elected for two or four years and had little actual power over the largely independent administrative agencies. These agencies directors were elected in their own right or by autonomous administrative boards and, consequently, did not owe the governor allegiance for retaining their office. In order for the governor to influence these officials, it was necessary to use informal political or personal methods, rather than the authority of the governor's office.

If the governor appointed these state directors under the weak-executive model, he did so with the approval of the legislature and, therefore, the governor had to be cognizant of the possible political consequences if his actions alienated his party. Ransome (quoted by Pfiffner and Presthus, 1967, p. 178) stated:

. . . the concept of the governor being primarily responsible for the management of the executive branch has not yet gained a firm foothold in most states in spite of some rather substantial reorganization (p. 178).

The Committee for Economic Development, in its monograph entitled, Modernizing State Government (1967), reported that only four states, Alaska, Hawaii, New Jersey and Pennsylvania elected no other state official independently. The committee further reported that the other 46 states elected between two and ten executive officials. "The political ambitions of independent officials often throw them into conflict with the governor and handicap him in preparing policy proposals and gaining approval for them" (Committee for Economic Development, 1967, p. 51).

The second model, the integrationist model, has been more commonly known as the strong-executive model. The strong-executive model

authorized the chief elected executive to appoint the chief agency administrator without legislative confirmation and also gave the chief executive the power to remove his appointee from office.

The integrationist model demanded that the executive branch be fully integrated and coordinated and that decisions come down from the governor and be implemented by non-political administrators. Opposed to this view, was the weak-executive political-pluralist model, where each agency and branch of government was fragmented and, consequently, where power was exhibited by public agencies according to the activities of their special interest groups. The agencies substantive issues were, therefore, the priorities established by their chief administrators (Pfiffner and Presthus, 1967).

The political environment of public administration, the controversy concerning the generalist vs. specialist role of high level government administrators and the need for more study of the public administrator formed the foundation for further study.

The need for further research was evidenced by Pfiffner and Presthus (1967) when they maintained that the current approaches to the study of organizations, including public administrative agencies, was the recognition of the impact of political values on administration, the need to pay greater attention to a methodology of study, and the need to consider the changing conception of jobs or positions. Finally, the consideration that administrative agencies were also social institutions having an impact on their employees and their consumers of service was considered sufficient grounds for further research.

### Role Theory

Historically, studies of public administration in such fields as education, public welfare, and labor have shifted from the university educators' concern for theory to the "practical" approach and back again towards a unifying of theory and practice. Halpin (1966) argued that, in the field of educational administration, there has been an appalling poverty of theory. Other writers (Landau, 1962; and Appleby, 1966) have also attempted to lay the framework within which administration could be studied. Today's studies have placed an emphasis on organizational and group phenomena as predictors of what administrative, supervisory and operational personnel behavior would be under certain circumstances (Blau and Scott, 1962; Waldo, 1948; and Presthus, 1965).

Dalton (1959) stated that any systematic examination of the place of a planned role in an organization, or the interface between an office and the person in it (role and role occupant) was unrealistic if treated apart from the interfusion of official and informal acts. Biddle and Thomas (1966), in their work on role-theory, stated that the study of role is a development of the last 35 years, and that today there is an emerging body of role research which may eventually lead to theory. Biddle and Thomas further stated: ". . . the field of role has unfortunately come to be known as 'role theory'" (p. 14). This implied that there was actually more theory than in fact was the case. Many occupational role studies have been performed in fields such as public education, medicine, the ministry, higher education, among

military personnel, family constellations and deviant behaviors of selected groups.

### Role Perception and Expectation

The determinant factors of role have been the subject of serious studies during the last 20 years (Biddle and Thomas, 1966). As defined by these authors the role assumed by the role taker depended upon the administrator's perception of that role, the expected behavior he was to display in that position and the impact conflict had upon his future role perceptions and expectations. "The role, therefore, could be defined as . . . a set of expectations . . . or as . . . a set of evaluative standards applied to an incumbent of a particular position" (Gross, Mason, and McEachern, 1958, p. 60).

An example of role taking and perceptions of school administrators in fulfilling the school superintendent's role was found in Carlson's work on executive succession (1962). He reported that "outsiders" (those who came to the superintendent's role from other superintendency experience) tended to define their role rather than accept a role that had been previously defined.

The differences between the administrator's perceptions and expectations of his role and the administrator's behavior would, therefore, constitute role conflict. Dalton (1959) further indicated that conflict in managerial roles was dependent upon the fusion of the personalities of the manager and the positions he held within the organization. The success of the executive, according to Dalton, was his ability to aptly play multiple roles within the framework of his formal position.

### Role Conflict

The relationship between the administrator's values and the responsibilities he has as an agency's chief executive have not always been in harmony, hence, a number of studies attempting to explain the conflict between the occupant and his formal role have been conducted. An incident reflecting role conflict of the administrator of a social welfare agency has been provided by the House Task Force on Welfare in Oregon (Meeker, 1971). Because the federal government pays more than 50 percent of the costs of welfare, there have been conferences held between federal and state welfare officials to work out an understanding about federal rules and regulations applicable to the state welfare programs. One official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (DHEW) stated: ". . . Oregon . . . has done an outstanding job in following our rules" (p. 7). Conferences were held between DHEW and the State of Oregon to determine the "exact" intention of federal regulations. The Task Force reported to the Oregon State Legislature that ". . . the first allegiance of the Public Welfare Division must be to the State of Oregon and its citizens--not to the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare" (p. 7). Further recommendations were made to the legislature to have Oregon develop its own priorities and policies for public welfare and that these plans ". . . should not be submitted to the federal government for approval" (p. 7). The concern expressed by Oregon public officials was an example of the role conflict that a state administrator apparently had in carrying out his duties. The state director of rehabilitation has been

placed in a similar position of deciding whether to listen to federal or state officials in administering state rehabilitation programs.

Another example of role conflict arising because of federal-state relations is found in the area of employment services. The state director of employment security heads an agency that is 100 percent federally funded. The question then became one of whether allegiance by the employment security director was to the federal government, where his program is funded or to the state government, where his agency is located.

Many state human resources manpower agencies directors have not been required to coordinate their programs with each other and many federal programs affecting the same populations have been administered in disconnected state agencies. There is, consequently, a continued tendency for agency directors to protect their own funding, to the potential detriment of more comprehensive programs dealing with human resource problems (Copeland, 1969, pp. 5-6).

A further source of conflict has been in the role interpretation and expectations of state administrators in essentially political matters. Obermann (1967) referred to the political motivations and strategies used by many administrators during the formative years of rehabilitation as attempts to enhance their positions and consolidate their agency's power within the state (Chapter 9).

Gross (1968) stated that a source of role conflict, which was reaching serious proportions, was when the specialist in an organization was promoted and advanced to positions which required less of his specialty skills and more of his administrative abilities. Initially

the specialist either had no administrative knowledge and/or lack of experience when appointed to the position as director. The conflict intensified as the promoted administrator had less "professional" responsibility and more involvement with factors and interests "external" to the organization. Gross further argued that when the specialist was promoted to higher administrative positions his administrative responsibilities many times outnumbered his executive abilities. Attempts to resolve such conflicts occurred by submerging the "professional" role and adopting the administrative role or by acquiring further training in administrative skills (pp. 216-218).

#### Role Model

Sayre (1958) pointed out that the history of public administration was an illustration of the changing attitudes and values among administrators and educators of public administrators. In spelling out the historical administrative role model of public administrators, Sayre (1958) discussed the basic premises upon which the field of public administration was built. The accepted administrative role of behavior before the World War II era was stated by six assumptions. These assumptions were: The politics-administration dichotomy, where the public administrator and the politician perceived the administrator in a world of apolitical values; the rules and methods adopted as a reflection of those values. These beliefs and accepted standards of behavior led to the concept of a rational or "scientific" base upon which the organization and staff were to function. Five other assumptions reflected this rational base. Stated, these assumptions were:



that organizational theory was founded in scientific management terms, that the executive budget was ". . . an instrument of rationality, or coordination, planning, and control" (Sayre, 1958, p. 103). Three other post World War II themes of administration were: personnel were to be selected and fill jobs on a scientific or rational basis, that public service was an establishment of a "neutral" or "impartial" and lastly, that: development of a body of administrative law would insure proper standards and due process in administrative conduct.

Following World War II, there was an assault upon the accepted beliefs of the past. This assault, bolstered by empirical studies, led to a new consensus.

The emerging reformulations were stated simply as:

1. Public administration doctrine and practice is inescapably culture bound. It is also bound . . . to the values of a specific administrative organization or bureaucracy at a specific time.
2. Public administration is one of the major political processes . . . .
3. Organizational theory in public administration is a problem in political strategy. . . . Organization therefore, (is) a determinant in bargaining.
4. Management techniques and processes have their costs as well as their benefits. Each new version has a high obsolescence rate, its initial contributions to rationality declining as it becomes the vested interest of its own specialist guardians and/or other groups with preferred access.
5. Public Administration is ultimately a problem in political theory; . . . responsibility to popular control; . . . to the elected officials. . . (Sayre, 1958, pp. 102-105).

In further confirming Sayre's formulations in the developing concepts of administration in public agencies, Pfiffner and Presthus (1967) discussed today's administrative bureaucratic role as: implementing social change, recommending policy framing legislation, influencing legislatures, and ensuring the agency's survival and growth.

Lastly, Thomas (1959) reported that the role constructs of perception and expectation were further complicated by the organization's size and the context of the community within which the organization was located. Welfare workers in large and small organizational units differed significantly in how they perceived their roles and how they met their professional responsibilities and service goals (pp. 30-37).

The current role model, then, had to take into consideration that an agency's chief administrator was political in performing his duties and that the roles of subordinates and the size of the organization had impact upon how the state director could accomplish his administrative tasks.

#### Administrative Functions

Halpin (1966) contended there was no legitimate administrative theory. He suggested a paradigm within which the administrator could function. He concluded that administrative functions included a definition of the functions by the administrator and how he viewed his performance of these functions. The state administrator's behavior, then, was a reflection of the concept of his role as a political or apolitical person (Sayre, 1958) and his perception of the functions he needed to perform or carry out the goals of his agency (Halpin, 1966).

The Illinois State Plan (1966), exemplary of other state plans, spelled out an overview of the responsibilities of the state director as:

. . . the director is responsible for the coordination and integration of all activities, control of operation, development and interpretation of policies, rules, regulations, and standards, employment, training, supervision of staff, and direction of the Illinois Federal Disability Program in accordance with the agreement between the State Agency and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In carrying out these functions, the Director delegates to staff assistants . . . the requisite authority to maintain operations (p. 3).

These functions or tasks reflected the federal rules and regulations stated in Chapter 45 of the Federal Rules and Regulations (US, DHEW, VRA, 1968) for Vocational Rehabilitation.

Koontz (1964) summarized the manager's (administrator's) functions in business and industry as:

. . . deciding upon the grouping of activities and the authority relationships of managers and subordinates in the firm, selecting subordinates, guiding and overseeing their activities, developing plans for accomplishing the enterprise objectives, and making certain that events conform to these plans.

It is the manager's responsibility, then, to achieve coordination . . . he assures that the environment facilitates coordination by creating an appropriate organization structure, selecting skillful subordinates and training and supervising them effectively, providing and explaining the integrated plans and programs that subordinates will carry out, and establishing means to determine whether plans are being carried out properly and programs are on schedule (p. 44).

Koontz (1964) further argued that regardless of the specific position within an organization or the kind of organization worked in, the manager used the same functions. He referred to this commonality of functions as ". . . the principle of the universality of managerial functions" (p. 45).

Though these two passages enunciate some specific responsibilities and their functions, other researchers have devoted intense interest to developing the full spectrum of functions which administrators perform.

Many writers (Flippo, 1968; Griffiths, 1964) in public and business administration, have recounted the historical development of managerial functions as enumerated by Taylor, Fayol, Urwick and others. Taylor (1947) is considered the father of scientific management and paid a great deal of attention to time and motion studies and finding the "right man to the right job."

Fayol's (translated by Constance Storrs in 1949) contributions were summarized in his definitions of administration. These functions became known as "Fayol's Elements" and consisted of five basic points: to plan, organize, command, coordinate and control. Followers further refined these functions. Gulick and Urwick (1937) expanded "Fayol's Elements" and described these functions in the acronym POSDCORB. This word included the initial letters of seven administrative functions: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting.

Flippo (1968) contended that these administrative functions were in reality four basic functions in which staffing, coordinating, and budgeting could be classified under either planning, organizing, directing or control.

Further developments in the study of administration and management led to studies of the behavior of managers and employees in organizational settings. These studies focused on formal and informal

communications, decision-making, small group process, leadership variables, values, human relations, and so forth. These studies in the interrelationships of man and material, manager and employee have been the interest of researchers such as Simon (1957a), Presthus (1965), Thompson (1961), Blau and Scott, 1962). Flippo (1960) maintained that the behavior of these people in organization, though of great interest and importance, was nevertheless dependent upon the formal structure and functions of the organization and a well defined system of expected formal relationships in order to produce a product or provide a service.

Indeed, Stone (1969) and his associates at the University of Pittsburgh's Graduate School of Public and International Affairs collaborated with scholars and governmental administrators (in foreign countries and the United States) to develop a handbook for use by schools and institutes to prepare administrators to step into governmental positions within their respective countries. The completed handbook was sponsored by the U. S. Agency for International Development. The handbook was prepared for the "over 200 schools and institutes of public and development administration in some 92 countries . . . ." (Jack Koteen, in Preface to Stone, 1969, p. iv).

Stone (1969) outlined the administrator's functions for effective achievement of organization's or agencies' purposes. Summarized (pp. 202-206), these were to:

1. Define objectives for the enterprise (policy planning).
2. Plan programs to carry out these stated objectives (program and budget planning).
3. Plan and build organization structure to carry out programs.

4. Plan and install procedures and methods: Develop detailed routines, procedures and systems for substantive or operating, staff, and service activities.
5. Procure funds and administer finances. . . .
6. Provide the necessary personnel . . .
7. Provide the information necessary for management . . .
8. Analyze the information provided for management . . .
9. Adjust and improve program operations and objectives . . .
10. Motivate the organization.
11. Provide facilities and supplies.
12. Maintain external relationships with:
  - a. Legislature
  - b. Administrative superiors
  - c. Related agencies
  - d. Agency clientele
  - e. General public
13. . . . issue orders to carry out decisions and policies and develop a system for the control and distribution of issuances.

These functions were inclusive of the responsibilities which administrators were expected to perform (Stone, 1969).

#### Rehabilitation Administration

The organizational problems of today's administrator of state rehabilitation are those of effectively coordinating a network of relationships that become increasingly complex. The trend has been toward arrangements that have allowed shared responsibility in the setting of goals and their attainment. Leadership has been viewed as a coordinating function rather than the exercise of authority (Taylor, Hawkins, and Tebow, 1968). Other factors affecting the state administrator are found within the decision-making process. This process

. . . goes on at three levels of government. Intergovernmental complexity, the sheer number and diversity of the units involved, their geographic spread, and the variation in the resources available to them combine to make effective collaboration a minor miracle. At the heart of the dilemma is the dual responsibility for giving individualized service to persons and families who number in the millions (Taylor, et al., 1968, p. 2).

State administrators have had to take into account the impact of veto groups in assessing their ability to carry out agency programs. They have also had to compromise their administrative activity because of decision-makers at higher levels of government (state governors, legislatures and federal officials) (Taylor, et al., 1968). Ever present were value conflicts, organizational patterns established for carrying out agency programs, informal overlays, such as sociometry of staff, decisional, functional power, and communication overlays (Taylor, et al., 1968).

The growth of rehabilitation administration as a specialized field in public administration has paralleled administrative development in other fields. The growth of rehabilitation administration has been traced through the development of vocational rehabilitation public laws, with the expansion of existing programs, and the development of new rehabilitation programs. There has also been an increase in rehabilitation budgets, an increase in both state and federal expenditures, a change in federal matching formulae through the changing public laws, and the addition of increased staff. These factors coupled with the turnover of rehabilitation personnel have added increasing administrative responsibility to state directors of rehabilitation.

Comprehensive histories of the development of vocational rehabilitation programs in the United States have been written by several authors. A study of the Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act would be time consuming. It would be more useful to refer to the histories written by others. These reports are contained in Obermann's (1967) A History of Vocational Rehabilitation in America.

Another historical document has been written by Lesowitz (1970) and a document: 50th Anniversary of Vocational Rehabilitation in the U.S.A.: 1920-1970 (US, DHEW, 1970b) provides an excellent understanding of the development of rehabilitation nationally. A synopsis of those events and circumstances will be provided to indicate the impact of growth on the administrative process.

#### The Growth of Vocational Rehabilitation

The first Public Law for the vocational rehabilitation of civilians (P.L. 236) was passed on June 2, 1920 (U. S. Congress, 1920). Obermann (1967, p. 219) stated that "the significance of the proposed legislation was not in the breadth of its provisions, but rather, in the precedent it set in involving the Federal Government in the rehabilitation of disabled people . . ."

Public Law 236 was designed to provide counseling, vocational training, prostheses and job placement to physically handicapped persons (Lesowitz, 1970).

Two precedents set in the early development of rehabilitation programing have had (and still have) a substantial influence on rehabilitation administration in some states. The Vocational Rehabilitation



Act of 1920 placed the new agency under the States' Board of Vocational Education. These boards were not operational agencies and were only prepared to make policy decisions on programs in vocational education. The States' Boards of Vocational Education did not fully comprehend the objectives of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (Obermann, 1967).

The establishment of State Boards of Education as policy-makers in rehabilitation set the stage for a second precedent which today still affects the administration of state rehabilitation programs. Many states were reluctant to participate in the new program and the Federal Board staff had to continually encourage the states and their legislators to participate. Many times, the federal advocate had to bypass state commissioners of education and go directly to the state legislatures for support of vocational rehabilitation. This act provoked some state educators to look dimly on the upstart vocational rehabilitation program designed for disabled adults who did not fit the normal school mold (Obermann, 1967).

The periodic passage of amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920 had several affects upon state rehabilitation programs. Each new enactment (U. S. Congress of 1935, 1943, 1954, 1965, 1967, 1968) accomplished three basic things. The amendments provided for: new service programs for physically disabled people, new disabled populations who were eligible for rehabilitation services and increased numbers of personnel to administer the states' rehabilitation programs.

Switzer (1970), remarking before an audience gathered in Washington, D. C. to celebrate 50 years of vocational rehabilitation stated:

It is doubtful that anyone will ever adequately portray the sort of growth that took place in rehabilitation in the 1960's. It took so many forms, old and new, and each form multiplied. State vocational rehabilitation agencies not only grew in numbers of disabled people rehabilitated, in funds and in staff; they also moved into special programming to conduct demonstration projects, provide for more and better staff training, and organize special programs for disabled groups . . . (p. 18).

The most significant legislation of the 1960 decade was the funding of statewide studies for the comprehensive planning of vocational rehabilitation services in the future and the inclusion of a new population to be served by the vocational rehabilitation programs--the culturally, economically and educationally disadvantaged (U. S. Congress, 1968).

Each of these successive amendments, with their new programs and expansion and modification of existing programs led to a parallel growth of administrative responsibility for State Directors of Vocational Rehabilitation. The state director now had to fill a role which required his agency to spend more time in the research and development of state programs. The director also had to have staff who were competent to professionally provide services to physically disabled disadvantaged people and to integrate these many new services into an integrated state rehabilitation program.

#### The Growth of Rehabilitation Administration

The growth of the problems for administrators began early in the State-Federal Program in vocational rehabilitation. At the Fifth National Conference on Vocational Rehabilitation in Wisconsin in 1928, the states reported that their activities:

. . . had become so extensive that some of the state supervisors were beginning to be troubled by personnel and other administrative problems. . . . The state supervisors were beginning to develop into the roles of managers and supervisors. The simple relationships to clients and staff that were possible during the earliest days in each state were by necessity, being replaced by administrative arrangements that resulted in increasingly greater 'distance' between the supervisor and his 'case workers' and their work. Rapport, staff, morale, intra-staff communications, staff improvements, these were already testing the leadership capabilities of the directors. . . . Many spoke of difficulties in recruiting good rehabilitation workers, problems in training them, the need for some specialized type of college training to supplement what could be taught through experience on the job, the inability to attract qualified personnel because of limited salary budgets, and political interference in selecting staff (Obermann, 1967, pp. 253-254).

A second factor in the growth of administrative responsibility was the new federal requirements for the submission and acceptance of the state plan. The state administrators had to indicate to the federal government the plans, policies, and methods to be followed in carrying out the work of rehabilitation and its administrative implications (U. S. Congress, 1943). Other federal mandates were to establish appropriate eligibility standards, establish personnel standards and qualifications of staff and ". . . provide such methods of administration, other than establishment and maintenance of personnel standards, as are found by the Administrator to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the plan." Other requirements in the state plans were to file reports, prohibit capital expenditures for administrative purchases and establish rules, regulations and standards for the expenditures of funds (U. S. Congress, 1943, pp. 374-375).

Until 1943 state directors were considered political beings. State directors knew that, in order to build the vocational

rehabilitation organizations and programs in the states, they had to progress through political action (Switzer, 1970).

The 1943 amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act brought an important organizational tool to the state directors: The Act provided 100 percent federal funding for administration, counseling and guidance, and placement personnel. For the first time, growth of administration occurred for reasons other than politics. Personnel systems were designed, and salaries comparable to those paid to similar professionals were adopted. There was a national foundation laid for the establishment of a viable vocational rehabilitation organization--the National Rehabilitation Association. These new services, and the legislative mandates from the Congress of the United States, required that state directors be prepared to handle the administrative functions of expanded and more complex relationships within the rehabilitation agency.

After World War II, the federal office suggested systematic procedures of budgeting and carried out administrative surveys which had implications for state directors. State vocational rehabilitation agencies continued to increase the size of their programs, the numbers of clients and the costs for the provision of these programs (Obermann, 1967).

Paul A. Strachan, President of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, testifying before Congress in 1953 as an antagonist of the National Rehabilitation Association philosophy, stated that the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation " . . . does not have the

capacity, the experience, or the trained personnel to administer an overall program for the handicapped" (Obermann, 1967, pp. 304-305).

The Harbridge House reports that the results of analyzing the state-wide planning reports for rehabilitation were summed up by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Rehabilitation Services Administration (1970b):

. . . public agencies at the State level (are) making strenuous and aggressive efforts to rise effectively to the challenge of the rehabilitation problem which increasingly is placed before them. How much of this challenge can be met by a direct expansion of State agency funds, staff and participating facilities and how much by a realignment of the methods of cooperation and participation by the various public and private organizations in closely related fields, remains unclear. Certainly the State Vocational Rehabilitation agencies see for their future an even stronger role in planning, brokerage, and the coordination of services than has been their past role . . . the reports indicate that apparently the offices and personnel of the State rehabilitating agencies of the future will be much more widely dispersed and frequently more decentralized with regional and local offices tailoring their rehabilitation programs to fit more specifically the needs of their own handicapped populations (p. 26).

To illustrate the growth of administrative responsibility of state directors of rehabilitation between 1950 and 1970 several figures were cited. Between 1950 and 1970, the expenditures for case services in the United States rose from \$29,347,000 to \$455,865,000--an increase of 1500 percent in 20 years. In the 1960's, the rehabilitation of the physically disabled tripled from 88,275 persons in 1960 to 241,390 persons in 1969 (Lesowitz, 1970).

Another problem facing state directors of vocational rehabilitation was the financing of their agency's program (Copeland, 1969). Copeland observed that many small state agencies had been losing ten to twenty million dollars a year because of their ignorance of funding

programs that offer the most favorable matching rates. Copeland further reported that many administrators did not understand the mathematics of financing. The ability to match scarce state dollars most favorably with federal funds required a knowledge of the many programs and the ability to shift funds from a program with less favorable to more favorable matching possibilities. Here again was an indication of the responsibility a state director had to the state legislature to inform them of the favorable use of state dollars.

#### The Current Status of State Administration

State Agency Exchange (National Rehabilitation Association, [NRA], 1971) stated that 26 rehabilitation agencies were affiliated with state education departments. Twenty-two state agencies were located independent of education's jurisdiction. Rehabilitation agencies of 21 states and territories were administratively under the direction of the general vocational rehabilitation program of their state. Some agencies for the blind were located in various organizational structures: independent agencies or within umbrella agencies dealing with social and rehabilitation problems. This study (NRA, 1971) also reported that a majority of state administrators of the general vocational rehabilitation programs had direct access to the state legislature, while 14 reported no access and nine others only limited access. In the agencies for the blind, 10 of 33 reported that they had direct access to the state legislature while five had a qualified access. Twelve reported that they had direct or qualified access to the governor. Three states, California, New York and Pennsylvania

spent over \$30,000,000 per year on their rehabilitation programs. Eighteen states spent under \$5,000,000 during fiscal year, 1970. The rehabilitation programs for the blind ranged in expenditures from under \$500,000 to over \$4,000,000 per fiscal year, 1970, per state.

#### The Needs and Problems of State Directors of Rehabilitation

Dishart (1964) reported that a survey of state directors showed that the seven most important factors for improving the services of the state vocational rehabilitation agencies were:

1. More rehabilitation counselors
2. More money in the budget
3. Better attitudes among the public and employer
4. Higher salaries for counselors
5. Better training facilities in the state
6. Better rehabilitation counselors
7. More clerical and secretarial help

Those not listed in the first seven were more supervisors (ranked 10 out of 22), better cooperation with other agencies, and an independent state commission for rehabilitation. There were no categories for executive or legislative factors on the list (p. 100).

Dishart (1964) also reported that the most important five factors for promotion of counselors to supervisory or administrative positions were: efficiency, leadership, interpersonal ability, initiative and knowledge (p. 87).

A major problem affecting state rehabilitation programs is the stability and the number of professionally trained staff. The

Quarterly Manpower Reports (Rehabilitation Services Administration, 1968, 1969, 1970) indicated that personnel in the state's rehabilitation programs turnover at an alarming rate. During the years 1968 through 1970, 39 of every 100 positions filled were filled by persons hired during that year. The average vacancy rate for these three years was 13 out of every 100 positions. At the end of the year, 39 staff were new and 13 positions were empty. Of 100 positions, 48 staff represented stability and continuity in the delivery of rehabilitation services.

An example of the difficulty of keeping well-trained staff has been exemplified by the turnover rates of RSA-sponsored long-term trainees. In 1969, there were 199 graduates of training programs hired by state rehabilitation agencies. Of these 199 persons, 120 vacated their positions. In 1970, for three quarters, 156 graduates filled positions. One hundred and thirty (130) later vacated their positions. In summary, 350 persons were specifically trained for service in state rehabilitation agencies and statistics indicated that 105 remained at the close of 1970.

These statistics raise questions about the quality and appropriateness of university rehabilitation training programs in counseling and administration. An additional concern for administrators of these rehabilitation agencies was the causes of the reported high turnover rates by the Rehabilitation Services Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1968, 1969, 1970).



### Current University Training Programs

Margolin and Sostek (1968) reported that today's administrators needed training commensurate with a goal moving towards creative management. Margolin stated the training most desired for a rehabilitation administrator:

It must be categorically stated that the skills needed in administration and supervision are different from those of rehabilitation counseling, physical therapy and the like. It is erroneous to assume that an individual trained in a one-to-one basis of operation, either physically or psychologically, is the most suited to carry on in a rehabilitation agency such functions as program planning, fiscal management, effective uses of manpower, and systems analysis. In other words, skill training in counseling or therapy does not necessarily make people sensitive to organizational dynamics. . . . Developing good administrative leadership may be a lot easier for the person with a generalist orientation as compared to the highly trained specialist. Perhaps the best combination is an expertise in a particular rehabilitation field coupled with an administrative training which imbues in the administrator the generalist outlook (p. 19).

Correspondence by the author with personnel in six universities who train in rehabilitation principles and professional administrative programs yielded varying results. Responses were received from Texas Technical University, The University of Florida, The University of Wisconsin, Northeastern University, The University of Oklahoma and The University of Arizona. Texas Technical University (Personal correspondence, July, 1971) indicated that though they once had an administrative program, they no longer were teaching administrators in rehabilitation.

The University of Florida (1971) had established a graduate program in health and hospital administration. The course, presented as an inter-disciplinary program offered jointly by the Colleges of Business Administration and Health Related Professions, focused on

rehabilitation facility administration. The University of Florida's Rehabilitation Administration program was developed by the Florida faculty as an addition to their established Health and Hospital Administration curriculum. The University of Florida program was instituted as a result of the premise that the basic curricula for both programs were compatible. The validity of this premise was studied and conclusions indicated that there were many similarities existing in the preparation of administrators in each field. The basic curriculum included courses in management, economics, health and hospital administration, law, and industrial engineering. The program required 21 months to complete, and the Master's of Business Administration was bestowed upon the successful completion of the program.

The University of Wisconsin (G. N. Wright, personal correspondence, July 29, 1971) emphasized that their programs, the Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute and the Rehabilitation Counselor Education project, focused on the roles and functions of rehabilitation counselors. A point made was that program planning and budgeting, as an administrative consideration of cost-benefit and effectiveness principles, was a part of their "professional" counselor training.

Northeastern University (1971) had instituted a program leading to a Master's Degree in Education with a specialization in Rehabilitation Administration. Students eligible for admission to that program were:

Rehabilitation supervisors and administrators in state and private agencies who want to be brought up to date on the latest thinking and practices in Rehabilitation Administration . . . Rehabilitation counselors interested in supervision and administration . . . Personnel from health care field interested

Rehabilitation and administration, . . . students . . . interested in entering the field of Rehabilitation Administration Research (Northeastern University Announcement, 1971).

Northeastern University has been funded for several years by the Social and Rehabilitation Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to train rehabilitation administrators at the master's level.

Margolin and Sostek (1968), faculty members of Northeastern University, designed a framework within which the necessary rehabilitation administrative skills can be taught. The industrial-business training model, with features peculiar to the field of rehabilitation, was utilized. Margolin's model included academic training, in-service training and continuing education. Margolin and Sostek (1968) maintained that ". . . a total academic program in rehabilitation administration would have to be conceptualized at the doctoral level" (p. 19).

Proper training required skill development in three basic areas: foundations of rehabilitation, generic aspects of administration and rehabilitation administration. The program in Rehabilitation Administration at Northeastern University at the master's degree level reflected Margolin's and Sostek's values. The titles of the courses offered in the administrative program were: Research Design in Education, selections from Psychological Social and Humanistic Foundations of Education. The rehabilitation requirements were: Introduction to Rehabilitation, Principles of Medical Rehabilitation, Vocational Rehabilitation and Social Services, Organization and Administrative Theory, Rehabilitation Administration I and II, and Federal-State Relations in Rehabilitation. Other required courses were: Group Dynamics, Practicum in Rehabilitation Administration, and Community Planning in Rehabilitation.

Electives available to the administrative student were Social Welfare and Rehabilitation, Rehabilitation Research, Administration of a Sheltered Workshop, Rehabilitation and the Law, and Occupational Placement.

The RSA Management Training Program at The University of Oklahoma began in July, 1965, and included program participants who represented top, middle and lower rehabilitation management. In this program vocational rehabilitation administrative personnel have been brought to the Oklahoma campus for an eleven phase programming of one-week seminars over a period of two years or longer. Further three day short courses were interspersed throughout the seminar program. Participation in the RSA Management Training Program did not lead to a degree. Since the program participants were actively administering vocational rehabilitation programs, the conference method, used as the primary method of instruction, permitted a ". . . free exchange of ideas and experiences within the group. . . . A major benefit of this method is the self-analysis each member makes of his own performance against the accepted and successful principles and practices presented during the seminar" (University of Oklahoma Bulletin, 1969). The seminar phase of the program consisted of the following topics: basic principles of management, program planning, manpower development, human relations and communications, problems in organization, management of managers, problems of the state director, supervisory management, decision-making, program evaluation and the management of change. The three day short courses topics were: delegation, systems

management, public relations training techniques and facilities management (University of Oklahoma Bulletin, 1969).

The University of Arizona began a doctoral program in Rehabilitation Administration in 1965. The approach to rehabilitation administration at both the master's degree and doctoral study level has been inter-disciplinary. This inter-disciplinary philosophy, held by the faculty of the Rehabilitation Center, has been reflected in the curriculum that student participants have taken in their preparations for the master's or doctorate degree. D. W. Smith (Personal interview, June 3, 1971) stated: ". . . students in rehabilitation and its philosophies need a background of administration in rehabilitation, business and management, computer sciences, education, and a background in a broad behavioral science curriculum." He further stated: ". . . the administration program must prepare an administrator whose skills are oriented towards perceiving the future needs of rehabilitation and then having the commensurate ability to implement rehabilitation programs that will be relevant to the needs of the physically disabled and disadvantaged." Another feature of the University of Arizona doctoral level program was the administrative internship experience provided each student in the community and at the University's Rehabilitation Center.

Each student's program consisted of a core of courses in rehabilitation, administration and electives selected by the student and his advisor which were dependent upon the student's interest and background preparations.

The courses taken by the student in rehabilitation were: rehabilitation principles, community and state resources for

rehabilitation, case practices, plan development in rehabilitation, medical and psychological aspects of disability, vocational evaluation and workshop facilities principles and practices, research and appropriate seminars.

Courses required in administration and management from the College of Education, Business, Government, Public Administration and Systems Engineering have been: management and organizational behavior, statistics, research personnel management, law, computer program, systems management, financial management, federal, state and municipal government, administrative leadership, supervision of personnel, health agencies administration, project administration, grantsmanship, public relations and educational administration (University of Arizona, 1971-72). Behavioral science electives have been taken by the student in concurrence with the student's advisor (pp. 226-235).

Whether or not this curriculum represents appropriate training programs for potential rehabilitation administrators, depends upon an operational definition of the role and functions of these administrators. A review of the literature does not report what the rehabilitation administrators consider their role and functions to be.

### Summary

This chapter presented a review of the related literature in five general areas: (1) the developing field studies in public administration; (2) the description of role theory and the confusion of roles taken and played by administrators in public agencies; (3) the development of theory on administrative functions which administrators

perform in carrying out their responsibilities; (4) the growth of administration in vocational rehabilitation; and (5) the review of existing rehabilitation administration training programs in the nation.

It was noted that the growth in financial, program and staff support to carry out rehabilitation services has greatly added to the complexity of the state rehabilitation administrator's job. The role and functions of the administrator's position have been discussed, and various opinions of scholars in the field have been cited.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The procedures and methodology used in the study are presented in this chapter, and are divided into four sections: (1) instrument construction, (2) selection procedures, (3) data collection, and (4) data analysis.

The study was designed to examine the state director's perception of his role and functions as the state's chief administrative officer in charge of the direct supervision of the state rehabilitation agency. The state director's immediate administrative superior was also questioned as to his perception of the director's role and functions as they related to the administration of the state's rehabilitation agency.

The Council of State Administrators, an affiliate of the National Rehabilitation Association, supplied the names and titles of the State Directors of the Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies and the Rehabilitation Agencies for the Visually Impaired. The population for the United States and the territories of Guam, Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico and Washington, D. C. consisted of 54 State Directors of Vocational Rehabilitation and 36 State Directors of Agencies for the Blind (Visually Impaired). In order to provide a sample of legitimate size, it was determined that the entire state director population would be used as the sample. The other population studied was the immediate



administrative superiors to whom the directors reported. The total population of administrative superiors to each State Director of Rehabilitation was ninety. Each member of the administrative superior population was asked to answer questions regarding their perceptions of the role and functions of the State Directors of Rehabilitation.

In summary, these two populations, the state directors and their administrative superiors, were utilized as the sample for this study. Van Dalen (1966) pointed out the particular and peculiar problems of sampling and the importance of insuring representativeness by using appropriate sampling design and sampling technique.

#### Construction of the Instrument

The purpose of the study was to explore the perceptions of state director's of rehabilitation role and functions of his position in light of what he perceives his current role and functions to be. The state director was also asked what he believed his role and functions should be. The state director's administrative superior was also asked to respond to the role and functions of the director. More specifically, an attempt was made to answer the following questions:

1. What is the education and experience background of persons currently employed as state rehabilitation directors?
2. To what extent does the state director's perception of his present role differ from his preferred role?
3. To what extent does the state director's actual role differ from the role his immediate administrative superiors would like him to assume?

4. How much difference is there between the percentage of time state directors devote to various functions and the percentage of time they believe they should devote to these functions?
5. What factors, external to the job itself, affect the work of the administrator?
6. How does the state director delegate his responsibility to other administrators in the rehabilitation agency?
7. To what extent do relationships with the federal government, state legislature, and executive branch affect the role of the administrator?
8. How much difference is there between the percentage of time which administrators devote to the innovation of new programs and services and the percentage of time they believe they should devote to these tasks?

In order to attempt to answer the preceding questions, a mailed, self-administered questionnaire was developed for use in this study. The advantages of mailed questionnaires are their relative low cost and their capacity to reach geographically dispersed people. The disadvantages of questionnaires are the tendency for response rates to be relatively low and the presumed differing characteristics between respondents and non-respondents (Van Dalen, 1966). The investigator assumed that the populations being studied were homogeneous. Therefore, information about the non-respondents would not substantially alter the findings. Because of the geographic location of the population needed to conduct

the study, the mailed questionnaire represented the only reasonable method for data collection.

The questionnaire was structured closed form so as to maximize the willingness of the respondent to answer the questions. The closed form questionnaire was also used because (1) the informants tend to answer questions more frankly by mail since anonymity is assured; (2) the questions are standardized; and (3) the respondent can answer the questionnaire at his convenience (Parten, 1950). To overcome Van Dalen's (1966) objections to the forced categorization of answers into a limited number of alternatives in a closed form questionnaire, the investigator provided for other alternative answers which allowed the subject to respond as he wished, outside of the categories provided.

Besides the disadvantage of low returns (Parten, 1950; Kerlinger, 1966), other problems encountered by the investigator during the writing of the questionnaire were: (1) the phrasing of the items so they would be understood by the respondents; (2) the sequential arrangement of the questions so as to assist the respondents in answering them; (3) the designing of items to help the respondent characterize his response; (4) to design items so as not to elicit a bias response; (5) the designing of a questionnaire which was not overburdening the respondent; and (6) the avoidance of questions that would alienate the respondent (Wise, Nordberg and Reitz, 1967). Van Dalen (1966) and Kerlinger (1966) both indicated the low return ratio of mailed questionnaires. On the basis of a review of the literature, the investigator concluded that a return of 75 percent from each population would be satisfactory.

In the actual design of the questionnaire, preliminary versions were submitted to professional administrators of rehabilitation programs and to individuals who were knowledgeable about the construction of survey instruments, who were not members of the population. After several revisions following the recommendations of the review panel, an additional sample of administrators and former administrators, not members of the population, were asked to complete the questionnaire. The individuals involved in the survey development also responded to questions concerning the length of the survey, its appropriateness, the objectivity of the instrument as well as confusing questions and/or instructions. The final version of the questionnaire contained five sections (I-V), while the questionnaire sent to the state director's administrative superior contained three sections (II-IV).

#### Collection of the Data

Using the names and addresses of the state directors of vocational rehabilitation and rehabilitation for the blind, a questionnaire (Appendix B) was sent with a cover letter (Appendix A) and a letter of support (Appendix C) from Mr. Craig Mills, the State Director of Vocational Rehabilitation in Florida. Mr. Mills was also the President-elect of the Council of State Administrators, a National Rehabilitation Association affiliate. Also included in the questionnaire packet, was a self-addressed, stamped envelope and a self-addressed postcard. The postcard was sent to the state directors with a request to send the name and address of their immediate administrative superior. Thirty-nine postcards were returned with 33 names and addresses of administrative superiors.

There were 54 questionnaires sent to state and territorial directors of vocational rehabilitation and 36 questionnaires sent to directors of rehabilitation for the blind. After approximately four weeks the return was 54 percent of the sample. A second follow-up letter was sent (Appendix D), to the state directors who had failed to return the original questionnaire asking for a response. Following an additional three weeks the total return reached 63.2 percent. This was followed by a third letter and another questionnaire (Appendix E). After an additional waiting period of three weeks the data collection was considered completed for the state directors questionnaire. There was a response from 70 state directors--a 78 percent return. Two of the questionnaires could not be used as one was not completed correctly, and the other respondent did not return the questionnaire.

Because the return of postcards from state directors listing the name and address of their superior only reached 33 of 90 persons, a list of names was requested from the Rehabilitation Services Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The listing contained no names of the administrative superiors to the state directors of rehabilitation agencies. The list contained only the offices of those considered in authority over the state directors of rehabilitation.

Thirty-three questionnaires were sent to those administrative superiors named by the responding state directors. The remaining 57 questionnaires were sent to the offices and positions named in the HEW, RSA document. Listed among the offices of those who had immediate

administrative authority over the state rehabilitation agency, were governors of six states, boards of education, department heads of agencies in which rehabilitation was subdivisional. The first mailing included the questionnaire, a cover letter to the immediate administrative superior and a copy of Mr. Craig Mills' supporting letter (Appendices C, G, F).

After four weeks 30 questionnaires were returned (33%). A second letter (Appendix H) and an additional questionnaire were sent to the non-respondents. Some questionnaires were sent to the state director by the board or other officer, who did not complete the questionnaire himself. After some incorrect responses and correspondence, a letter was sent explaining the intent of the original request (Appendix I). After approximately four weeks 55 responses were received (61%).

Several of the responses (17) could not be used for the following reasons: (1) the persons answering were representing board members and disclaimed that they were superior to the state director; (2) the six governors who were considered the administrative superiors of the state director did not respond; (3) some questionnaires were sent by some boards to the state director for their response; (4) some directors stated that they had no administrative superior in the state to whom they reported; and (5) four questionnaires were returned by administrative superiors whose state directors did not respond. It was determined at this time that that phase of the study comparing administrative superiors with their state directors would be conducted with 38 usable returns.

The rate of return for the questionnaires sent to the state directors was considerably higher (78%) than that generally reported for mailed questionnaires (Van Dalen, 1966). The rate of return for the questionnaires mailed to the administrative superior (61%) was considered the usual return rate, however. There appeared to be other factors, as mentioned above, which contributed to that rate of return.

Parten (1950) attributed high return rates to the extensiveness of experimentation in the development of the questionnaire. Two other factors could have contributed to the state director's high return rate. One factor was the close comradery among state directors of rehabilitation and the second factor was the endorsement of the president-elect of the Council of State Administrators of the National Rehabilitation Association, Mr. Craig Mills.

#### Method of Analysis

The questionnaires used in this study were hand tabulated. Sixty-eight questionnaires were tabulated, and sections of the questionnaire were rejected if the respondents indicated their inability to appropriately answer the section. Four questionnaires received from administrative superiors of state directors who did not respond were also rejected. Thirty-eight questionnaires were tabulated and used in comparing state directors and their administrative superiors (Sections II, III and IV).

The method of analysis in each of the five sections of the state directors' questionnaire varied according to how the questions were framed. Sections II, III and IV were identical for both state directors

and their administrative superiors (Appendices B, G). Sections I and V were answered only by the state directors of rehabilitation agencies.

### Section I

The purpose of this section was to obtain background information about the state director. This background information consisted of: (1) general information, (2) education, (3) membership in professional organization, (4) hours spent in administering the rehabilitation agency, and (5) the minimum qualifications for state directors in rehabilitation.

The data were presented in tabular form and in brief qualitative descriptions of fact. The data not appearing in tabular form were analyzed by qualitative descriptive methods. All data were descriptively analyzed and presented as a composite profile of the present state directors of rehabilitation agencies.

### Section II

The purpose of this section was to determine how a state director viewed his present role in the agency. The following three models were presented for his selection:

Model A: The state director's role is primarily political in nature. The role also includes the exercise of discretionary power and the making of value choices as a characteristic of rehabilitation administrators. Lastly, it is the administrator's responsibility to reflect, as a discretionary power, the desires of the voter through their elected legislature and executive branch personnel.



Model B: The state director's role is primarily apolitical in nature. A description of this role would include values which would reflect a dichotomy between politics and administration and that rehabilitation administration should be based on rationale which is not influenced by "politics". In this role model, the administrator is a neutral career service officer who primarily displays competence, expertise and a rationality which is politically value free.

Model C: This model is a combination of A and B. The state director places equal emphasis on both the political and apolitical role.

The respondents were asked to select the model which most nearly described (1) his present role, (2) his preferred role, and (3) the role which he thought his superiors would like him to assume.

These role models were developed after researching the literature. The authors representing the greatest influence in both the format and the substance of the model descriptions were: Tully (1970), McGowan and Porter (1967), Pfiffner and Presthus (1967), Sayre (1958), Simon (1962), and Sharkansky (1970).

Mean percentages were calculated and the Chi Square Test of significant differences between mean percents was used to test the differences between the three models as selected by state directors. The McNemar Test for the Significance of Changes was used to test the null hypotheses (Siegel, 1956). The following null hypotheses were used:

1. There is no significant difference between the state administrator's present perception of his role and the role he would prefer if he were free to choose.

2. There is no significant difference between the state administrator's present perception of his role and the role which he believes his superior would like him to assume.

Tests of significance were reported at the .05 level.

### Section III

The purpose of this section was to determine how state directors spent their time in the functions of administration commonly accepted by authorities in the field. The questions were developed after a thorough review of the literature and by testing the format with experts in the field of rehabilitation administration. The functions were operationally defined after a review of such writers as Fayol (1949), Gulick and Urwick (1937), Flippo (1968), and Stone (1969). The respondents were asked to rank the time spent in each function and the time they believed they should spend. The null hypothesis was tested by the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test for significant differences. The following null hypothesis was tested:

3. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time which state administrators now spent on various functions and the percentage of time which they believe they should spend on these functions.

The tests of significant differences were reported at the .05 level.

#### Section IV

The purpose of this section was to determine the percent of time spent on major functions relating to other people. The relationships explored as major functions were the administrator's responsibilities of working with (1) state legislators, (2) superiors to the state directors, in the executive branch, (3) federal officials, (4) those state rehabilitation personnel who are developing new programs, (5) other state level rehabilitation administrators, and (6) special interest and citizen groups. The questionnaire was designed to determine the amount of time currently spent on these functions and the amount of time that the director believed should be spent on these relationships.

The data were presented in tabular form and were analyzed by the t-test of significant differences between mean percents (Popham, 1967). The analyses were calculated in order to test the following null hypotheses:

4. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators believe they should spend with the state legislature (legislators) and the percentage of time currently spent.

5. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators believe they should spend with the state's executive branch and the percentage of time presently spent.

6. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators believe they should spend with federal officials of rehabilitation programs and the percentage of time presently spent.

7. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators spend with agency supervisory and administrative staff on program problems and the percentage of time they believe they should spend.

8. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators spend with other groups (Private, citizen and other public administrative agencies) and the percentage of time they believe they should spend.

9. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state directors spend in research and development of rehabilitation programs and the percentage of time they believe they should spend.

Tests of significance were reported at the .05 level.

## Section V

The purpose of this section was to provide a greater perception of administrative relationships with groups both within and without the state's rehabilitation agencies. Section V offers an intensive insight into those relationships which form the necessary formal and informal communications channels to carry on the activities of the agency. The communications questions examined in Section V were: (1) who has the greatest impact on budget preparation? (2) how often were meetings held with other state human resources agency directors? and (3) how often were meetings held with administrative superiors and legislative committees? Other data analyzed were answers to questions regarding the techniques used for mobilizing support for programs of state rehabilitation agencies. Finally, a recheck of skills relating to successful

administrative behavior was tabulated for further insight into the director's beliefs about administration of state rehabilitation agencies. The data were presented in tables and by using descriptive statistics.

### Trend Analysis

Following the descriptive analysis and testing of the hypotheses, a section on trend analysis was included. In the section selected factors were correlated with each other and those correlation coefficients which exceeded the .05 level of significance were reported and descriptively analyzed. The second part of the trend analysis section compared the state director of rehabilitation with his matched administrative superior on their responses to questions in Sections II, III, and IV of the questionnaire. These responses were tested for significant differences using the McNemar test for significant changes (Section II), the Wilcoxon matched-pairs, signed-rank test (Section III), and the t-test for significant differences between means (Section IV).

### Summary

This chapter presented the development of the questionnaire used in this study, the selection of subjects, the procedures for collecting data, and the method of analysis used in testing the data collected in this study.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS OF THE STUDY

#### Introduction

Chapter four is a presentation of the results of data analysis. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section is a descriptive analysis of the collected data from the questions. The second section is a presentation of the results associated with the hypotheses postulated in this study. The third section is an analysis of trends and a comparison of administrative superiors' and state directors' responses to selected questions.

#### Descriptive Analysis

As previously stated, one population for the study consisted of 90 state and territorial administrators of rehabilitation agencies throughout the nation. The second population consisted of the administrative superiors to the state directors. The analysis reflects the returns from 68 state directors and 38 administrative superiors. The descriptive analysis has been treated in the sequence of the questions asked in the survey instrument. The questionnaire consisted of five sections.

#### Section I--Background Information

Question 1. What was the background of state directors of rehabilitation agencies throughout the country?

The demographic data are presented in Tables 25 through 32 in Appendix J.

An analysis of the data in Section I revealed that 56 (82%) chief administrators were titled State Director, Chief or Administrator, while the rest had other titles. The average age of the state director was 51.9 years and the median age was 53 years (Table 25). The median time spent by state directors in office was 5.6 years (Table 26). The total time spent in rehabilitation by state directors, including the period of time as director was over 14 years (Table 27).

There were 43 (64%) state directors who had administrative experience in rehabilitation prior to becoming state director. Examples of positions held in rehabilitation prior to becoming state directors were equally divided between assistant state directors, district and casework supervisors. There were 22 (36%) directors who had no previous rehabilitation administrative experience prior to becoming the director of the state rehabilitation agency. Of these 22 directors, 12 (56%) had other administrative experience, examples of which were school principals, school superintendents and executives in private foundations or other businesses.

The response from state directors indicated that 68 percent of them had had prior counseling experience while 32 percent indicated no such experience. Sixty-seven percent of the responding state directors believed that the chief administrative officer for rehabilitation in the state should have counseling experience as compared to 33 percent who did not believe such experience was necessary.

The education level attained by 97 percent of the directors was a bachelor's degree or higher. Fifty-nine percent of the state directors held master's degrees and 10% held the doctor's degree (Table 28). When asked whether they were working towards a graduate degree or taking courses, nine percent responded yes. When asked if the director believed he had a need for additional training 62 percent (39) answered affirmatively. Of those directors who indicated a need for further training, 97 percent believed that it was most or more important to take administration courses, 46 percent believed it was most or more important, while 41 percent believed it was of average importance to study rehabilitation. The third category of courses, social sciences, received a 29 percent rating for most or more important; 35 percent of the directors rated social science of average importance, while 35 percent indicated that it was less or not important to receive further training in social science courses (Table 29).

As to membership in professional organizations, the respondents indicated that 93 percent of state directors belonged to the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation and 96 percent belonged to the National Rehabilitation Association. Additional organizations reported in the survey were the National Rehabilitation Counseling Association, the American Rehabilitation Counseling Association, the Council of State Agencies for the Blind and others (Table 30).

The state directors averaged a 48 hour work week in fulfilling their responsibilities as state directors. The minimum qualifications for the state director's position ranged from unspecified criteria (21%)



to a master's degree and/or 10 years experience in rehabilitation and adequate accompanying administrative experience (Tables 31 and 32).

## Section II--Administrator Role

Question 1. Which role best describes the state directors' present role?

The state director was asked to select from Model A, B or C as developed in the questionnaire. An abbreviated definition of the roles is: Model A, a role primarily political in nature; Model B, a role apolitical in scope; Model C, was a combination of the political and apolitical roles described in Models A and B.

Surprisingly no state director described his role as strictly political (Model A) but 60 percent selected Model B and 40 percent selected Model C (Table 1).

Question 2. Which model most nearly described the role the state director would choose if he were free to choose?

Again, no state director selected Model A as his role. Sixty-eight percent of the directors selected Model B as their preferred role and 32 percent selected Model C.

Question 3. Which role most nearly described the role the state director believed his superiors would like him to assume?

Again, the state directors did not select Model A. Fifty-five percent of the state administrators believed their superiors would want them to assume Model B. The other 45 percent believed their superiors wanted them to assume Model C.

Table 1. Role of State Directors

Role**	Model A		Model B		Model C		Total		Chi Square
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Present	0	0	38	60.32	25	39.68	63	100	35.52*
Preferred	0	0	43	68.25	20	31.75	63	100	44.10*
Agency	0	0	34	54.84	28	45.16	62	100	31.87*

\* Significant at the .05 level - 2 degrees of freedom

\*\* Defined as the state director's perception of his present role, his preferred role and the role he believes his superiors would like him to take

In reviewing Table 1, the greatest difference observed was the unexpected virtual lack of response by the state directors for Model A. In comparing the state directors present versus his preferred role, Model B was selected as the actual role 60 percent of the time and 68 percent of the time, if they were free to choose. The present role of state directors as compared with assumed role, indicated a 55 percent (Model A) to 45 percent (Model B) as a response by the state directors.

### Section III--Administrative Functions

Section III was designed to determine what state directors believed were their most important functions.

Question 1. How much difference was there between the amount of time which state directors spent on various administrative functions and the time they believed they should spend on these functions?

Table 2 presents a comparison of the time state directors presently spend on functions and how they believed they should spend their time. State directors reported that they currently spend more time in taking care of administrative adjustments than other functions. Two other important consumers of state directors' time were program and budget planning, policy planning, and organizing the agency's structure. In comparison, state directors of rehabilitation agencies believed they should be spending their time in policy planning, program and budget planning, public relations, and organizing agency structure.

It is interesting to note that the two functions considered most important were functions that directly involved relationships with organizations and agencies external to rehabilitation agencies. State

Table 2. State Directors Rank of Time Spent on Administrative Functions

Function	Now		Rank	Should		Rank	Wilcoxon matched-pairs (z-score)
	N	Mdn**		N	Mdn		
Policy Planning	56	3.79	3	56	1.38	1	3.87*
Program & Budget Planning	55	3.39	2	55	1.63	2	3.29*
Organize Agency Structure	55	4.14	4	55	4.14	3.5	.12
Install Agency Procedures & Methods	52	5.00	7	52	6.17	7	2.87*
Procure Funding & Administer Finances	55	5.50	8	55	5.04	6	.81
Staffing	53	7.10	9	53	6.77	9	1.25
Management Information	54	4.83	6	54	4.33	5	.72
Administrative Adjustments	55	2.86	1	55	6.30	8	3.91*
Facilities & Supplies	53	9.39	11	53	9.50	10.5	.27
Public Relations	54	4.50	5	54	4.14	3.5	1.54
Travel	54	8.50	10	54	9.50	10.5	2.09*

\*Significant at .05 level

\*\*Median determined by ranking functions (1 is most time spent in function)

directors believed they should spend less time with installing agency procedures and methods, administrative adjustments, administering facilities, supplies and administrative traveling.

#### Section IV--Major Relationship Functions

Question 1. How much difference was there between the percentage of time spent on major functions by state directors and the time they believed they should spend on these functions?

Table 3 gives a comparison of the time spent on the functions involving meeting with various groups affecting rehabilitation programs. State directors reported they should spend more time with legislators (from 5.96% to 9.50% of their time). Additionally, directors believed more time should be spent in research and development (14.05% to 15.77%). One function indicating a decreasing trend in time spent was in the category of other relationships (15.68% to 14.33%). Considerable difference was found in the time spent in legislative functions and research and development functions.

#### Section V--Selected Administrative Factors

Section V was designed to describe in greater depth selected factors involved in state directors fulfilling their administrative roles and functions.

Table 4 shows that the state director ranks himself as the most important person (1) in establishing the agency's budget preparation. The next most influential persons in budget preparation are, in rank order, (2) the governor's budget office, (3) agency superiors, (4) the legislature, (5) federal laws, and (6) the governor. It is worth

Table 3. Percentage of Time Spent on Major Functions by State Directors

Functions	Now		Rank	Should		Rank	Degrees of Freedom	t-test** (t-value)
	N	%		N	%			
Legislative Functions	60	5.96	6	60	9.50	5	59	5.90*
Administrative Functions	57	19.07	2	57	19.30	2	56	.22
Federal Functions	58	9.52	5	58	8.95	6	57	-.81
Research & Development	61	14.05	4	61	15.77	3	60	2.72*
Management Council	59	26.61	1	59	26.62	1	58	.01
Other Relationships	60	15.68	3	60	14.33	4	59	-1.54

\*Significant at .05 level of two-tailed test

\*\*t-test for significant differences between related-sample means

Table 4. Those Who Most Influence Budget Preparation Priorities

Office	N	Median Rating*	Rank Order
State Director	62	1.36	1
Federal Law	55	2.58	5
Governor	54	2.86	6
Governor's Budget Office	58	1.80	2
Agency Superiors	52	1.89	3
Legislature	58	2.33	4

\*Based on 1 being most important

noting that the agency's state director, his administrative superior, and the governor's budget office collaborate on the budget preparation. It is also interesting and perhaps surprising that the federal law is more influential in budget preparation than the governor.

The rank order of importance placed upon topics discussed with administrative superiors is illustrated in Table 5. As expected, administrative problems were the most discussed issue. Following in importance of topics discussed were (2) budgetary matters, (3) program problems, (4) new programs, (5) employee and personnel problems, (6) reporting, reviewing and evaluating problems, and (7) federal laws and guidelines.

Table 6 shows the ranking of topics discussed with legislative committees. The most often discussed topics in decreasing order were: (1) budgetary matters, (2) new programming, (3) program problems,

Table 5. Topics Discussed with Administrative Superiors  
by State Directors

Topics	N	Median Rating*	Rank Order
Administrative Problems	59	1.31	1
Program Problems	52	2.00	3
Budgeting Matters	57	1.43	2
New Programming	54	2.67	4
Federal Laws & Guidelines	51	4.77	7
Reporting, Reviewing & Evaluating Problems	54	4.50	6
Employee & Personnel Problems	51	4.38	5
Other	24	7.33	

\*Based on rank of 1 being most time spent in discussing topic



Table 6. Topics Discussed with Legislative Committees  
by State Directors

Topic	N	%	Median Rating*	Rank Order
Administrative Problems	17	25	3.88	5
Program Problems	29	43	2.07	3
Budgeting Matters	50	74	1.28	1
New Programming	34	50	1.79	2
Federal Laws & Guidelines	25	37	2.75	4
Reporting, Reviewing & Evaluating Problems	19	28	4.17	6
Employee & Personnel Problems	13	19	6.21	7
Other	8	12	7.20	

\*Based on rank of 1 being most time spent in discussing topic

(4) federal laws and guidelines, (5) administrative problems, (6) reporting, reviewing and evaluating problems, and (7) employee and personnel problems.

When state directors appear before legislative committees (appropriations) 74 percent of the directors discussed budgetary matters. Fifty percent of the directors discussed new programs and 43 percent discussed program problems before legislative committees.

In ranking the various specialized roles which state directors fulfill within their agencies, the roles chosen from most important to least important are shown in Table 7. Administrative planning, program development and policy initiation rank as the most important roles, respectively, while interpreting laws and regulations, state executive liaison, and assisting clients were the least important roles.

Budget preparation and securing funds were ranked the sixth and seventh most important roles, and establishing legislative liaison was the eighth most important role.

Table 8 illustrates those rehabilitation agencies having public relations functions. These public relations functions were divided into two categories with 49 percent of the respondents indicating that they used the public relations functions to mobilize support for rehabilitation programs. Sixty-two percent of those reporting state directors who had a public relations function designed to disseminate information.

In mobilizing support for their rehabilitation programs (Table 9), 54 percent of the state directors used the news media to influence public opinion in his favor. The other contacts made to

Table 7. Specialized Roles of State Director

Role	N	Median Rating*	Rank Order
Administrative Planning	60	1.27	1
Staff Directing	60	4.43	4
Policy Initiation	59	3.10	3
Interpreting Laws & Regulations	59	7.50	9
State Legislative Liaison	54	6.85	8
State Executive Liaison	57	7.61	10
Budget Preparation	58	5.17	6
Program Development	59	2.92	2
Securing Program Support	59	4.79	5
Securing Funds	59	5.38	7
Assisting Clients	42	9.80	11

\*Based upon ranking (1 being most important) for specialized roles

Table 8. Rehabilitation Agencies with Public Relations Functions

Purpose	Yes	%	No	%	N	%
Mobilize Program Support	30	49	31	51	61	100
Disseminate Information	38	62	23	38	61	100

Table 9. State Directors' Attempts to Provide Information  
to Various Groups

Contact Groups	Mobilize Support			Disseminate Information		
	Total N	N-Yes	%	Total N	N-Yes	%
Legislative Committees	61	20	33	61	28	46
Legislators	61	23	38	59	31	53
Legislative Council Staff	60	16	27	60	20	33
Legislative Comm. Research Staff	61	17	28	61	21	34
State Executive Budget Staff	61	23	38	61	24	39
Governor's Office	61	23	38	61	29	48
Federal Congressmen	61	24	39	61	30	49
Federal Agency Personnel	61	25	41	60	26	43
Lobby Groups	61	24	39	61	25	41
Special Interest Groups	62	27	44	60	29	48
Pressure Groups	61	19	31	61	22	36
News Media	61	33	54	61	37	61
Business & Industry	61	29	48	61	33	54
Advisory Committees	61	29	48	62	34	55

mobilize program support ranged from a low of 27 percent before legislative council staff, to a high of 48 percent among business and industrial leaders and vocational rehabilitation advisory committees.

Table 9 also indicates that 61 percent of those state directors reporting relied on the news media to disseminate information about their agency's program. Contact with other groups ranged from a low of 34 percent disseminating information to legislative council research staff to a high of 55 percent to advisory committees, 54 percent to business and industrial leaders and 53 percent to legislators. When state agency directors were asked if they appeared before their state legislature in regard to program and funding, 74 percent reported affirmatively.

Katz (1958) reported three essential skills required of top administrative personnel in order to be effective: conceptual, technical, and human relations; with conceptual skills being the most important. Table 10 confirms that hypothesis. Eighty-two percent of those state directors reporting believed that conceptual skills were the most important and 98 percent reported that they were the most or more important. Twenty-nine percent of those directors reporting believed that technical skills were the most or more important while 70 percent believed that this skill was of average importance, or less. Eighty-seven percent of the state directors also reported that human relations skills were most and more important.

In response to the question of whether a state director should be a generalist or specialist, 54 percent indicated generalist.

Table 10. Skills Most Needed as State Directors

Skills	<u>Importance:</u> Most		More		Important		Less		Not		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Conceptual	51	82	10	16	1	2	0	0	0	0	62	100
Technical	6	10	12	19	25	40	17	27	2	3	62	99
Human Relations	37	60	17	27	8	13	0	0	0	0	62	100

Another 15 percent reported specialist and 31 percent a combination of both (Table 11).

The response to questions of whether state directors met with other directors of human resources agencies, showed 92 percent reporting affirmatively. When asked how often they met with these directors, two percent reported daily, 14 percent weekly, eight percent biweekly, 22 percent monthly, 20 percent quarterly, three percent semi-annually, and two percent annually. Thirty percent reported they met on other schedules not indicated above (Table 12). Sixty percent of the directors held regular meetings with their administrative superior, while 40 percent reported no regular schedule of meeting with their superiors.

When asked if the state directors used an intra-agency management council for assistance in making decisions on agency programs and problems, 44 percent reported they did not.

### Hypotheses

#### Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 was: There is no significant difference between the state administrator's present perception of his role and the role he would prefer if he were free to choose.

The McNemar test for significance of changes was calculated to test the hypothesis. With one degree of freedom, a Chi Square value of 3.84 was needed for significance at the .05 level. As shown in Table 13, the calculated value of 1.785 did not exceed the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.



Table 11. Characteristics of State Directors

Skills	N	%
Generalist	32	54
Specialist	9	15
Both	<u>18</u>	<u>31</u>
Total	59	100

Table 12. Vocational Rehabilitation State Directors Meeting with Other State Agency Directors

Frequency	N	%
Daily	1	2
Weekly	8	14
Bi-Weekly	5	8
Monthly	13	22
Quarterly	12	20
Semi-Annually	2	3
Annually	1	2
Irregular	<u>20</u>	<u>30</u>
Total	62	101

Table 13. Present Role and Preferred Role of State Directors

Role**	Model A		Model B		Model C		Total		Chi Square***
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Present	0	0	38	63.33	22	36.67	60	100	
Preferred	0	0	43	67.19	21	32.81	64	100	1.785*

\*Not significant at .05 level - 1 degree of freedom

\*\*Defined as the state directors' perception of their present and preferred role

\*\*\*McNemar test for the significance of changes

These results suggest that there was no significant conflict between the state director's present perception of his role and the role he would prefer if he were free to choose.

### Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 was: There is no significant difference between the state director's present perception of his role and the role which he believes his superior would like him to assume.

The McNemar test for significant changes was calculated to test the hypothesis. With one degree of freedom, a Chi Square value of 3.84 was needed for significance at the .05 level. As shown in Table 14, the calculated value of .90 did not exceed the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

These results suggest that there was no significant conflict between the state director's present perception of his role and the role he believed his superior would like him to assume.

### Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 was: There is no significant difference between the percentage of time which state directors now spend on various functions and the percentage of time which they believe they should spend on these functions.

The Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks tests for significant differences was calculated to test the hypothesis.

A z-score of 1.96 was needed for significance at the .05 level. As shown in Table 2, the calculated values of policy planning (3.87), program and budget planning (3.29), installation of agency procedures

Table 14. Present Role and the Agency Preferred Role of State Director

Role**	Model A		Model B		Model C		Total		Chi Square***
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Present	0	0	38	61.29	24	38.71	62	100	
Agency	0	0	34	54.84	28	45.16	62	100	.90*

\*Not significant at .05 level - 1 degree of freedom

\*\*Defined as the state directors' perception of their present role and the role their superiors would like him to take

\*\*\*McNemar test for the significance of changes

and methods (2.87), administrative adjustments (3.91) and travel (2.09) exceeded the level of significance of 1.96 at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for these five functions. The other listed functions did not reach the level of significance required at or beyond the .05 level. The null hypothesis for the functions organizing agency structure, procuring funding and administering financing, staffing, management information, providing facilities supplies and public relations was accepted.

These results indicated that there was a considerable discrepancy between the amount of time state directors devoted to policy planning, program and budget planning, installing agency procedures and methods, making administrative adjustments and travel and the amount of time they believed they should spend on these functions. The directors believed they should spend more time in policy planning, program and budget planning, and less time in installing agency procedures and methods, making administrative adjustments and traveling.

#### Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 was: There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators believe they should spend with the state legislature and the percentage of time currently spent.

The t-test of significant difference between mean percents was used to test the hypothesis. With 59 degrees of freedom a t-value of 2.00 was needed for significance at the .05 level. Table 3 indicated that the legislative functions value (5.90) exceeded the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

These results suggest that there is a conflict between the amount of time now spent by state directors with their state legislatures and the amount of time they believe they should spend.

#### Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 was: There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state directors believe they should spend with the state's executive branch and the percentage of time presently spent.

The t-test of significant difference between mean percents was used to test the hypothesis. With 56 degrees of freedom, a t-value of 2.00 was needed for significance at the .05 level. Table 3 showed that the administrative functions with state executive branch personnel (.22) did not reach the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

These results suggest that there is no discrepancy between the amount of time state directors spend with the executive branch and the amount of time they believe they should spend.

#### Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 was: There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state directors believe they should spend with federal officials of rehabilitation programs and the percentage of time they presently spend.

The t-test of significant difference between mean percents was used to test the hypothesis. With 57 degrees of freedom, a t-value of 2.00 was needed for significance at the .05 level. Table 3 showed

that the calculated t-value did not reach the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

These results suggest that there was no discrepancy between the amount of time state directors spend with federal officials of rehabilitation and the amount of time they believed they should spend.

#### Hypothesis 7

Hypothesis 7 was: There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state directors spend with agency supervisory and administrative staff on program problems and the percentage of time they believe they should spend.

The t-test of significant difference between mean percents was used to test the hypothesis. With 53 degrees of freedom, a t-value of 2.00 was needed to reach the .05 level of significance. Table 3 showed that the calculated t-value of .01 did not reach the level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

These results suggest that there was no discrepancy between the amount of time that state directors were spending now with their supervisory and administrative staff and should be spending in solving the agency's program problems.

#### Hypothesis 8

Hypothesis 8 was: There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state directors spend with other groups (private, citizen and other public administrative agencies) and the percentage of time they believe they should spend.

The t-test of significant difference between mean percents was used to test the hypothesis. With 59 degrees of freedom, a t-value of 2.00 was needed to reach significance at .05 level. Table 3 indicated that the calculated t-value of 1.54 did not reach or exceed the level of significance at .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

These results indicated that there was no discrepancy between the time now spent by state directors with other groups and the time that should be devoted to them.

#### Hypothesis 9

Hypothesis 9 was: There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators spend in research and development of rehabilitation programs and the percentage of time they believe they should spend.

The t-test of significant difference between mean percents was used to test the hypothesis. With 60 degrees of freedom a t-value of 2.00 was needed to reach significance at .05 level. Table 3 indicated that the calculated t-value of +2.72 exceeded the level of significance at .05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

These results suggest that there was a discrepancy between the time now spent on research and development to functions and the time that should be devoted to this function.



### Trend Analysis

The purpose of this section is to illustrate trends and correlations between the selected factors describing the role concepts and functions of state directors of rehabilitation agencies. This section is divided into two parts. The first part will describe the correlation between data collected from state directors and their respective administrative superiors. Part two compares the difference between the state directors and their administrative superiors as indicated by Sections II, III, and IV of the survey instrument.

### Correlation Factors

The following list represents a report of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between state directors (SD) and their administrative supervisors (AS) on selected variables which were significant at the .05 level:

1. (SD) Age with (SD) Time in Present Position	.4638
2. (SD) Age with (SD) Experience in Rehabilitation	.3882
3. (SD) Present Position with (SD) Experience in Rehabilitation	.5828
4. (SD) Experience in Rehabilitation with (AS) Research & Development - Now	-.3307
5. (SD) Legislative Function - Now with (SD) Legislative Function - Should	.6364
6. (SD) Legislative Function - Now with (AS) Legislative Function - Now	.3052
7. (SD) Legislative Function - Now with (AS) Management Council - Now	.3152
8. (SD) Legislative Function - Now with (AS) Management Council - Should	.3341

9.	(SD) Legislative Function - Should with (AS) Management Council - Should	.3160
10.	(SD) Administrative Function - Now with (SD) Administrative Function - Should	.8941
11.	(SD) Administrative Function - Now with (SD) Federal Function - Now	.3073
12.	(SD) Administrative Function - Now with (SD) Federal Function - Should	.4604
13.	(SD) Administrative Function - Now with (SD) Management Council - Now	.3706
14.	(SD) Administrative Function - Now with (SD) Management Council - Should	.4006
15.	(SD) Administrative Function - Now with (AS) Management Council - Should	.3487
16.	(SD) Administrative Function - Should with (SD) Federal Function - Now	.3611
17.	(SD) Administrative Function - Should with (SD) Federal Function - Should	.3204
18.	(SD) Administrative Function - Should with (SD) Management Council - Now	-.3431
19.	(SD) Administrative Function - Should with (SD) Management Council - Should	-.3551
20.	(SD) Administrative Function - Should with (SD) Other Relationships - Should	-.2815
21.	(SD) Administrative Function - Should with (AS) Management Council - Should	.3567
22.	(SD) Federal Function - Now with (SD) Federal Function - Should	.6342
23.	(SD) Federal Function - Now with (AS) Management Council - Should	.3139
24.	(SD) Research & Development - Now with (SD) Research & Development - Should	.9092
25.	(SD) Research & Development - Now with (AS) Research & Development - Now	.5902

26.	(SD) Research & Development - Now with (AS) Research & Development - Should	.3984
27.	(SD) Research & Development - Should with (AS) Research & Development - Now	.5235
28.	(SD) Research & Development - Should with (AS) Research & Development - Should	.3815
29.	(SD) Management Council - Now with (SD) Management Council - Should	.8792
30.	(SD) Management Council - Should with (AS) Management Council - Now	.3289
31.	(SD) Other Relationships - Now with (SD) Other Relationships - Should	.7988
32.	(SD) Other Relationships - Now with (AS) Legislative Function - Now	.3556
33.	(SD) Other Relationships - Should with (AS) Legislative Function - Now	.3560
34.	(AS) Legislative Function - Now with (AS) Legislative Function - Should	.3722
35.	(AS) Administrative Function - Now with (AS) Administrative Function - Should	.8530
36.	(AS) Federal Function - Now with (AS) Federal Function - Should	.6558
37.	(AS) Federal Function - Should with (AS) Legislative Function - Now	.4142
38.	(AS) Research & Development - Now with (AS) Research & Development - Should	.8405
39.	(AS) Management Council - Now with (AS) Management Council - Should	.7981
40.	(AS) Other Relationships - Now with (AS) Other Relationships - Should	.8196

(The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were reported at the .05 level of significance for 37 and 60 degrees of freedom. The administrative superiors (37 degrees of freedom) needed a correlation coefficient of .3094 to be significant at the .05 level. The matched factors correlated for state directors (60 degrees of freedom) need a coefficient of .2795 for significance at the .05 level. A coefficient of .3578 is significant at the .02 level for 37 degrees of freedom and .3218 is significant at .02 level for 60 degrees of freedom.)

The age of the respondent was significantly correlated with the time the director was in his present position and his experience in rehabilitation. There was a negative correlation between the director's experience in rehabilitation and the time he believed he should currently spend in research and development. Since there was no correlation between experience in rehabilitation and future research and development time, these data suggest that the state director believes less time should be spent in research and program development as his experience increases.

As expected, there were strong correlations between the amount of time now spent and the time believed should be spent in the same function. These results reflect the matching effect of comparing the present with the future in the same functional area.

The data indicated that there was a significant correlation between the time spent by state directors on the present legislative function level and administrative superiors' concept of that same function. There was also a significant correlation between the time the state director presently spends in legislative functions and the time

his administrative supervisor believes he now spends, and believes he should spend, with his management council.

Another significant correlation was reported showing the amount of time spent by the state director with his present and desired management council relationships. The administrative superior's perception of time now spent and what should be spent in management council was correlated with the state director's perception of this same function, now but not correlated with the state director's beliefs about how much time should be spent in this function. The time that should be spent, as reported by administrative superiors, correlated with the state director's time spent in present federal functions, present and desired administrative functions, and present and desired time spent in legislative functions.

#### Comparisons of State Directors and Their Superiors on the Role and Functions of State Directors

The administrative superiors responding to the question of what they believed was the present role of the state director as compared to their preferred role, reported a significant difference between these roles (Table 15). These data suggest that administrative superiors would prefer state directors to take an apolitical role (Model B) rather than a combined political or apolitical role or a strictly political role.

By matching state directors and their administrative superiors and comparing their responses on what the present role of the state director is, Table 16 indicates no significant difference between the

Table 15. Administrative Superiors' Perception of the Present and Preferred Role of State Directors

Role**	Model A		Model B		Model C		Total		Chi Square***
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Present	0	0	24	65.00	13	35.00	37	100	
Preferred	0	0	29	78.40	8	21.60	37	100	6.12*

\*Significant at .05 level - 1 degree of freedom

\*\*Administrative superiors' perception of the state directors' present and preferred role

\*\*\*McNemar test for the significance of changes

Table 16. State Directors (SD) and Their Administrative Superiors' (AS) Perception of the State Directors' Present Role

Role**	Model A		Model B		Model C		Total		Chi Square***
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Present (AS)	0	0	21	65.63	11	34.37	32	100	
Present (SD)	0	0	21	65.63	11	34.37	32	100	.053*

\* 1 degree of freedom

\*\* Administrative superiors' and state directors' perception of the state directors' present role

\*\*\* McNemar test for the significance of changes

two groups. Table 17 suggests that there was no significant difference between the state directors and their administrative superiors on what role each preferred the state director to take. In Table 18 the administrative superiors did not differ from the state director in their perception of the role the agency wanted the state director to take. Sixty-seven percent of the administrative superiors perceived the role the agency wanted the state director to perform as apolitical. Sixty-three percent of the matched state directors reported the apolitical role (Model B) as the agency's preferred role for state director.

The data collected from administrative superiors, in response to the question of what time is spent on administrative functions in the rehabilitation agency, were calculated and presented in Table 19.

As reported, there was a significant difference between the time currently spent in certain functions and the time administrative superiors believed state directors should spend on these functions. Policy planning, program budgeting, procuring funding for agency programs, providing management information, the time spent in administrative adjustments are those functions reported as significantly different.

In comparing the time spent in various functions as reported in Table 2 by state directors and Table 19 by administrative superiors, policy planning and program and budget planning and administrative adjustment were all reported significantly different. Both the administrative superiors and the state directors agreed that more time should be spent in policy planning, program and budget planning and less time in the making of administrative adjustments.



Table 17. Preferred Role State Director (SD) Has Compared with Administrative Superiors (AS)

Role**	Model A		Model B		Model C		Total		Chi Square***
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Preferred (AS)	0	0	26	78.79	7	21.21	33	100	
Preferred (SD)	0	0	24	72.73	9	27.27	33	100	.10*

\* 1 degree of freedom

\*\* Administrative superiors' and state directors' perception of the state directors' preferred role

\*\*\* McNemar test for the significance of changes

Table 18. State Directors (SD) and Their Administrative Superiors' (AS) Perception of the Role the Agency Would Like the State Directors to Take

Role**	Model A		Model B		Model C		Total		Chi Square***
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Agency (AS)	0	0	20	66.67	10	33.33	30	100	
Agency (SD)	0	0	19	63.33	11	36.67	30	100	.00*

\* 1 degree of freedom

\*\* Administrative superiors' and state directors' perception of the role the agency would like the state director to take

\*\*\* McNemar test for the significance of changes

Table 19. Time State Directors Spend on Administrative Functions as Perceived by Administrative Superiors

Function	Now		Rank	Should		Rank	Wilcoxon matched-pairs (z-score)
	N	Mdn**		N	Mdn		
Policy Planning	39	1.92	1	39	1.20	1	3.76*
Program & Budget Planning	39	3.07	2	39	1.76	2	2.81*
Organize Agency Structure	40	3.60	4	40	4.88	5	1.62
Install Agency Procedures & Methods	38	5.80	7	38	5.60	8	1.19
Procure Funding & Administer Finances	39	6.63	8	39	5.36	6	2.51*
Staffing	38	6.80	9	38	7.29	9	1.86
Management Information	39	5.17	6	39	3.58	3	3.32*
Administrative Adjustments	39	3.50	3	39	5.50	7	2.48*
Facilities & Supplies	38	9.08	11	38	9.18	10	.56
Public Relations	39	5.10	5	39	4.63	4	.79
Travel	38	8.67	10	38	9.86	11	1.42

\*Significant at .05 level

\*\*Median determined by ranking functions (1 is most time spent in function)

Table 20 reported the response of state directors matched with administrative superiors from the same state to determine if they perceived the time currently spent on various functions alike. As indicated, there was no significant difference between these matched pairs. The difference between the time now spent on management information as reported by the state director and his superior, did approach significance.

The same comparison was made between the state director and his superior, as they reported what time they believed should be spent on various functions.

Table 21 suggests there was no significant difference in any functions, though, again, management information as reported by the two groups, approached significance.

The administrative superiors who responded to the question of what time should be spent on major functions involving establishing relationships with selected groups reported a significant difference of time spent in the legislative and research and development functions. The reporting administrative superiors indicated that more time should be spent in legislative, research and development functions. Though the management council function is not significant at the .05 level, there is a difference which indicates that administrative superiors would like to see more time spent in management council deliberations (Table 22).

In comparing state directors (Table 3) and administrative superiors (Table 22), both groups reported significant differences between legislative functions and research and development. Both also

Table 20. Rank of Time Spent on Administrative Function Now: Comparison of State Directors and Their Administrative Superiors

Function	State Director		Administrative Superior		Wilcoxon matched-pairs (z-score)
	N	Now Mdn. Rank	N	Now Mdn. Rank	
Policy Planning	30	2.33	30	3.50	.40
Program & Budget Planning	30	3.25	30	3.40	.42
Organize Agency Structure	30	4.40	30	3.67	.24
Install Agency Procedures & Methods	27	4.50	27	5.38	.42
Procure Funding & Administer Finances	30	5.23	30	6.25	1.36
Staffing	28	6.50	28	6.25	.56
Management Information	30	5.00	30	6.00	1.94
Administrative Adjustments	30	4.50	30	3.75	.56
Facilities & Supplies	27	9.08	27	9.28	.35
Public Relations	29	5.25	29	5.17	.18
Travel	29	8.25	29	9.83	1.35

Not significant at .05 level

Table 21. Rank of Time That Should be Spent on Administrative Function: Comparison of State Directors and Their Administrative Superiors

Function	State Director Should		Administrative Superior Should		Wilcoxon matched-pairs (z-score)
	N	Mdn. Rank	N	Mdn. Rank	
Policy Planning	30	1.38	30	1.18	.66
Program & Budget Planning	30	1.80	30	1.80	.29
Organize Agency Structure	30	4.33	30	4.83	.26
Install Agency Procedures & Methods	27	6.25	27	6.38	.13
Procure Funding & Administer Finances	30	4.60	30	5.20	1.01
Staffing	28	6.83	28	7.00	.38
Management Information	30	5.00	30	4.00	1.70
Administrative Adjustments	30	6.33	30	6.00	.51
Facilities & Supplies	27	8.94	27	9.07	1.09
Public Relations	29	4.17	29	4.88	.33
Travel	29	9.50	29	9.90	.76

Not significant at .05 level

Table 22. Percentage of Time Spent by State Directors on Major Functions as Perceived by the Administrative Superior

Functions	Now		Should		t-test** (t-value)
	N	%	N	%	
Legislative Functions	39	7.64	39	9.79	2.03*
Administrative Functions	40	19.20	40	19.03	-.15
Federal Functions	40	9.35	40	9.15	-.23
Research & Development	40	13.25	40	15.48	2.69*
Management Council	40	22.78	40	24.05	1.94
Other Relationships	40	18.88	40	17.43	-1.22

\*Significant at .05 level

\*\*t-test for significant differences between related-sample means

reported that the state director should spend more time in working with the legislature and in research and development activities.

Table 23 reports how much time matched administrative superiors and state directors believe they should spend on major functions. There was no significant difference between these two groups as reported at the .05 level.

Table 24 compares what time the state directors and their superiors believe should be spent on these major functions. There were no significant differences between any of the relationships.

This lack of difference between the state directors and their superiors in any of the three sections (II, III, and IV) suggests that the superior and his state director basically agree on the role and functions which state directors currently perform and those they should perform.

#### Summary

The results of the study were presented in this chapter in three sections. The first section presented the descriptive data of the topical sequence of development in the questionnaire. The second section presented the hypotheses and accompanying discussions. The last section calculated the results of a trend analysis of selected factors as reported by state directors and their administrative superiors.



Table 23. Percentage of Time Spent on Major Functions Now: Comparison of State Directors and Their Administrative Superiors

Function	State Director		Administrative Superior		t-test* (t-value)
	N	%	N	%	
Legislative Functions	30	6.10	30	7.50	-1.35
Administrative Functions	31	18.55	31	15.23	.86
Federal Functions	30	8.13	30	8.23	- .06
Research & Development	36	12.00	36	14.00	-1.13
Management Council	35	19.37	35	21.46	- .74
Other Relationships	35	16.86	35	20.06	.98

Not significant at .05 level

\*t-test for significant differences between related-sample means

Table 24. Percentage of Time That Should be Spent on Major Functions: Comparison of State Directors and Their Administrative Superiors

Function	State Director Should		Administrative Superior Should		t-test* (t-value)
	N	%	N	%	
Legislative Functions	36	9.17	36	9.47	- .25
Administrative Functions	33	18.12	33	16.00	.89
Federal Functions	32	8.38	32	9.00	- .45
Research & Development	35	14.43	35	16.26	- .98
Management Council	35	20.46	35	23.06	-1.20
Other Relationships	34	15.18	34	18.18	-1.10

Not significant at .05 level

\*t-test for significant differences between related-sample means

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the results of the study. The chapter also includes conclusions and implications of the results and recommendations for further research.

#### Summary

In reviewing the literature in the area of counseling and administration, it became evident that many studies have been conducted describing the role concepts and functions of counselors and operating level personnel of a variety of agencies and professions. However, it became equally evident that there was nothing in the literature which measured the role concept and functions of high level administrative personnel. There was literature available which described the characteristics essential for effectiveness as an administrator of an agency, but the literature was qualitatively descriptive and generally consisted of case studies.

#### Purpose

The purpose of this study was to obtain demographic data on directors of state rehabilitation agencies and to describe the role concept and functions of state directors in order to provide a base line of information which would lead to further research in an in-depth

study of selected issues described in this dissertation. To accomplish this objective, the following questions were asked:

1. What is the educational and experiential background of persons currently employed as state rehabilitation administrators?

2. To what extent does the state director's perception of his present role differ from his preferred role?

3. To what extent does the state director's actual role differ from the role his immediate administrative superiors would like him to assume?

4. To what extent does the state director's actual role differ from the role he believes his superiors would like him to assume?

5. How much difference is there between the percentage of time state directors devote to various functions and the percentage of time they feel they should devote to these functions?

6. What factors, external to the job itself, affect the work of the state administrator?

7. How does the state director delegate his responsibility to other administrators in the rehabilitation agency?

8. To what extent do relationships with the federal government, state legislature, and state executive branch affect the role of the administrator?

9. How much difference is there between the percentage of time which administrators devote to researching and developing new programs and services and the percentage of time they feel they should devote to these tasks?

### Design

A questionnaire was developed and mailed to 90 state directors of rehabilitation in the United States and its territories. The questionnaire contained five sections of which sections II, III, and IV were mailed to each state director's administrative superior. Of the questionnaires returned by the state directors, 68 were used to answer the questions posed by the author in this study. The administrative superiors responded with 55 questionnaires, of which 38 were used in the data analysis. The information contained in the questionnaire was used to answer the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference between the state administrator's present perception of his role and the role he would prefer, if he were free to choose.

2. There is no significant difference between the state administrator's present perception of his role and the role which he believes his superior would like him to assume.

3. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time which state administrators now spend on various functions and the percentage of time which they feel they should spend on these functions.

4. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators believe they should spend with the state legislature (legislators) and the percentage of time currently spent.

5. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators believe they should spend with the state's executive branch and the percentage of time presently spent.

6. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators believe they should spend with federal officials of rehabilitation programs and the percentage of time presently spent.

7. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators spend with agency supervisory and administrative staff on program problems and the percentage of time they believe they should spend.

8. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators spend with other groups (private, citizen and other public administrative agencies) and the percentage of time they believe they should spend.

9. There is no significant difference between the percentage of time state administrators spend in research and development of rehabilitation programs and the percentage of time they believe they should spend.

Tully's (1970) dissertation on "Role Concepts and Functions of Rehabilitation Counselors with the Deaf" provided the format for the design of this study.

### Results

In analyzing the data, the typical state director of a rehabilitation agency is 53 years of age and has been employed in his present position five and one-half years. He has been working in the field of rehabilitation over 14 years. The majority of state directors have had

counseling experience, and most state directors believe counseling experience should be a prerequisite to the job.

The typical state director had a master's degree and was not working towards another degree. The director also believed additional training was necessary. The study area most preferred by those who desired more training was administration, with rehabilitation the next desired study area. The least important study area was the social sciences. Most directors belonged to the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation and its parent group, the National Rehabilitation Association. Most states require at least a bachelor's degree. A segment of state directors (23%) indicated that there were no specific requirements for administrative experience while the majority of state directors were expected to have had five years (or more) of experience.

The state directors and their administrative superiors were virtually unanimous in their rejection of Role Model A--the political as compared with the apolitical role or some combination of the political or apolitical role. There was no significant conflict between the state director's present role as compared to the role he preferred to take. However, the administrative superior to the state director differed significantly (.05 level) in the role he preferred his state director to take as compared to his present role. Most administrative superiors preferred that their state directors fill an apolitical role. The state director agreed with his administrative superior on what the director's present role is, his preferred role and the role his agency want him to assume.

The state director performs a variety of administrative functions. The typical director ranks the time he now spends performing his functions in the following order: (1) making administrative adjustments, (2) program budgeting and planning, (3) policy planning, (4) organizing the agency's structure, (5) public relations, (6) spending time in management information, (7) installing agency procedures, (8) procuring funding and administering finances, (9) staffing, (10) travel, and (11) providing facilities and supplies. These same directors indicated that they preferred to spend their time in: (1) policy planning, (2) program budgeting and planning, (3) public relations, and (4) organizing the agency's structure. These directors reported a significant difference (at .05 level) between the time spent on policy planning, program budgeting and planning, installing agency procedures, making administrative adjustments and in travel.

Comparing the state director with his administrative superior in the performance of the director's administrative functions, revealed that the director and his superior both believed significant changes in time should be spent in several of these functions.

The director and his superior both believed that the state director of rehabilitation should spend more time in policy planning, program budgeting and planning. They further agreed that the state director should spend less time in making administrative adjustments. The state director believed he should spend less time in administrative travel and installing the rehabilitation agency's procedure, while the administrative superior did not respond to these functions in the same



way. By contrast, the administrative superiors preferred their state director to spend more time in providing management information and in procuring funding for the agency.

The typical state director believes he should spend more time in developing legislative relationships and in the research and development function of the rehabilitation agency. Their administrative superiors also felt the same about the time the director should spend in legislative relationships and research and development (.05 level of significance).

The analyzed data also revealed that currently 74 percent of the state directors appear before their state legislature as the agency's representative for program and funding. In preparing the rehabilitation agency's budget, the typical director himself, had the most influence on what that budget would report. The governor's budget offices were the second most influential, while the administrative superior was the third most influential. The typical state director meets with directors of other state human resources agencies on program and administrative matters. However, on a monthly or quarterly basis more often than any other period of time.

The topics most discussed (in rank order) with the director's administrative superior were: (1) administrative problems, (2) budgeting matters, (3) program problems, and (4) new programs. In comparison, directors in their discussions with legislative committees talked of: (1) budgeting matters, (2) new programming, (3) program problems, and (4) federal laws and guidelines.

Slightly over half of the state directors meet with an intra-agency management council whom they depend for assistance in making decisions on agency programs and problems. The most important specialized roles of the state rehabilitation administrator was listed in rank order as: (1) administrative planning, (2) program development, (3) policy initiation, and (4) staff direction. The four next important specialized roles of the state director are: (5) securing program support, (6) preparing the rehabilitation agency's budget, (7) securing funds for rehabilitation programs, and (8) establishing a liaison with the legislature. It is interesting to note that the first four specialized roles are internal administrative roles, while the second four are specialized external relationship roles.

Less than half of the states responding had a public relations function designed to mobilize program support, while a majority had a public relations function to disseminate information. The news media received the greatest attention in the state director's attempt to disseminate information and mobilize program support.

The skills most reported by the state director as those needed to function effectively were, first, conceptual, second, human relations, and third, technical skills. The director also believed he should be a generalist as his agency's state administrator.

#### Conclusions and Implications

Assuming that the responding state directors and administrative superiors were representative of the states rehabilitation agencies, the following conclusions have been made:

1. Some state directors function as if they headed completely autonomous agencies without any apparent control exercised by an administrative superior. This was true in states where the agency was under the policy direction of a state board whose prime interests and knowledge are in educational issues (state boards of education), rather than rehabilitation. Other states indicating autonomy were states where the administrative superior was the governor. Implication: Some rehabilitation agency directors believe they are operating independent of the executive hierarchy of administrative superiors.

2. There was a significant trend in the beliefs of the state directors and their administrative superiors that the director's role should be apolitical. Implication: The apparent desire to be more influential with legislative groups and to devote more time to those functions which have impact outside of the agency appears inconsistent to the apolitical role. The desire to be influential with groups external to the agency appears to be an illustration of role conflict.

3. The most important skills needed by state directors are conceptual skills. This conclusion is evidenced by the significant belief the directors held toward spending more time in planning activities. Implication: Potential administrators for these high-level administrative positions should be educated and trained in policy and planning and budgeting and fiscal procedures.

4. The need exists to provide training for state directors of rehabilitation in administrative skills. Implication: More administrative training should be provided to middle and upper level rehabilitation management.

5. State directors and their administrative superiors would prefer to spend less time in performing internal agency administrative functions. Implication: Training programs should emphasize the delegation of authority to subordinate administrative personnel and the training of future directors to spend time in conceptual skills development.

6. The state director and his administrative superior agreed that more time should be spent in research and development. Implication: The rehabilitation agencies should look at the research and development function within their agency to determine whether or not they are utilizing the resources (financial and programmatic), available to upgrade the agencies' programs.

7. The rehabilitation agency director believes he needs to increase the time he spends establishing a liaison with the legislature. Implication: There appears to be a need to establish better relationships for the purpose of more positively affecting those policy makers who determine the extent of the states rehabilitation programs and the level at which services are provided.

8. The state director does not actively attempt to mobilize program support. Implication: Again, there seems to be a conflict between the director's desire to control and expand his agency and his apparent desire to remain apolitical. A reason for this belief may be the casework orientation of the directors and the need to talk of program in casework terms, rather than describing the operational and administrative aspects and needs of rehabilitation agencies to appropriate groups.

9. State directors and their administrative superiors expressed the opinion that more time should be spent in policy planning, program and budget planning. Administrative superiors further felt the director should spend more time in procuring funds for the rehabilitation agency and providing more management information. Implication: State rehabilitation agencies should consider a thorough management study to determine job evaluations and classifications consistent with optimum management practice.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

1. Future research should be directed to an investigation of the complex elements of each function of an administrator's responsibility in order to empirically determine the content of each function which will more accurately define the job of the administrator.

2. Since the state directors and their administrative superiors believed the role of the director should be apolitical and yet the director wanted to perform in the political arena of the executive and legislative branch, further research should be undertaken to investigate this apparent conflict.

3. Further research should consider the relationships of time spent in each administrative function and the effective achievement of rehabilitation agency goals and objectives.

4. Further correlational studies should be conducted. The purpose of such research would be to examine the relationships between the role and functions of the state director and variables external to the agency.

5. A future study should be designed to measure legislative-administrative relationships. Since there was an interest on the part of state directors in forming relationships with state legislators, a study should be designed to examine the most effective behavior and presentation of program information to the legislature.

6. Since the state director wished to remain apolitical, and yet influence the legislature towards a more active and expanded support of rehabilitation programs, a study should be designed to examine the propriety and place, if any, of a public relations (mobilizing program support and information dissemination) function in state vocational rehabilitation programs.

## APPENDIX A

### COVER LETTER TO STATE DIRECTORS

(The University of Arizona Rehabilitation Center Letterhead)

Through the years the Rehabilitation Center of the University of Arizona has maintained an abiding interest in the complex of administrative problems which face State Directors of Rehabilitation programs. Because of the increasing size, complexity and overlapping of Rehabilitation services and programs across the country, we would like to examine and evaluate the role and functions of today's State Director of Rehabilitation. Your participation will make a major and valued contribution to our efforts.

In order to define the role and functions, we are asking all the State Directors of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Visually Impaired to respond to our questionnaire. The questionnaire contains five sections and we would like your response to Sections I-V. We are also intending to send Section II, III, and IV to your immediate administrative superior for his response.

The purpose of defining the role and functions of State Directors in this study is to assist colleges and universities in developing their training and preparation programs for rehabilitation administrative personnel.

We are committed to maintaining the confidentiality of our respondents and will plan to furnish you a copy of our findings when the study is completed.

Your cooperation in this study would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. Gary D. Hulshoff  
Research Coordinator

Dr. David Wayne Smith  
Research Director

Enclosures

P.S. Would you fill out the name, title and address of your immediate administrative superior and drop the enclosed postcard in the mail immediately? Please assure him that all input will be kept in strict confidence.

APPENDIX B

STATE DIRECTORS QUESTIONNAIRE



State Directors Questionnaire

Please return to:

Gary D. Hulshoff  
 Rehabilitation Center  
 College of Education  
 University of Arizona  
 Tucson, Arizona 85721

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

(After receipt of the ques-  
 tionnaire your name will be  
 removed.)

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Role Concepts and Functions of State Administrators  
 of Rehabilitation Agencies

Explanation

All State Directors of Rehabilitation (Vocational Rehabilitation and Rehabilitation of Visually Impaired) and their immediate administrative superiors will be asked to respond to this questionnaire. The State Director's Administrative Superior will only be asked to respond to the administrator's role and function sections (II, III, IV). The questionnaire is divided into the following sections:

Section I

Background information. Every precaution will be taken to treat this information in a professional and confidential manner. Neither your name nor the name of your agency will appear in the written report of this study.

Section II

State Directors role: the objective in this part is to determine how you and your superiors view the role of a state director of a rehabilitation agency.

Sections III & IV

Ranking of amount of time spent on major activities and functions: the objective in this part is to determine in what areas the State Director is spending most of his time and how he believes his time should be spent. Use estimates if you are uncertain.

Section V

Expansion of Sections III and IV: the objective of this section is to determine in greater detail the involvement of State Directors with specific activities.

### Section I - Background Information

Every precaution will be taken to treat this information in a professional and confidential manner. Neither your name nor the agency you represent will appear in the written report of this study.

#### A. General Information

1. Your present job title
  - a. ☐ State Director or Chief or Administrator
  - b. ☐ Other - please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Age (check)
 

a. <input type="checkbox"/> Under 25	d. <input type="checkbox"/> 36-40	g. <input type="checkbox"/> 51-55
b. <input type="checkbox"/> 26-30	e. <input type="checkbox"/> 41-45	h. <input type="checkbox"/> 56-65
c. <input type="checkbox"/> 31-35	f. <input type="checkbox"/> 46-50	
3. How many years have you been employed in your present position?
 

a. <input type="checkbox"/> Under 1 year	d. <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 years	g. <input type="checkbox"/> 11-12 years
b. <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 years	e. <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 years	h. <input type="checkbox"/> 13-14 years
c. <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 years	f. <input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 years	i. <input type="checkbox"/> Over 14 years
4. How many years have you worked in the field of rehabilitation?
 

a. <input type="checkbox"/> Under 1 year	d. <input type="checkbox"/> 5-6 years	g. <input type="checkbox"/> 11-12 years
b. <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 years	e. <input type="checkbox"/> 7-8 years	h. <input type="checkbox"/> 13-14 years
c. <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 years	f. <input type="checkbox"/> 9-10 years	i. <input type="checkbox"/> Over 14 years
5. Please list the previous administrative positions you have held in rehabilitation.
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. \_\_\_\_\_
6. Please list the administrative positions you held prior to your entering the field of rehabilitation.
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. \_\_\_\_\_
7. Have you had previous rehabilitation counseling experience?  
Yes ☐ No ☐
8. If yes,
 

<u>Position</u>	<u>Years/Months in Service</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
9. Do you believe that state directors generally should have had counseling experience in rehabilitation? Yes ☐ No ☐

B. Education

1. Please check the highest degree you now hold and give the year of graduation and your major:

<u>Degree</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Major</u>
a. <u>None</u>	_____	_____
b. <u>AA</u>	_____	_____
c. <u>BA, BS</u>	_____	_____
d. <u>MA, MS</u>	_____	_____
e. <u>EdS</u>	_____	_____
f. <u>EdD, PhD, MD</u>	_____	_____
g. <u>Other</u>	_____	_____

2. Are you now working towards a degree or taking courses?  
a. Yes                      b. No
3. Do you believe you have need for additional training at this time?  
a. Yes                      b. No
4. If yes, please rank the study areas which you believe would be beneficial for a State Director:

	<u>Most</u>	<u>More</u>	<u>Important</u> <u>Average</u>	<u>Less</u>	<u>Not</u>
a. Administrative Courses	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Rehabilitation Courses	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Social Science Courses	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

C. Membership in Professional Organizations: (Check)

1. Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation  
 2. National Rehabilitation Association  
 3. Division of Administration, Supervision - NRA  
 4. National Rehabilitation Counseling Association  
 5. American Rehabilitation Counseling Association  
 6. Council of State Agencies for the Blind  
 7. American Psychological Association  
 8. Other, Please specify. \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- D. What are the average number of hours you spend per week in fulfilling your duties as the State Director? \_\_\_\_\_

- E. What are the State's minimum qualifications for your position as State Director?

1. Work Experience: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
2. Education and Training: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
3. Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

### Section II - Administrator Role

Listed below are several descriptions of role models for State Directors of Rehabilitation. The purpose of this section is to determine how you view your role. In answering the questions below please select the model which most nearly describes your situation.

**Model A:** The State Director's role is primarily political in nature. It also includes the exercise of discretionary power and the making of value choices as a characteristic of Rehabilitation Administrators. Lastly, it is the administrator's responsibility to reflect, as a discretionary power, the desires of the voter through their elected legislature and executive branch personnel.

**Model B:** The State Director's role is primarily apolitical in nature. A description of this role would include values which would reflect a dichotomy between politics and administration and that rehabilitation administration should be based on rationale which is not influenced by "politics". In this role model, the administrator is a neutral career service officer who primarily displays competence, expertise and a rationality which is politically value free.

**Model C:** This model is a combination of A and B above. The State Director places equal emphasis on both the political and apolitical role.

	Check	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>
1. Which of the above roles most nearly describes your present role?		—	—	—
2. Which model most nearly describes the role you would prefer if you were free to choose?		—	—	—
3. Which model most nearly describes the role which you think your superiors would like you to assume?		—	—	—
4. Any comments you wish to make:		_____		
		_____		
		_____		

### Section III - Functions of State Directors

Please rank in order of time spent (with 1 representing most time and 12 representing least time spent) during an average week. In column A, please rank time now spent in these listed activities. In column B, please rank the listed activities by the amount of time which you believe you should spend. (For example: If you spent most of your time on administrative adjustments, then you would give it a rank of 1. If policy planning was the second largest time consumer, it would receive 2 as its rank, etc.)

	<u>A</u> <u>Now</u> <u>Spend</u>	<u>B</u> <u>Should</u> <u>Spend</u>
<u>Policy Planning:</u> includes determining the broad objectives of the agency and setting priorities, deciding the general method of reaching these objectives and establishing time, cost, and quality limits of objectives.	_____	_____
<u>Program and Budget Planning:</u> includes agency activities and priorities for activities, and translating activities into problems by forecasting work volume, determining resources, identifying program limitations, preparing a program work plan, setting schedules and determining costs of programs.	_____	_____
<u>Organize Agency Structure:</u> includes examining agency's work process, developing structure for line and staff processes and activities.	_____	_____
<u>Installation of Agency Procedures and Methods:</u> includes developing routines, procedures and systems for operating, staff and service activities.	_____	_____
<u>Procure Funding and Administer Finances:</u> includes translating programs into budget requirements, developing budgeting requirement of agency operations, estimate revenues and appropriations and make allocations.	_____	_____
<u>Staffing:</u> includes providing by recruitment and training, by job specifications and staffing priorities, the staff for carrying out agency programs.	_____	_____
<u>Management Information:</u> includes evaluating performance of work, standards of cost, quality and production, setting up operational audits and controls and programs, effect management planning, etc., also includes analysis of program operations in relationship with program objectives.	_____	_____
<u>Administrative Adjustments:</u> includes improving program operations and objectives, and procedures through handling of telephone, correspondence, mediating staff conflicts, handling complaints, and other administrative work, etc. It also includes motivating staff and improving communications and initiatives of staff, etc.	_____	_____
<u>Provide Facilities and Supplies:</u> includes establishing, maintaining and using facilities and their supplies and equipment.	_____	_____
<u>Public Relations:</u> includes maintaining external relationships with the state legislature, state executive superiors, federal agency personnel, related agencies, agency clientele and the general public.	_____	_____
<u>Travel:</u> includes all travel on official business of the agencies.	_____	_____
<u>Other:</u>	_____	_____

#### Section IV - Percent of Time Spent on Major Functions

Directions: In column A please estimate, as well as you can, the percentage of time which you now spend during an average week on each of these major administrative functions. In column B, please indicate the percentage of time you believe you should spend. These activities to only include that part of the job which requires meeting with other people.

	<u>A</u> <u>Now Spend</u>	<u>B</u> <u>Should Spend</u>
<u>Legislative Functions:</u> includes formal and informal meetings, hearing, visits and contacts with legislators to discuss programs.	_____%	_____%
<u>Administrative Functions:</u> includes formal and informal meetings and contacts with superiors of rehabilitation in the executive branch.	_____%	_____%
<u>Federal Functions:</u> includes meetings with federal officials who have financial and regulatory power of your agency's programs.	_____%	_____%
<u>Research and Development:</u> includes meeting with agency personnel who under the State Director's guidance develop new programs and assist in upgrading present services.	_____%	_____%
<u>Management Council:</u> includes meetings with your state level administrative personnel to decide on agency problems in programming and services (top administrators of your agency).	_____%	_____%
<u>Other Relationships:</u> includes meeting with private individuals, clients, citizens groups, and special interest groups, etc.	_____%	_____%

Section V - Please Check the Appropriate Answers

1. Do you appear before your state legislature as the agency's state director in regards to program and funding?  
a. ☐ Yes      b. ☐ No
2. If not, what governmental official appears before the state legislature in your behalf?  
Official's Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Department \_\_\_\_\_
3. In preparing your budget, rank those who determine the programs to be developed and financed in your agency (1=most important, 2=less important, etc., rank them equal if you wish).  
a. ☐ State Director      e. ☐ Superiors in your agency  
b. ☐ Federal Law      f. ☐ Legislature  
c. ☐ Governor      g. ☐ Other  
d. ☐ Governor's Budget Office
4. Do you meet with other directors of Human Resources agencies on program and administrative matters in your state?  
a. ☐ Yes      b. ☐ No  
If yes, how often: (check)  
1. Daily \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Quarterly \_\_\_\_\_  
2. Weekly \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Semi-Annually \_\_\_\_\_  
3. Bi-weekly \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Annually \_\_\_\_\_  
4. Monthly \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Other \_\_\_\_\_
5. Do you meet with your administrative superiors on a regular basis?  
a. ☐ Yes      b. ☐ No  
If yes, how often: \_\_\_\_\_  
If no, when: \_\_\_\_\_
6. What topics are usually discussed with administrative superiors and with legislative committees (if you do not appear before the legislature please write D/A for does not apply). Please rank order by time spent, 1=most time, etc.

<u>With Administrative Superiors</u>		<u>With Legislative Committees</u>	
a. Administrative Problems	_____	_____	_____
b. Program Problems	_____	_____	_____
c. Budgeting Matters	_____	_____	_____
d. New Programming	_____	_____	_____
e. Federal laws and Guidelines	_____	_____	_____
f. Reporting, Reviewing & Evaluation Problems	_____	_____	_____
g. Employee & Personnel Problems	_____	_____	_____
h. Other	_____	_____	_____

7. Do you have an intra-agency management (departmental or divisional employees) council whom you depend upon for assistance in making decisions on agency programs and problems?  
a. ☐ Yes                      b. ☐ No
8. How often do you meet with your intra-agency management council?  
\_\_\_\_\_
9. What do you see as your most important role as an administrator?  
Please rank order from 1 to 10, 1-most important.
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| a. <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Planning                                | f. <input type="checkbox"/> State Executive Liaison  |
| b. <input type="checkbox"/> Staff Directing  | g. <input type="checkbox"/> Budget Preparation       |
| c. <input type="checkbox"/> Policy Initiation                                      | h. <input type="checkbox"/> Program Development      |
| d. <input type="checkbox"/> Interpreting Laws & Regulations<br>(Federal and State) | i. <input type="checkbox"/> Securing Program Support |
| e. <input type="checkbox"/> State Legislative Liaison                              | k. <input type="checkbox"/> Assisting Clients        |
|  | l. <input type="checkbox"/> Other                    |
10. Do you have a public relations function within your agency to:  
(i.e., one person or staff)
- |                             |                              |                             |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| a. mobilize program support | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| b. disseminate information  | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
11. If yes or no (a & b) in question 10, does this function include working with: (If position or persons do not exist in your state, please indicate by DNA for does not exist or Y for yes, N for no)
- |   | <u>Mobilize<br/>Program Support</u> | <u>Disseminate<br/>Information</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| a. Legislative Committees               | _____                               | _____                              |
| b. Legislators                          | _____                               | _____                              |
| c. Legislature Council Staff            | _____                               | _____                              |
| d. Legislative Committee Research Staff | _____                               | _____                              |
| e. State Executive Budget Staff         | _____                               | _____                              |
| f. Governor's Office                    | _____                               | _____                              |
| g. Federal Congressmen                  | _____                               | _____                              |
| h. Federal Agency Personnel             | _____                               | _____                              |
| i. Lobby Groups                         | _____                               | _____                              |
| j. Special Interest Groups              | _____                               | _____                              |
| k. Pressure Groups                      | _____                               | _____                              |
| l. News Media                           | _____                               | _____                              |
| m. Business and Industry                | _____                               | _____                              |
| n. Advisory Committees                  | _____                               | _____                              |
| o. Others, specify                      | _____                               | _____                              |
12. Please check what you believe are the skills needed by State Directors (do not hesitate to give equal rank, according to importance).
- |   | <u>Most</u> | <u>More</u> | <u>Important</u> | <u>Less</u> | <u>Not</u> |
|---|-------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|------------|
| a. Conceptual (foreseeing agency needs)   | _____       | _____       | _____            | _____       | _____      |
| b. Technical (knowing how to do each job) | _____       | _____       | _____            | _____       | _____      |
| c. Human Relations                        | _____       | _____       | _____            | _____       | _____      |
13. To best serve as a State Director of Rehabilitation, the Director should be: a. Generalist (one who has organizing & public relations skills) or b. Specialist (one who is well founded in rehabilitation).



APPENDIX C

LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT

(State of Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Letterhead)

Mr. Gary Hulshoff  
The Rehabilitation Center  
College of Education  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, Arizona 85721

Dear Gary:

Your questionnaire has been checked carefully and reviewed with members of my staff who have worked on similar efforts. With the comments given to you in my letter of June 1, 1971, I believe you have a practical document that will be easy to complete in a short time and will produce the results you want.

All State Directors of Vocational Rehabilitation get a rather substantial number of questionnaires to complete, but they don't get many that refer to the role and function of the administrator. For this reason, I think you will find them to be responsive and cooperative in completing the form and returning it to you.

I believe that all of us in the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation would be interested in seeing the results of your study, and we shall appreciate your sharing this with us when you have it completed.

Best wishes for success in your work.

Sincerely yours,

Craig Mills, Director  
Division of Vocational  
Rehabilitation

APPENDIX D

FIRST FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO STATE DIRECTORS

(The University of Arizona Rehabilitation Center Letterhead)

Dear

Recently we mailed you a questionnaire entitled Role Concepts and Functions of State Administrators of Rehabilitation Agencies. As yet we have not received your response.

In order for this study to be valid and meaningful, it is very important that we receive responses from as many State Directors as possible. May we again ask that you complete the questionnaire as soon as possible and return it in the stamped-addressed envelope provided.

As mentioned in our initial communication to you your contribution is vital to future and progressive changes in your special field.

Your cooperation is urgently needed and will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. Gary D. Hulshoff  
Research Coordinator

Dr. David Wayne Smith  
Research Director

APPENDIX E

SECOND FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO STATE DIRECTORS

(The University of Arizona Rehabilitation Center Letterhead)

Recently we sent you a questionnaire entitled Role Concepts and Functions of State Administrators of Rehabilitation Agencies and have not yet received a response.

We are enclosing another questionnaire in case you are not able to locate the previous questionnaire.

Would you complete the questionnaire as soon as possible and return it in the stamped-addressed envelope provided?

We will appreciate your help and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. Gary D. Hulshoff  
Research Coordinator

Dr. David Wayne Smith  
Research Director

Enclosure

P.S. Please be assured that this will not be a perfunctory survey. Instead, with your help, we hope to convert our findings into more meaningful and productive suggestions for you and your associates.

## APPENDIX F

### COVER LETTER TO ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERIORS

(The University of Arizona Rehabilitation Center Letterhead)

Dear

Through the years the Rehabilitation Center of the University of Arizona has maintained an abiding interest in the complex of administrative problems which face State Directors of Rehabilitation programs. Because of the increasing size, complexity and overlapping of Rehabilitation services and programs across the country, we would like to examine and evaluate the role and functions of today's State Director of Rehabilitation. Your participation will make a major and valued contribution to our efforts.

In order to define the role and functions, we are asking all the State Directors of Vocational Rehabilitation and Rehabilitation for the Visually Impaired to respond to our questionnaire.

As the immediate administrative superior to the State Directors, we would like you to respond to the questionnaire by what you think the State Director's role and functions are now and what you believe they should be. Indeed your input will contribute to a future "sense of direction."

Sections I and IV are not included with your questionnaire because these two sections are specific to the State Director's personal background and experience.

The purpose of defining the role and functions of State Directors in this study is to assist colleges and universities in developing their training and preparation programs for rehabilitation administrative personnel.

We are committed to maintaining the confidentiality of our respondents and will plan to furnish you a copy of our findings when the study is completed.

Your cooperation in this study would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. Gary D. Hulshoff  
Research Coordinator

Dr. David Wayne Smith  
Research Director

Enclosure

APPENDIX G

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERIORS QUESTIONNAIRE

Administrative Superiors Questionnaire

Please return to:

Gary D. Mulshoff  
Rehabilitation Center  
College of Education  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, Arizona 85721

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

(After receipt of questionnaire  
your name will be removed.)

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Role Concepts and Functions of State Administrators  
of Rehabilitation Agencies.

Explanation

All State Directors of Rehabilitation (Vocational Rehabilitation and Rehabilitation of Visually Impaired) and their immediate administrative superiors will be asked to respond to this questionnaire. The State Director's questionnaire includes two other sections (I and V). These sections are related to the Director's background and some specifics related to those asked in Sections II, III, and IV, but in greater detail. This questionnaire is divided into the following sections:

Section II

State Directors role: The objective in this part is to determine how you view the role of a state director of a rehabilitation agency.

Sections III and IV

Ranking of amount of time spent on major activities and functions: The objective in this part is to determine in what areas the State Director is spending most of his time and how you believe his time should be spent. Use estimates if you are uncertain.

### Section II - Administrator Role

Listed below are several descriptions of role models for State Directors of Rehabilitation. The purpose of this section is to determine how you view the state director's role. In answering the questions below please select the model which most nearly described your situation.

- Model A: The State Director's role is primarily political in nature. It also includes the exercise of discretionary power and the making of value choices is a characteristic of Rehabilitation Administrators. Lastly, it is the administrator's responsibility to reflect, as a discretionary power, the desires of the voter through their elected legislature and executive branch personnel.
- Model B: The State Director's role is primarily apolitical in nature. A description of this role would include values which would reflect a dichotomy between politics and administration and that rehabilitation administration should be based on rationale which is not influenced by "politics". In this role model, the administrator is a neutral career service officer who primarily displays competence, expertise and a rationality which is politically value free.
- Model C: This model is a combination of A and B above. The State Director places equal emphasis on both the political and apolitical role.

	Check	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>
1. Which of the above roles most nearly describes your present role?		---	---	---
2. Which model most nearly describes the role you would prefer if you were free to choose?		---	---	---
3. Which model most nearly describes the role which you think your superiors would like you to assume?		---	---	---
4. Any comments you wish to make:				

### Section III - Functions of State Directors

Please rank in order of time spent (with 1 representing most time and 12 representing least time spent) during an average week. In column A, please rank the now spent in these listed activities. In column B, please rank the listed activities by the amount of time which you believe should be spent. (For example: If the director spent most of his time on administrative adjustments, then you would give it a rank of 1. If policy planning was second largest time consumer, it would receive 2 as its rank, etc.)

	<u>A</u> <u>Now</u> <u>Spend</u>	<u>B</u> <u>Should</u> <u>Spend</u>
<u>Policy Planning:</u> includes determining the broad objectives of the agency and setting priorities, deciding the general method of reaching these objectives and establishing time, cost, and quality limits of objectives.	_____	_____
<u>Program and Budget Planning:</u> includes agency activities and priorities for activities, and translating activities into problems by forecasting work volume, determining resources, identifying program limitations, preparing a program work plan, setting schedules and determining costs of programs.	_____	_____
<u>Organize Agency Structure:</u> includes examining agency's work process, developing structure for line and staff processes and activities.	_____	_____
<u>Installation of Agency Procedures and Methods:</u> includes developing routines, procedures and systems for operating, staff and service activities.	_____	_____
<u>Procure Funds and Administer Finances:</u> includes translating programs into budget requirements, developing budgeting requirement of agency operations, estimate revenues and appropriations and make allocations.	_____	_____
<u>Staffing:</u> includes providing by recruitment and training, by job specifications and staffing priorities, the staff for carrying out agency programs.	_____	_____
<u>Management Information:</u> includes evaluating performance of work, standards of cost, quality and production, setting up operational audits and controls and programs, effect management planning, etc., also includes analysis of program operations in relationship with program objectives.	_____	_____
<u>Administrative Adjustments:</u> includes improving program operations and objectives, and procedures through handling of telephone, correspondence, mediating staff conflicts, handling complaints, and other administrative work, etc. It also includes motivating staff and improving communications and initiatives of staff, etc.	_____	_____
<u>Provide Facilities and Supplies:</u> includes establishing, maintaining and using facilities and their supplies and equipment.	_____	_____
<u>Public Relations:</u> includes maintaining external relationships with the state legislature, state executive superiors, federal agency personnel, related agencies, agency clientele and the general public.	_____	_____
<u>Travel:</u> includes all travel on official business of the agencies.	_____	_____
<u>Other:</u>	_____	_____



#### Section IV - Percent of Time Spent on Major Functions

Directions: In column A please estimate, as well as you can, the percentage of time which the director now spends during an average week on each of these major administrative functions. In column B, please indicate the percentage of time you believe he should spend. These activities to only include that part of the job which requires meeting with other people.

	<u>A</u> <u>Now Spend</u>	<u>B</u> <u>Should Spend</u>
<u>Legislative Functions:</u> includes formal and informal meetings, hearing, visits and contacts with legislators to discuss programs.	_____%	_____%
<u>Administrative Functions:</u> includes formal and informal meetings and contacts with superiors of rehabilitation in the executive branch.	_____%	_____%
<u>Federal Functions:</u> includes meetings with federal officials who have financial and regulatory power of your agency's programs.	_____%	_____%
<u>Research and Development:</u> includes meeting with agency personnel who under the State Director's guidance develop new programs and assist in upgrading present services.	_____%	_____%
<u>Management Council:</u> includes meetings with your state level administrative personnel to decide on agency problems in programming and services (top administrators of your agency).	_____%	_____%
<u>Other Relationships:</u> includes meeting with private individuals, clients, citizens groups, and special interest groups, etc.	_____%	_____%

APPENDIX H

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERIORS

(The University of Arizona Rehabilitation Center Letterhead)

Dear

Recently we sent you a questionnaire entitled Role Concepts and Functions of State Administrators of Rehabilitation Agencies and have not yet received a response.

We are enclosing another questionnaire in case you are not able to locate the previous questionnaire.

Would you complete the questionnaire as soon as possible and return it in the stamped-addressed envelope provided?

We will appreciate your help and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. Gary D. Hulshoff  
Research Coordinator

Dr. David Wayne Smith  
Research Director

Enclosure

P.S. Please be assured that this will not be a perfunctory survey. Instead, with your help, we hope to convert our findings into more meaningful and productive suggestions for you and your associates.

## APPENDIX I

### FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO UNNAMED ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERIORS

(The University of Arizona Rehabilitation Center Letterhead)

Recently we sent you a letter and questionnaire to have the Administrative Superior to the State Director of Vocational Rehabilitation or of the Blind fill out. Unfortunately, we do not know the name of the immediate superior to the State Director. Consequently, the questionnaire, in some instances, has been forwarded to the State Director. This defeats our purpose as the State Directors have already filled out a questionnaire.

If the enclosed questionnaire could be filled out by the State Director's administrative superior, we could then evaluate the State Director's role and functions from the point of view of the State Director and his administrative superior.

Please forgive us for this confusion and thank you in advance for your help in this matter.

Sincerely,

Gary D. Hulshoff  
Research Coordinator

Dr. David Wayne Smith  
Research Director

APPENDIX J

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON STATE DIRECTORS  
OF REHABILITATION AGENCIES

Table 25. Age of State Directors

Age	N	%
Under 25	0	0
26-30	0	0
31-35	3	4
36-40	5	7
41-45	11	16
46-50	9	13
51-55	12	18
56-65	27	40
Over 65	1	1
No response	0	0
Total	68	99

Mean Age - 51.9

Median Age - 53

Table 26. Experience as State Director

Length of Time	N	%
Under 1 year	3	5
1 - 2	12	18
3 - 4	15	23
5 - 6	6	9
7 - 8	10	15
9 - 10	5	8
11 - 12	4	6
13 - 14	1	2
Over 14	15	23
No response	0	0
Total	67	

Median length of experience - 5.58

Table 27. Years State Directors Have Worked in Field of Rehabilitation

Years	N	%
Under 1	1	2
1 - 2	5	8
3 - 4	2	3
5 - 6	2	3
7 - 8	3	5
9 - 10	4	6
11 - 12	6	9
13 - 14	4	6
Over 14	39	59
No response	1	2
Total	66	

Median years - 14.4

Table 28. Highest Degree Held

Degree	N	%
None	1	1
AA	1	1
BA, BS	17	24
MA, MS	40	56
EdS	2	3
EdD, PhD, MD	7	10
Other	4	6
No response	0	0
Total	72	101



Table 29. Courses State Directors Preferred for Further Training

Courses	<u>Most</u>		<u>More</u>		<u>Importance</u> <u>Average</u>		<u>Less</u>		<u>Not</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Administration	34	82.92	6	14.63	0	0	0	0	1	2.44	41	99.99
Rehabilitation	5	13.51	12	32.43	15	40.54	2	5.41	3	8.11	37	100.00
Social Science	1	2.94	9	26.45	12	35.29	9	26.45	3	8.32	34	99.95

Table 30. Membership in Professional Organizations

Organization	N	Total	
		N	p
Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation	63	68	93
National Rehabilitation Association	65	68	96
Division of Adm. Supervision - NRS	18	68	26
Nat. Reh. Couns. Assoc.	26	68	38
American Reh. Couns. Assoc.	5	68	7
Council of State Agencies for the Blind	24	68	35
American Psych. Assoc.	6	68	9
Others	29	68	43

Table 31. State Minimum Educational Qualification for Position  
as State Director

Category	N	%
No Specific Qualifications	14	21
Bachelor's Degree	18	26
Master's Degree	30	44
No Response	6	9
Total	68	100

Table 32. State Minimum Administrative Experience to Qualify  
for Position as State Director

Required Administrative Experience (in years)	State Minimum Requirements	
	N	%
Unspecified	19	28
2	1	1
3	1	1
4	5	7
5	13	19
6	6	9
7	2	3
8	5	7
9	0	0
10	8	12
10+	1	1
No response	<u>9</u>	<u>13</u>
Total	68	101

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Appleby, P. Making sense out of things in general. In O'Donnell, M. (Ed.) Readings in public administration. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1968.
- Barnard, C. I. The functions of the executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Barnard, C. I. Organization and management. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948.
- Biddle, B. J., and Thomas, E. J. (Eds.) Role theory, concepts and research. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Blalock, H. M., Jr. Social statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1960.
- Blau, P. M., and Schoenherr, R. A. The structure of organizations. New York: Basic Books, 1971.
- Blau, P. M., and Scott, W. R. Formal organizations: A comparative approach. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.
- Bleeker, R. W. A history of vocational rehabilitation in Arizona to 1960. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1971.
- Campbell, R. F. Implications for the practice of administration. In D. E. Griffiths (Ed.), Behavioral science and educational administration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Carlson, R. O. Executive succession and organizational change: Placebound and careerbound superintendent of schools. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1962.
- Committee for Economic Development, Modernizing state government. New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1967.
- Copeland, W. C. Financing rehabilitation services. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959.
- Dalton, M. Men who manage: Fusions of feeling and theory in administration. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.

- Dishart, M. Patterns of rehabilitation services provided by the 50 state vocational rehabilitation agencies of the United States. Washington, D.C.: National Rehabilitation Association, 1964.
- Downs, A. Inside bureaucracy. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1967.
- Dumas, N. S. (Ed.) Management and personal abstracts. Gainesville, Fla.: University of Florida, 1968.
- Fayol, H. General and industrial management (translated by Constance Storrs). London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, 1949.
- Festinger, L, and Katz, D. Research methods in the behavioral sciences. New York: The Dryden Press, 1953.
- Flippo, E. B. Management: A behavioral approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1966.
- Gawthrop, L. C. Bureaucratic behavior in the executive branch: An analysis of organizational change. New York: The Free Press, 1959.
- Gladjen, E. W. The essentials of public administration. (3rd ed.) London: Staples Press Limited, 1964.
- Golembiewski, R. T. Civil service and managing work: Some unintended consequences. In M. E. O'Donnell (Ed.) Readings in public administration. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1966.
- Goode, W. J. Norm commitment and conformity to role-status obligations, American Journal of Sociology, No. 66, 1960, pp. 246-258.
- Gore, W. J. Decision-making research: Some prospects and limitations. In S. Maillach and E. H. Van Ness (Eds.) Concepts and issues in administrative behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.
- Graduate Program in Health and Hospital Administration, University of Florida. Teaching grant and traineeships in rehabilitation facility administration: Grant Number 314-T-70. Gainesville, Florida, Author, 1964.
- Griffiths, D. E. The nature and meaning of theory. (Ed.) Behavioral science and educational administration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Gross, B. M. The managing of organizations: The administrative struggle. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1964.

- Gross, B. M. The scientific approach to administration. In D. E. Griffiths (Ed.) Behavioral science and educational administration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Gross, B. M. Organizations and their managing. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- Gross, N., Mason, W. S., and McEachern, A. W. Explorations in role analysis: Studies of the school superintendents role. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956.
- Gross, N., McEachern, A. W., and Mason, W. S. Role conflict and its resolution. In E. E. Macoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. C. Hartley (Eds.) Readings in social psychology, 3rd ed. New York: Holt, 1958.
- Gulick, L. (Ed.) Papers on the science of administration, 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University, 1947.
- Gulick, L. Administrative reflection on World War II. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1948.
- Gulick, L., and Urwick, L. (Eds.) Papers on the science of administration. New York: Columbia University, 1937.
- Halpin, A. W. Theory and research in administration. New York: MacMillan, 1966.
- Hemphill, J. K., Griffiths, D. E., and Frederikson, N. Administrative performance and personality. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.
- Illinois State Plan. State plan: Division of vocational rehabilitation. Springfield, Ill.: 1966.
- Katz, R. L. Skills of an effective administrator. Harvard Business Review, 1958, 33 (1), 33-42.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.
- Koontz, H. (Ed.) Toward a unified theory of management: A symposium. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- Landau, M. S. The concept of decision making in the field of public administration. In S. Mallick and E. Van Ness (Eds.) Concepts and issues in administrative behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.

- Landis, J. M. The future of regulatory agencies. In M. E. O'Donnell (Ed.) Readings in public administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966.
- Lesowitz, N. Statistical history: Federal-state program of vocational rehabilitation, 1920-1970. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Lipham, J. M. Leadership and administration. In D. E. Griffiths (Ed.) Behavioral science and educational administration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Lonsdale, R. C. Maintaining the organization in dynamic equilibrium. In D. E. Griffiths (Ed.) Behavioral science and educational administration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Massey, R. J. Program packages and the program budget in the Department of Defense. In M. E. O'Donnell (Ed.) Readings in public administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Mailick, S., and Van Ness, E. (Eds.) Concepts and issues in administration. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.
- Margolin, R. J., and Sostek, A. B. Professional development and training in rehabilitation administration and supervision, Journal of rehabilitation. Washington, D. C., May-June, 1968.
- McGowan, J. F., and Porter, T. L. (Eds.) An introduction to vocational rehabilitation. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.
- Meeker, A. House task force on welfare, 1971: Report to the fifty-sixth legislative assembly. Oregon: Oregon Legislature, 1971.
- National Citizens Advisory Committee on Vocational Rehabilitation. A Report to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968.
- National Rehabilitation Association. State agency exchange. Washington, D. C.: Rehabilitation Interagency Focus, Feb. 1971.
- Northeastern University. Announcement: Master's degree in rehabilitation or rehabilitation research. Boston: 1971.
- Northeastern University. Catalog: Graduate school of education, 1971-1972. Boston: 1971.
- Obermann, C. E. A history of vocational rehabilitation in America. (4th ed.) Minneapolis: T. S. Demson and Co., 1967.



- O'Donnell, M. E. (Ed.) New dimensions in employee-management relations in the federal civil service. Readings in public administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Parten, M. Survey, polls and samples: Practical procedures. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Pfiffner, J. M., and Presthus, R. Public administration, 5th ed. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1967.
- Popham, W. J. Educational statistics: Use and interpretation. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Presthus, R. V. Authority in organizations. In S. Mailick and E. H. Van Ness (Eds.) Concepts and issues in administrative behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1962.
- Presthus, R. The organizational society: An analysis and a theory. New York: Vintage Books, Inc., 1965.
- Price, D. K. Excellence and leadership in a democracy. Daedalus, 1961, 90 (4), 750-763.
- Ransome, C. B., Jr. The office of governor in the United States. University of Alabama, University of Alabama Press, 1956.
- Rehabilitation Services Administration. Quarterly manpower reports. Washington, D. C.: 1968.
- Rehabilitation Services Administration. Quarterly manpower reports. Washington, D. C.: 1969.
- Rehabilitation Services Administration. Quarterly manpower reports. Washington, D. C.: 1970.
- Sarbin, T. Role enactment. In Handbook of social psychology, Volume 1. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954.
- Sayre, W. S. Premises of public administration: Past and emerging. Public Administration Review, 1958, 18 (2), 102-105.
- Sharkansky, I. Public administration: Policy-making in government agencies. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1970.
- Siegel, S. Non-parametric statistics, for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Simon, H. A. Administrative behavior. New York: Macmillan, 1947.
- Simon, H. A. Administrative behavior, 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1957a.

- Simon, H. A. Models of man. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1957.
- Simon, H. A. The decision maker as innovator. In S. Maillick and Van Ness (Eds.) Concepts and issues in administrative behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.
- Simon, H. A. Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making process in administration organization, 2nd ed. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- Simon, H. A., Smithburg, D., and Thompson, V. Public administration. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950.
- Staats, E. M. Relationship of budget planning to long-range planning. Federal Accountant, 1962, March, 27-35.
- Stone, D. C. Organizing schools and institutes of administration. Washington, D. C.: Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh, Agency for International Development, 1969.
- Switzer, M. E. in United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Rehabilitation Services Administration, 50th anniversary of vocational rehabilitation in the USA. 1920 - 1970. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Tate, M. W. Statistics in education and psychology: A first course. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963.
- Taylor, E. K., Hawkins, E., and Tebow, H. P. Administrative approach to staff development in public welfare agencies. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Taylor, F. The principles of scientific management, Scientific management. New York: Harper and Bros., 1947.
- Thomas, E. J. Role conceptions, organizational size and community context, American Sociological Review, No. 24, 1959, 30-37.
- Thompson, V. A. Hierarchy, specialization and organizational conflict. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1961, March, 485-492; 495-500; 502-505; 507-508; 511-515; 517-519.
- Thompson, V. A. Modern organizations. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- Tully, N. L. Role concepts and functions of rehabilitation counseling with the deaf. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1970. No. 71-67).

- United States Congress. United States code: Vocational rehabilitation act. Session II, Chap. 107. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1918.
- United States Congress. United States code: Vocational rehabilitation act. Session II, Chap. 219. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1920.
- United States Congress. United States code: Part 4, Section 531, Vocational rehabilitation. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1935.
- United States Congress. United States code: Public Law 113, The vocational rehabilitation act amendments of 1943. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1943.
- United States Congress. United States code: Public Law 565, The vocational rehabilitation act amendments of 1954. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1954.
- United States Congress. United States code: Public Law 89-333, The vocational rehabilitation act amendments of 1965. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1965.
- United States Congress. United States code: Public Law 90-99, The vocational rehabilitation act amendments of 1967. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.
- United States Congress. United States code: Public Law 90-391, The vocational rehabilitation amendments of 1968. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968.
- United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. Regulations governing the programs administered by the vocational rehabilitation administration. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968.
- United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Services, Rehabilitation Services Administration. 50 years of vocational rehabilitation in the USA. 1920 - 1970; (Conference proceedings) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970a.
- United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Rehabilitation Services Administration. 50th anniversary of vocational rehabilitation in the USA. 1920 - 1970. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970b.

- University of Arizona. The University of Arizona--biennial catalogue: 1971-1972, 1972-1973. Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Record, 1971.
- University of Florida. Rehabilitation services administration traineeships. Gainesville, Florida: 1971.
- University of Oklahoma. RSA management training: 1969-1973. Norman, Oklahoma: 1969.
- Van Dalen, D. B. Understanding educational research: An introduction. (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Waldo, Dwight. The administrative state: A study of the political theory of American public administration. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948.
- Walker, H. M., and Lev, J. Statistical inference. New York: Henry Holt, 1953.
- Wallis, W. A., and Roberts, H. V. Statistics: A new approach. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.
- Wildavsky, A. The politics of the budgetary process. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964.
- Wise, J. E., Nordberg, R. B., and Reitz, D. J. Methods of research in education. Boston: Heath, 1967.