This paper examines the relationship among professionalism, commitment to organization, and attitudes toward increasing client power in the Training Teacher Trainers (TTT) program at the City University of New York (CUNY). The project consisted of a central TTT office; three programs located at City, Hunter, and Richmond Colleges; and 16 schools located in Harlem and Richmond. Of the 849 persons involved in CUNY-TTT who received questionnaires, only 300 returned them with a usable yield of 242 instruments. The sample included project directors and their staffs, public school administrators and teachers, college faculty, student teachers, and community participants. Professionalism was measured by nine items on level of professional activity and support for professional training. Nine items measured respondents' commitment to the organization, and six Likert scale items measured perceived community participation in decision making. It should be noted that decisional equity, one of the major goals of CUNY-TTT, was not realized. Results of the study show that (a) there is no consistent relationship between professionalism and commitment to work; (b) professionals tend to support increased power for the community within existing hierarchical constraints; and (c) professionalism in CUNY-TTT was in effect neutralized as a factor that contributed to the success or failure of the program. (HUD)
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In complex and rapidly changing industrial societies, organizations are the major means for achieving man's goals. Under such conditions, the problem of organizational change is as important as it is inevitable. Of the numerous models for organizational change (Hage and Aiken, 1970; Corwin, 1973; Zaltman, et al., 1973; Styskal, 1974; Jones, 1969; Mosher, 1967; Bennis, 1966; Bennis, 1970), perhaps the most sweeping proposal is to create new, special purpose, often temporary organizations rather than attempt to extensively change existing organizations. The claim is that in existing organizations, vested interests and bureaucratic inertia reduce change to relatively minor, remedial adjustments and drive out planning. If all the resources of an organization are employed in carrying on existing programs, the process of initiating new programs will be slow and halting. Thus, the creation of a new organization is the only way to secure innovation that is free of tradition and precedent (March and Simon, 1958:185-187; Downs, 1967:160-162).

Establishing a new organization, developing a new bureau, or organizing a "project team" free of the normal constraints of the parent organization are especially favorable objectives when the task is complex and its parameters are unknown or partially known; it calls for novel research or operations; it requires many resources; and when it must be accomplished within a relatively short time (Downs, 1967:160). Examples of such special purpose, innovative organizations are the Manhattan Project, the Lockheed "Skunk Works," and NASA. In addition to the heavily research oriented type of organizations are the newly created federally funded public service organizations and demonstration projects such as Urban Renewal, juvenile delinquency demonstration projects, Community Action and
Modal Cities Programs, the Teacher Corps, and the Triple T Program. While both types of special purpose organizations reward innovative solutions, place importance on teamwork and operate under reduced, if not totally eliminated hierarchical controls, there are marked differences between them. At Lockheed's "Skunk Works," a highly productive organization, scientists and technologists worked in relative secrecy with reduced reporting controls and only the parent organization as the "client." For Lockheed and other research organizations similar to it, professional autonomy was vital for achieving technological innovations (Downs, 1967). The opposite was true for many of the federally sponsored community service organizations of the 1960's and 70's, where the state mediated the professional-client relationship in order to guarantee services to consumers. Such programs explicitly denied that freeing expertise from controls was conducive to innovative change. Rather, the traditional autonomy and insulation of professionals were considered inappropriate or even negative factors for innovation (Leadership and Training Institute, 1972). These programs frequently mandated the broad participation of clients in the development and initiation of new projects and required periodic evaluations to determine if these and other job-related strictrures were carried out. For some programs this meant that "key components" of the profession were to be altered, including "the type of new members recruited, the authority structure, the status and role system, knowledge content, ideologies and philosophies, socialization practices, and relationships among the profession ...." (Corwin, 1973:20). For other programs, the effect of state intervention was less severe; this was the situation in some Community Action Programs where direct grants-in-aid to consumers were administered by the occupation itself (Greenstone and Peterson, 1968). Where this is the case, the effect of intervention may be to support existing institutions of professionalism for some time at least (Johnson, 1972:77).

The competing philosophies of a NASA and a Model Cities Program with respect to professional autonomy are obviously related to the different objects of change — creation of a moon rocket on the one hand and better living conditions for low income Americans on the other. The knowledge required for the former goal is highly specialized,
the product of known laws and principals, and limited to a relatively few specialists while the knowledge needed for achieving the latter goal is tentative, speculative, controversial, and more readily subject to public discourse and censure. These differences in the esoteric nature of the "knowledge base" alone, imply that the professional educator, for example, has a less autonomous relationship to his client than does the Los Alamos scientist. Such differences also provide the rationale for reducing even further the public service professionals' power over policy decisions in those problem areas where it is decided by administrators, politicians, or other professionals that "no one alone" has the expertise needed to deal effectively with such decisions (Smalley, 1973:145).

The public service professional is confronted with conflicting pressures stemming from the relationship between occupational authority on the one hand, and consumer choice on the other (Johnson, 1972:59). These pressures are intensifying. How the professional responds to them is an important question for undoubtedly their response will affect the type and extent of services that are provided as well as the future role of professionalism in an increasingly government-regulated society.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the relationship between professionalism, commitment to organization, and attitudes toward increasing the power of clients in CUNY-TTT. CUNY-TTT was a temporary, special purpose, federally sponsored educational organization whose main goals were to develop innovative teaching and teacher training techniques that would be generalizable to existing educational institutions and to change the system of teacher training a schooling itself by providing for the "continual participation" of both professionals and "clients" in the design and implementation of teacher education programs. CUNY-TTT brought together a coalition of institutions including the university, the public schools, and the communities they served. From this four "parity" groups emerged: education and liberal arts professors, public school teachers, student teachers, and community participants. Although there was some ambiguity about the mechanics of participation, student teachers and members of parent associations and other interested members of the
community were to have "decisional equity" with other groups in the initiation of technological change and in the direct reexamination of current personnel recruitment, selection, training, and placement procedures. As Smalley describes it, TTT was to be a "venture in educational pluralism" that would change the relationships of "producers" and "consumers" in the educational enterprise (Smalley, 1973:146).

There are at least two theories about how a professional should or would respond to a situation where his self-directing code of ethics conflicted with the more egalitarian standards of an organization. In the first theory, expertise and professionalism are equated with a flexible, creative, and equalitarian way of organizing work (Freidson, 1970:74). A major dimension of professionalism is thought to be the service or collectivity orientation (Goode, 1960:913). The professional is seen as adhering to an ideal in which "... there is devotion to the clients' interests more than to personal or commercial profit." "The service ideal impels men to seek new knowledge continually in order to serve the clients' interests more adequately." (Hage and Aiken, 1970:33). Accepting this view, one would anticipate that the professional in CUNY-TTT would be, on the whole, committed to the organization and would accept therefore, changes in the traditional professional-client relationship as being in the best interests of his client even if this meant a reduction in his power. Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume that the professional might conclude that participating in and supporting such innovative change could measurably enhance his status within the profession.

In contrast to this self-denying, change-supporting model of the professional is the self-serving theory of professionalism. Professionalism is viewed primarily as a means of occupational control rather than an expression of the inherent nature of particular occupations (Johnson, 1972:45). Therefore, the power of self-regulation is considered to be the major single dimension of professionalism. Professionals are thought to view the participation of clients as unnecessary and unwarranted. As Johnson states, "In all service-related matters the occupational community is believed to
be wiser than the layman. From such beliefs the occupational community derives an ethical sense of full responsibility. No group is more morally outraged when laymen put forward opinions on occupationally related matters" (Johnson, 1972:56-57). In line with this second hypothesis the professional in CUNY-TT conceivably would register a relatively low degree of commitment to the organization and would tend to regard increases in client participation as threatening to both his professional autonomy and his power in the organization. While participating in the Program the professional could be expected to resist wholesale encroachments on his power even while offering positive contributions to technological change.

These interpretations of the reaction of professionals to organizational change that may substantially effect their power suggest an interrelationship between professionalism, commitment, and attitudes toward change in the power relations in CUNY-TTT similar to that portrayed in Diagram I. Professionalism is related to organizational commitment which in turn is related to specific changes in power resulting in more decisional equity for all participating groups. The plus and minus signs indicate the direction of the relationship.

**DIAGRAM I**

Professionalism  Commitment  Change

The null hypothesis is that professionalism and commitment and/or professionalism and attitudes toward changes in power are not related. A competing hypothesis therefore might be similar to the one pictured in Diagram II.

**DIAGRAM II**

Professionalism  Change

Commitment
In Diagram II, professionalism and commitment are unrelated, but they are separately related to attitudes toward changes in intra-organizational power.

Before proceeding to the analysis one point should be made. CUNT-TTT was a temporary organization, most of whose members were engaged in working for it part time. Since many of the highly skilled -- measured in years of training -- had full time jobs elsewhere, it could be argued that in such a setting as CUNY-TTT professionals could afford to overlook or disregard professional norms. However, the literature in professionalism is almost unanimous in defining professionalism as a set of universal norms that are related to expertise and its application, not to the setting in which it is applied. Thus, as long as there are substantial variations in the distribution of professionalism among CUNY-TTT members, their length of service in the organization should neither reinforce nor detract from the validity of either of the two hypotheses above.

The Sample

The CUNY-TTT Program consisted of the TTT Central Office -- an umbrella group that served as an administrative and fiscal coordinator -- and three projects located at City, Hunter, and Richmond Colleges that worked directly with school teachers in sixteen West Harlem, East Harlem, and Richmond elementary schools. Individuals were self-selected and appointed to their positions in CUNY-TTT. Altogether, 879 persons were involved in the Program when, after four years of operation, it ended in June, 1973.

Mail-back questionnaires consisting mostly of forced-choice items were mailed or given to every member of CUNY-TTT in the Spring of 1973. After repeated follow-ups, 300 questionnaires or 34 percent were returned. Subtracting the CUNY-TTT Advisory Board members who were infrequent participants in the Program and those questionnaires that were less than one-half completed, 242 usable instruments remained.

The major groups sampled were the project directors and their staffs (including the Central Office Director and his staff, N=21;
58 percent return), public school administrators (N=21; 40 percent return), public school teachers (N=68; 34 percent return), college faculty -- education and liberal arts (N=30; 39 percent return), college student teachers (N=84; 22 percent return), and community participants (N=18; 26 percent return).

The Variables

A. Professionalism: The two dimensions most frequently distinguished in attempts to measure professionalism are structural characteristics such as formal education and entrance requirements, and attitudinal characteristics. Neither kind of measurement alone is wholly satisfactory: structural factors do not effectively measure variations within occupations and attitudinal measures often suffer from problems of reliability (Palumbo and Styskal, 1974). For this study, two measures of professionalism have been used. The first measure is participation in professional activities. This is an indirect measure of the "sense of calling" to the profession (Ibid). Five items were used to tap the number of professional organizations the respondent belonged to, how often the person attended meetings, what offices he held, and stated attempts to keep informed of the latest professional developments by reading journals. The assumption is that those who engage more in these activities are more concerned about their professional than their organizational standing. Each question was scored and summed for every member of the sample; the higher the individual's score, the more professional he is assumed to be. The scores ranged from a low of 0 to a high of 21. The amount of variation of the scores compares favorably with that of principals and school-board members in an earlier study (Ibid). The corrected split-half reliability is .94. Four Likert-scaled items on the necessity of specialized training for dealing with problems of education make up the second, attitudinal measure. It is assumed that the more professionally oriented a person, the more he will support the need for professional training. The scores ranged from a low of 0 to a high of 23. The higher the score the higher the professionalism. An index was formed by summing the scores. The corrected split-half reliability was
The correlation between the two measures is .271 indicating that the two indexes measure separate dimensions of professionalism.

B. Commitment to the Organization: Gouldner has called attention to the difference between commitment of the individual to the organization as a whole and the person's commitment to specific values, policies, or goals of the organization. This distinction is important, she claims, because it suggests that "those who are committed only to the goals of an organization may resign or withdraw should these be changed." (Gouldner, 1960:469). It is equally possible that a person may support the broad goals of an organization but not certain of its specific policies. It was the potential for this variation in the specificity of an individual's commitment that made it necessary to distinguish between overall commitment to CUNY-TTT goals and tasks and support for change in the distribution of intra-organizational power.

While Gouldner rightly distinguishes between general and specific organizational commitment, her formulation relates only to values and not behavior. Thus, a person may verbally support organizational goals but act in a contrary fashion. In this study, measurements of the commitment to organizational goals and to work in CUNY-TTT were used. For the first measure, the respondent was asked to indicate how important six frequently communicated goals were for his or her project on a scale ranging from "extremely important" (1) to "not at all important" (6). According to Gouldner, there is a positive relationship between organization preference and personal preference and that assumption was applied here (Gouldner, 1960:173). The scores on each item were summed for each person sampled and an index created. The higher the score the greater the commitment to organizational goals.

The second measure of commitment relates to the person's work experience in CUNY-TTT. Individuals were asked to respond on a six-point Likert scale to the following three items: (1) "Overall, how committed are you to your work (or training) in TTT?"; (2) "I feel so strongly about TTT that I would give up some of my social life in order to successfully complete my work"; (3) "Overall, my TTT experience has been better than any other professional educational experience I have had (or, for student respondents, can imagine having in
the near future)." The individual answers were scored and summed. The higher the score, the lower the commitment to task.

C. Change in the Distribution of Power: Three measures were used to determine members' support of changes in the distribution of power that would result in greater influence for members of the community and student teachers. The first measure, the Parity Scale, is patterned after Arnstein's "Ladder of Citizen Participation," and is designed to gauge attitudes about participation in CUNY-TTT of members of the community (Arnstein, 1969:216-224). Twelve judges were asked to select six items from a list of fourteen and then rank them according to the degree of citizen participation they referred to. The final six items were presented to respondents in a Likert scale format. They ranged from such statements as, "Professionals -- teachers and administrators -- are the only ones who have the skills to translate the interests of parents and the community into educational terms and procedures" to "Community participants should have majority membership on policy groups that have final authority for making decisions on school goals and objectives."

The responses were subjected to Guttman Scale analysis and two items were found not to scale. The final four item scale for all respondents has a Coefficient of Reproducibility of .89 and a Coefficient of Scalability of .60. Although the Coefficient of Reproducibility does not meet the standard of .90 that is normally required for acceptance, since it was only one percentage point below the standard, it was decided to use the scale rather than create a summated index. The higher the score, the greater the support for change.

The remaining two measures are based on Tannenbaum's Control Graph (Tannenbaum, 1961:33-46). The Control Graph Technique, in addition to allowing comparisons of differences in total influence between two or more organizations, also allows for comparisons between sub-groups. It relies on the individual's perception of a sub-group's degree of influence or "control" in relation to the influence of other groups. Respondents were asked how much influence seven CUNY-TTT sub-groups had. They were also asked to indicate how much influence each of the sub-groups should have. The five category response scale ranged from "Practically no Influence" to "A Very
Great Deal of Influence." Two indexes were constructed from the scored individual responses. The Relative Control Index was computed by subtracting the individual respondent's scores on preferred community participant influence from his or her score on the preferred project director influence. The higher the score, the greater the disparity preferred between the project director's influence and the influence of the community participant. The scores ranged from a -3 to a +4. For the Total Control Index, the respondent's preferred influence for five groups --project directors and their staffs, public school administrators, public school teachers, student teachers, and community participants -- was summed and then subtracted from the mean of the total number of responses for the five positions. The higher the score (i.e., the smaller the minus value), the less total influence is preferred for all groups. The scores ranged from a low of -7 to a high of +9.

Findings

Before considering the relationship between professionalism and commitment, data representing the distribution of power by position and project is given in Figure I. Although the question of existing power relations is only indirectly related to the original question of this study, it is instructive to note that decisional equity, one of the major goals of CUNY-TTT, was not realized, at least as measured by respondents' estimates of the authority of various subgroups over five major policy and administrative decisions. The five decision areas reflected in Figure I are, changing the curriculum, evaluating staff and program, hiring and firing employees, preparation of the budget, and assigning work to student teachers. The scoring was as follows: each project's estimate of the authority of each of the six positions over each of the five decision areas was calculated. The scores for the five decision areas were then summed and an average calculated, yielding one score per position per project for the five decision areas combined. The level of authority ranges from "consultative authority" or better for project directors and staffs to "advisory authority" or less for student teachers and community participants. The pattern or hierarchy of authority is exactly the same as that
produced by the Control Graph Method as reported in the larger study on which the present one is based (Styskal: 1974). The fact that non-educators -- the student teachers and community members who did not engage in the practice of education full time or derive their living from their work as educators -- are considered to have the least authority, suggests the possibility that professionalism is a factor in the failure to achieve decisional equity. This implies a direct relationship between professionalism and position of authority, a result not borne out by the data in Table I.

A. Professionalism and Organizational Commitment: Table I gives the mean scores on professionalism (sense of calling) and commitment to work in CUNY-TT by position. Positions are ranked according to their authority as represented in Figure I. Professionalism is ranked from high (1) to low (6). Although the two positions lowest in authority are also lowest in professionalism, college faculty who rank highest on professionalism rank fourth out of six on authority, while project directors and staff who rank highest on authority, score third on professionalism.

There appears to be no consistent relationship between professionalism and commitment to work. Commitment is ranked from high (6) to low (1). Project directors and staffs, student teachers and community participants, rank the highest on commitment, closely followed by college faculty. School administrators and elementary school teachers, who ranked second and fourth on professionalism are the least committed to their work. The relationship between professionalism and commitment is a weak one at best.

Comparisons based on group means are somewhat crude distillations of the data that frequently mask individual differences; and it is the latter that we are most interested in. In Table II therefore, correlations between the two measures of professionalism and the two measures of commitment are given. The strongest relationship is between the attitudinal measure of professionalism and commitment to work, however neither it nor the other correlations are significant. Model one above, which posited a relationship (+ or -) between professionalism and commitment to organization does not appear to apply. Before accepting this conclusion as final, a test of linearity was
made in order to determine if the relationship between professionalism and commitment was curvilinear.

The linear trend test is conducted by first calculating the between and within sum of squares. The between sum of squares is then partitioned between that which is due to a linear trend and that which is the result of curvilinear trends. The linear component is that portion of the sum of the squares which the independent variable accounts for when standard linear regression is used. The remaining sum of squares are attributable to non-linear trends and are calculated as follows:

\[
\text{Sum of Squares due to Deviation from Linearity} = \frac{\text{Between Group Sum of Squares} - \text{Regression Sum of Squares}}{\text{Sum of Squares}}
\]

The corresponding calculations for testing the relationship between professionalism (sense of calling) and commitment to work in CUNY-ITT are:

\[
\text{Deviation Sum of Squares} = 346.3611 - 1.7328 = 344.6283
\]

The F Statistics is:

\[
F = \frac{\text{Mean Square Deviation from Linearity}}{\text{Mean Square Within}} = \frac{344.6283}{18.5105} = 18.618
\]

The value of the F statistic compared with the F distribution, d.f. = 1, 175, indicates the deviation from linearity is not statistically significant. The deviation from linearity for the correlation between professionalism (sense of calling) and commitment to goals was also found to be statistically insignificant. Since professionalism (sense of calling) and commitment are unrelated linearly and curvilinearly and since professionalism measured attitudinally is only weakly and insignificantly related to commitment, we conclude that the two variables represent unrelated phenomena.

If professionalism is unrelated to commitment then it is reasonable to assume that it will be unrelated to other indicators of group influence. Commitment to an organization, on the other hand, is an indication of a member's attachment or loyalty to the
organization and therefore, is thought to affect the degree and kind of influence that the group can exert on him (Gouldner, 1960: 470); it should be positively related to group influence.

To examine this question, four indirect measures of group influence were correlated with the measures of commitment and professionalism. The variables are: (1) stated reports of the number of hours the individual spent per week working on CUNY-TTT activities; (2) stated reports of the amount of communication the individual had with members of other sub-groups; (3) stated reports of a change of attitude about teacher training as a result of work with CUNY-TTT; (4) a general evaluative question in which the respondent was asked to judge his TTT project on a ten-point scale ranging from "worst possible" to "best possible." The results are shown in Table III.

For professionalism, there is only one significant relationship, that between the measure of a "sense of calling" and communication. There are no significant relationships between commitment to goals and the four indicators. However, the measure of commitment to work is positively related to all four indicators including a .321 correlation with changed attitudes toward teacher training, perhaps the single most important "long-run" objective of CUNY-TTT. What is surprising is the lack of relationship between commitment to goals and any of the four indicators of group influence. This outcome not only underlines the importance of distinguishing between types of commitment, but strongly suggests that general commitments to the organization are less successful than instrumental or task-oriented commitments for achieving change in the organization.

**B. Professionalism, Commitment, and Attitudes toward Change in the Distribution of Power:**

How then, if at all, are professionalism and commitment related to attitudes supportive of change in the distribution of power in CUNY-TTT? Table IV shows the intercorrelations between the four independent variables and the three measures of attitudes toward changes in power among CUNY-TTT sub-groups. The two measures of professionalism are significantly related to only one of the change measures, the Parity Scale. The correlation between professionalism measured as a sense of calling and Parity is .243;
between professionalism measured attitudinally it is .177. Professionals therefore tend to support increased power for community participants but within existing hierarchical constraints (although the sign is positive for the .171 correlation between professionalism measured attitudinally and the Relative Control Index, the relationship is a negative one, due to the direction of the scales). Of the six correlations between the two commitment measures and the three change measures, five are significant. Commitment to goals is positively related to RCI (.231), TCI (.265), and Parity (.257). Commitment to work is positively related to TCI (.260) and Parity (.200). Thus model two above, which postulates that commitment and professionalism are independently related to attitudes toward changes in power applies with, however, the major qualification that professionalism is only partially related to change.

**Conclusion**

Most studies of professionals in organizations continue to find an incompatibility between professional norms and organizational commitment. Where no such incompatibility is found, it is generally assumed to be the result of the organization adapting to the needs of the professional or the professional identifying with the bureaucratic norms in order to guarantee his future in the organization. Few researchers have found a reduction in professionalism commensurate with a reduction in bureaucratic norms; rather, a trade-off between specialist autonomy and power in the organization has been the usual case.

Few if any of these studies have dealt with the special purpose organization in which expertise is called upon to institute change but where the state mediates the professional-client relationship by questioning the validity of professional autonomy. For the professional, the potential conflict between the authority of his occupation and consumer choice, backed up by the authority of the organization and the state, is exaggerated by the fact that his role in the organization is a function of his expertise; and it is precisely his expertise that is being questioned. The available models of the professional imply, in effect, a trade-off by the professional confronted with
this situation: either he will embrace the goals of the organization on the ground that it is in the best interests of his clients, thereby reducing his autonomy, or he will react defensively and deny support to organizational goals. Our finding of no relationship between professionalism and commitment and a partial relationship between professionalism and changes in intra-organizational power indicates that the trade-off model does not adequately explain the reactions of CUNY-TTT professionals; rather, professionalism was found not to be a factor in the commitment to and support of the technological goals of CUNY-TTT and the goals for reducing the autonomy of professionals. Professionalism in CUNY-TTT was, in effect, neutralized as a factor that contributed to the success or failure of the Program.

More extensive research is needed to understand the reasons for these findings. It does seem clear that monolithic views of professionalism as a consistent and mutually supporting set of norms are subject to question. It is conceivable that state mediation in the professional-client relationship exacerbates the latent discongruities in professional norms. State mediation, for example, often leads to bureaucratization and the stratification of professional which tends to destroy colleague relationship and neutralize the controls which the autonomous profession imposes on its members (Johnson, 1972:80). It is possible that in public service professions, there is and will continue to be a direct relationship between the intervention of the state and the reduction of such professional norms as autonomy.
Figure 1
FIVE DECISION AREAS COMBINED BY PROJECT AND BY POSITION

C = City College
H = Hunter College
R = Richmond College
## TABLE I

PROFESSIONALISM AND COMMITMENT TO TASK BY POSITION (MEANS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Professionalism Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Commitment Mean</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project Directors &amp; Staffs (n=21)</td>
<td>7.052</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.062</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Public School Administrators (n=21)</td>
<td>9.579</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.117</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public School Teachers (n=68)</td>
<td>5.848</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.285</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. College Faculty (n=30)</td>
<td>12.666</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.629</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Teachers (n=84)</td>
<td>1.947</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.652</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community Participants (n=18)</td>
<td>5.331</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE II
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN COMMITMENT MEASURES AND PROFESSIONALISM MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professionalism (Sense of Calling)</th>
<th>Professionalism (Attitudinal Measure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Task</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Goals</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE III
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN COMMITMENT, PROFESSIONALISM
AND SELECTED INDICATORS OF GROUP INFLUENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commitment (Task)</th>
<th>Commitment (Goals)</th>
<th>Professionalism (Calling)</th>
<th>Professionalism (Attitudes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK: Hours per week</td>
<td>.266*</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION WITH OTHER GROUPS</td>
<td>.256*</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.282*</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE IN ATTITUDES: Teacher Training</td>
<td>.321*</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION OF TTT PROJECT</td>
<td>.498*</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .001 level
| Correlations between Commitment, Professionalism, and Attitudes Toward Changes in Power |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                       | Commitment (Task) | Commitment (Goals) | Calling (Attitudes) |
| **Relative Control Index (RCI)**      | .030             | .231*            | -.082           |
| **Total Control Index (TCI)**         | .260*            | .265*            | -.109           |
| **Parity Scale**                      | .260**           | .257*            | .177*           |

* Significant at .001 level
** Significant at .01 level
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