This study examined the influence of education, agency culture, and demographic attributes on the level of professional socialization of state administrators, using data from a national survey of 5,980 state administrators. It found a positive relationship between the educational attainment of state administrators and their orientations toward service professionalism. Analysis suggested that the level of professionalism was dependent, for the most part, on the political acuity level. The degree of supervisor encouragement for training positively impacted political acuity, but had no discernable impact on professionalism. Younger administrators were found to be less politically acute than older administrators. Professionalism level was found to have a significant impact on public service values such as organizational democracy, pluralistic polity, politicized merit system, and service to clientele. Two appendices provide copies of the administrator questionnaire and the data code book. (Contains approximately 285 references.) (MDM)
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FOREWORD

This final technical report prepared by the faculty in the School of Public Affairs represents the core findings of a research project that was supported by the National Science Foundation from August 1, 1990 to February 28, 1994 R1190045-63.

Aside from the scientific findings of this study, the project contributed toward the professional development of our faculty through hands-on research in a major study of this nature. Two MPA students wrote their theses using this project data. Several faculty members from other universities were associated with this research project as consultants.

The survey data generated by this project will be available to the social science research community from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Science Research, Ann Arbor. Kentucky State University has instituted a Center for Public Policy Research and has begun publication of a research newsletter titled Public Administration Briefing to disseminate faculty research.

We are thankful to Dr. Arturo Branson, Program Director of NSF's RIMI Program, for providing us with this opportunity to strengthen public administration research at Kentucky State University.

Any opinions, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation or Kentucky State University.

Dr. Cassie Osborne, Jr., Dean
School of Public Affairs and
Director, Center for Public Policy Research

March 3, 1994
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INTRODUCTION

For more than a decade public officials both elected and appointed have struggled with the question of efficiency and effectiveness. In an effort to address this question many attempts have been made to redefine the way governmental task functions are formulated and implemented. Although planning and implementation of task functions constitutes an important element in the ongoing endeavor toward government accountability, it is but a first step. The failure of governmental decision makers to expand their inquiry has created a false picture regarding the issues at hand.

Antecedent of Present Study

In 1987 a group at Kentucky State University begin exploring questions and concerns regarding effective and efficient government. This project funded by a grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF) (Grant No. RII 87040-15), although limited in scope to the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the findings did point out the need to undertake a more comprehensive and complete study. Therefore, the current project was conceptualized based on those findings. Here again a proposal was submitted to the National Science Foundation for funding. In 1991 a research project entitled “Management Training And Public Service Education As Correlates Of Orientations Toward Public Service Professionalism Among State Administrators In The Fifty States”, was funded by the National Science foundation (NSF) (Grant No. RII 9006563).

Aware of past failure to fully address the question so prevalent to government—a working hypotheses was formulated suggesting that governmental effectiveness and efficiency was somehow related to the degree of professionalism among government employees. Hence this study is structured to accomplish an effective measurement of the relationship between effective and efficient government, and professionalism. Previous research conducted at Kentucky State University suggests an important correlation possibly exists between professionalism, training and/or education (Mohapatra, Rose, Woods and Bugbee, 1989). Based on findings which link professionalism and education/training the next logical step was to measure the strength and nature of this relationship. This endeavor generated the findings summarized below.

It is the hope of the researchers that this project will provide government administrators with a basic and fundamental field of knowledge that will lead to a greater degree of professionalism, and more enhanced administrative effectiveness and efficiency.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions of Past Study

The central conceptual concern of the past research was “professional socialization of state administrators.” Professional socialization is defined as the process through which employees aligned within various disciplines gain specialized knowledge rele-
vant to their professions; become cognizant of the ethical norms related to their
day-to-day organizational behavior and develop an identification with their peer group.

The socialization conceptual model (see Figure 1), used in this study indicates that
participation of state administrators in management training/education programs is
emphasized as a major contributing factor toward professional socialization. Additionally, the model recognizes the influence of "state agency culture" as a mediating variable influencing relationships between education/training and professional socialization.

Finally, the model proposes two composite trait indicators to interpret public
administrators' professional socialization. The first trait, labeled professionalism, emphasizing commitment to public service as a career and recognizes that public administration is indeed a unique discipline. The professionalism trait structure was found to consist of three levels (i.e., Rejector, Ambivalent and Enthusiast). The second trait, labeled political acuity, emphasizes the need to understand the political nature of public administration, and was also found to consist of three levels (i.e., Naïve, Apolítico and Político).

This conceptual framework suggested the need to test certain proposed relationships among independent, intervening and dependent variables, namely:

- Influence of education/training on level of professional socialization;
- Influence of agency culture on levels of professional socialization;
- Influence of demographic attributes of state administrators on professional socialization;
- Influence of professional socialization on four public service values (i.e., organizational democracy, puralistic polity, politicized merit system and service clientele).

Findings

Training appeared to plausibly and positively influence political acuity but not professionalism. Administrators identified as having attended a week long Management Awareness program were found to be somewhat more politically acute than their untrained peers.

Agency culture was defined as supervisor encouragement and peer enthusiasm. The degree of supervisor encouragement for training seemed to positively impact political acuity, but had no discernible impact on professionalism. On the other hand, peer enthusiasm for training positively impacted both political acuity and professionalism. However, the analysis suggested that the professionalism level was dependent, for the most part, on the political acuity level. That is, as an individual became more politically acute, he/she tended to believe that public administration was, in fact, a profession.
Figure 1
Original Conceptual Model of Public Service Socialization

Participation in Public Service Education/Management Training Programs
- Typological Variations:
  - University based MPA programs
  - Consortium based CPM programs
  - Management Awareness programs

Orientations Toward Public Service Training/Education
- Perceived Job-relatedness of Public Service Training/Education
- Involvement with Public Service Professional Organizations
- Interactions with Public Service Educators/training
- Image of Administrative Training Institutions
- Participation in Continuing Education Activities
- Career Goals in Public Service
- Perceived Commitment of Peers Toward Public Service Values
- Comparative Perceptions of Other Professionals in Public Service
- Role Expectations of Hierarchical Decision-Makers

Independent Variables

Mediating Variables

Contextual Variables
(State Agency Administrative Culture)

Dependent Variables

- Agency Educational Culture
- Level of Institutionalization of the Merit System
- Responsiveness to Ombudsmanic Role of Elected Officials
- Social Representiveness
- Politicization of Personnel in Agency
- Reward System
- Status of Non-Merit Personnel vis-a-vis Merit Personnel

Orientations Toward Professionalism
- Professional
- Political Acuity
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One of the analyses outcomes was confounding—no statistical difference was noted between the highest and lowest levels for political acuity even though the means seemed to indicate a difference should exist.

Gender, age, ethnicity, and education were used as reference variables to test the demographic influence on political acuity and professionalism. Age was the only demographic variable found to significantly impact either political acuity or professionalism. Younger Managers were found to be less politically acute as their older peers.

Political acuity level was found to significantly impact attitudes toward the merit system and providing quality services to clientele. Politically acute public managers were less hostile to the idea that political pull outweighed the merit system and appeared to have more positive feelings that state government should provide quality services to clientele than were their naive peers.

Professionalism level was found to significantly impact all four of the public service values (i.e., organizational democracy, pluralistic polity, politicized merit system and service to clientele). However, the differences measured for service to clientele and organizational democracy attitudes tended to be the result of attitudes held for politicized merit system and pluralistic polity. In general, professionally enthusiastic managers held less negative attitudes toward the merit system and more positive attitudes toward pluralistic polity, service to clientele and organizational democracy values than did professionalism rejecters.

**Conclusions**

Overall, training and age were found to impact reported levels of political acuity, but not professionalism. Reported levels of acuity impacted attitudes toward the merit system and services to clientele, while professionalism level impacted all four service value attitudes.

These data suggests that as political acuity increases it tends to cause increases in professionalism, even though these traits were found to be statistically independent. In turn, levels of political acuity and professionalism tend to positively impact the four service value areas. There is a good likelihood that much of professional socialization results from aging and experience from formal training, the work place and political environments.

The results of this study tended to support the original conceptual model for professional socialization. In addition, it suggested some alterations to the conceptual model due to the findings about the nature of the discovery of the traits constituting professional socialization.
II

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There has been a great deal of interest in managerial training and education of state public administrators. However, Kentucky State University's (KSU) study of Kentucky public managers suggests that an overwhelming majority of state administrators still do not have a degree in Public Administration.

Various universities in the United States have collaborative arrangements with state governments enabling state employees to pursue the MPA degree on a part-time basis.

Some state governments have established provisions for in-service managerial training. Objectives of these managerial training programs focus on developing managerial skills and leadership qualities among in-service state administrators. Institutional arrangements of these training programs are rather varied.

The Council of State Governments maintains up-to-date information on the status of training programs in each of the fifty states, including lists of the names of state officials responsible for in-house managerial training programs. Two other documentary sources also provide sketchy information about the status of state-level managerial training programs (NASTADD, 1985; New York State, 1983). The Center for Public Policy Research (now the Research Center for Public and International Policy) at Kentucky State University also directly collected a profile of the training programs at the state level in 1989. Based on these data sources, the following analyses have been made to propose a classification of these programs.

Some states support highly structured, yet diversified training programs. A case in point is Virginia which has three major institutional arrangements: Virginia Executive Institute, Commonwealth Management Institute and Virginia Supervisors Institute. The Virginia Executive Institute is an executive education program for top level state administrators. The Commonwealth Management Institute is designed for mid-level managers and seeks to promote their leadership skills. The Virginia Supervisors Institute is primarily designed for lower level supervisors in state government.

Ten states (i.e., Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma and Utah) have developed Certified Public Management Programs and have created a consortium to facilitate standard settings. Presently, these Programs vary from one another in some ways.

For example, in Georgia the University of Georgia and the state's training division jointly administer the program. In Kentucky the Kentucky Certified Public Management Program (KCM) is administered by the state's Governmental Services Center at Kentucky State University. In Indiana there is no standardized or centralized manage-
ment training program. The Division of Employee Training and Development in Missouri offers a series of courses which include elements of management training. Similar training programs are offered by the Idaho Personnel Commission, the Iowa Department of Personnel and the Bureau of Personnel in South Dakota. Nebraska offers a Managers Course and encourages professional membership in the National Management Association (NMA).

Table 1 proposes a classification of all state government sponsored managerial training programs into six mutually exclusive categories. This classification has been proposed on the basis of documentary data collected about management training programs available in the fifty states (i.e., Council of State Government Working Papers, New York State survey 1983, American Society of Training and Development (ASTD) profile 1985 and KSU mail requests to 50 states).

Table 1
A TAXONOMY OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR STATE ADMINISTRATORS IN THE FIFTY STATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.</th>
<th>II.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University-based</td>
<td>State Agency management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA degree</td>
<td>with training program modeled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasis on state</td>
<td>along CPM consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employee clientele standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III.</th>
<th>IV.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management training</td>
<td>Management training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program for top</td>
<td>program for middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management state</td>
<td>management state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td>administrators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V.</th>
<th>VI.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management training</td>
<td>Assorted managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program for supervisor</td>
<td>workshops and courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level state administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These state government sponsored management training programs seem to contribute toward the professional socialization of state administrators and facilitate the growth of public service professionalism among the state administrators. State government sponsored managerial training systems have not received much scholarly attention, and there are many unanswered theoretical questions about the efficacy of these training programs (Faerman, 1987). All the while managerial training programs continue to
proliferate in cross-national settings. Training agencies and other interests involved in training may have developed a trainingism orientation Turner (1989). Left unanswered are:

- To what extent do these training programs contribute toward professional socialization of state administrators?
- How do the high-level state administrators perceive agency-based generic management training programs?
- How do the high-level executives perceive university-based public administration education?
- What are social, work-related and other correlates associated with variations of such orientations (i.e., positive, negative, neutral) of these executives?

Their impact on administrative systems need to be studied.

This study addresses the problem through a national inquiry about training and education programs of state administrators.
III
RESEARCH ON PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION

The central conceptual concern of this research is "professional socialization of state administrators." Professional socialization is a complex process through which professionals in different fields gain specialized knowledge relevant to their profession; become cognizant of the ethical norms related to their day-to-day organizational behavior; and develop an identification with an occupational peer group (Blankenship, 1977).

PROFESSIONALISM ACROSS OCCUPATIONS

The inter-disciplinary field of study, "professional socialization" has attracted the attention of researchers from Sociology, Psychology, Political Science, Education, Social Work, Planning and other disciplines. Some of who have delved into conceptualization of professionalism from theoretical perspectives (Blankenship, 1977; Becker, 1956; Carr-Sanders, 1983; Cleveland, 1985; Derber, 1982; Forsyth, 1985; Greenwood, 1957; Henry, 1967; Jamous, 1970; Moore, 1970; Mosher, 1977; Pandey, 1985; Rosenbloom, 1983; Schein, 1972; Wilensky, 1964; Golembiewski, 1983 and Mohapatra, et al, 1989). These theoretical and conceptual works have studied the evolution of professions and professionalism in human society and their implications.

Others have studied professional socialization in the context of specific professions. Considerable number of professions have been analyzed and it seems pertinent to cite a few of these studies. One of the earliest studies of professional growth among medical students was by Becker, (1957) and of law students by Lorrie, (1959). They analyzed law school and medical schools as agents of professional socialization of students who spend several years in professional study. Using a single educational institution as the database, Khelif (1975) analyzed professional socialization of school superintendents who underwent doctoral studies. Perrucci (1969) analyzed professional socialization of engineers, specifically focusing on their lack of a sense of community. Varney (1985) studied the evolution of organizational consultants as a new type of professional. Dingwell and Associates (1983) analyzed professional socialization patterns of lawyers and doctors in a comparative perspective. Scientific curiosity about the process of professional socialization has attracted the attention of a number of other social scientists. (Greenwood, 1957; Moore, 1969; Perrucci, 1969; Jackson, 1970; Roth, 1974; Blankenship, 1977; and Forsyth, 1985). The above studies have yielded some constant generalities that can be grouped into three categories (Institutional, Self Perception/Attitudinal and Public Perception) shown in Table 2 below.
GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PROFESSIONALISM*

I. Institutional Dimensions

- Organizations/Associations of professionals with criteria for membership
- Schools with professional certification role upon completion of professional socialization
- A specialized body of knowledge based on continuing research Provision for continuing education for professionals
- Recognition of outstanding professionals by peers
- Sanction system for deviants
- A formal ethical code or conduct with self-regulation system
- Organized response to protect individual members in their professional role behavior

II. Self Perceptions/Attitudinal Dimensions

- Definitive role perceptions as a professional
- High regard for professional peers as a reference group
- Participation in professional organization
- Commitment to continuing education in new specialized knowledge
- Observation of ethical code

III. Public Perceptions Dimensions

- Prestige in relation to mass public
- Recognition of professional service as a significant contribution to public
- Recognition of professional as a specialist with specialized knowledge


Most recognized professions tend to demonstrate characteristics listed under these three broad categories. All professions in the United States, and perhaps, to some extent, in all societies tend to exhibit these three types of characteristics. Public administrators can be measured along the three dimensions shown above. Table 3 below suggests one way of recognizing these attributes as they are related to public administration as a profession.

Public Administrators' Professionalism

In most public management settings an administrator does not need to have specific degrees or courses in the field of public administration in order to be recruited as a professional public administrator. Nor is membership in a professional organization of public administration mandatory for a person desiring to become a public administrator. Further, a practicing public administrator does not need to be cognizant of existing formal professional ethical conduct codes such as the American Society for Public Administrators (ASPA) ethical code.
Many conventional attributes of American public administration professionals are now undergoing change. The number of graduate degree holders in public administration has increased, and public administration organizations have increased their membership and activities (Mosher 1977; Danziger, 1979; Kline, 1981; Yeager, 1982; Nalbandian, 1983; Thai, 1983; Lewis, 1987). Consequently, certain commonalities about the characteristics or professionals can be derived. A review of social science literature suggests the possibility of identifying some characteristics of public administration professionalism in general. Table 3 below suggests a three-fold classification of these general characteristics of professional characteristics.

Table 3
CHARACTERISTICS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION PROFESSIONALISM

I. Institutional Dimensions

   Existence of an organization of public administrators (Pugh 1989)

   Existence of schools of Public administration and in-house agencies for the professional recognition of "public administration" as a body of scientific knowledge (Pugh 1989)

   Existence of ethical codes by the organization of public administrators (Pugh 1989)

II. Self-Perceptions/Attitudinal Dimensions

   Some empirical evidence of the role perception of public administration as professionals (Freidrei, 1988; Loveridge, 1971)

   Involvement of some public administrators with professional associates, continuing education and sharing of ethical codes (Pugh, 1989)

III. Public Perception Dimensions

   Some empirical evidence of positive public image of public administration as a professional. (Jennings, 1966)

Research on Professionalism Of Public Administrators

Professionalism among public administrators has been studied by several investigators. Some have specifically studied professionalism among specific types of public administrators. These studies have included probation officers (Albrecht, 1979); public works professionals (Babcock, 1980); NASA scientists (Bayton, 1972); elite administrators in India (Bhambri, 1972); state administrators (Wright, 1965); foreign service officers (Calkin, 1978 and Powlick 1985); welfare administrators (Cashman, 1978), mental health executives (Delgado, 1985); congressional aides (Edson, 1988); city managers (Loveridge, 1971); personnel directors (Fottler, 1979, and Plake, 1987); urban black managers (Henderson, 1979); (Howard, 1975); senior executives in Canada (Johnson, 1972); police officers (Keil, 1978; Mecum, 1979; Price, 1976); scientists in government agencies (Lambright, 1978); presidential management interns (Newcomer, 1989) and public prosecutors (Winfree, 1984).

Wright and Associates (1977) studied professionalism among state administrators in fifty states. Evidence was found that suggested a trend toward the recruitment of
college educated agency heads. Nevertheless, the proportion of individual administra-
tors with formal MPA degrees was found to be rather small (3-5%); however, the rise
in the proportion of state personnel administrators with in-house/informal training in
public administration was noticeable (from 14% in 1964 to 45% in 1974). Fottler and
Novell (1979) found a higher degree of professionalism among these directors and
noted that the environment of each state agency seemed to influence professionalism.
Podell and Miller (1974) used a survey of administrators in New York City’s Depart-
ment of Social Services to measure their level of involvement in professional activities
(e.g., membership in professional organization and reading of journals). It was observed
that these professionals seemed to be detached and uncommitted to professionalism.
Lorenz and Associates (1984) studied the orientation of rehabilitation administrators
through a national survey of 851 respondents toward professional certification. This
group as a whole was found to be ambivalent toward certification. Sauser and Smith
(1983) found evidence among Alabama county administrators suggesting five underly-
ing dimensions of professionalism (i.e., need for special skills, value of experience,
administrative duties, freedom from political constraints and professional identifica-
tion).

Dailey (1983) measured commitment toward public service professionalism among
state executives and legislators and found general support for commitment among the
respondents; yet, noticeable reservation was still noted. Price (1976) found police
administrators to be ambivalent toward professionalism. They seemed to fear some
perceived conflict between professionalism and organizational operation. Nalbandian
and Edwards (1983) studied professional values of public administrators in a compara-
tive perspective (i.e., with business administrators, lawyers and social workers), and
found significant statistical differences between the members of the four groups on a
professional value scale. Heinemann and Associates (1986) studied the desire for
involvement in professional organizations among 87 state rehabilitation administra-
tors. A series of variables that explained commitment toward professional involvement
were identified. Pearson and Sanders (1981) studied orientations of state administra-
tors toward authoritative values in seven states. Those surveyed reported an attitudi-
nal orientation supportive of authoritarian values. Among the determinants of authoritar-
ian values, this study suggested that public safety agency administrators tended to have
more authoritarian values, as did older and senior administrators.

Aberback and Rochman (1973) studied the values of federal executives in relation
to citizen participation in administration. Although their conclusion was that federal
executives tend to believe that greater citizen involvement with government is desir-
able, they found a sizable minority who had reservations about this activity. Hopkins
(1980) studied subjective discrimination among state employees of five states. This
study suggests a pervasiveness of “perception of subjective discrimination” among
women, older and minority employees. Among the explanatory variables associated
with this perception were job environment related variables.
Sparado (1973) studied role perceptions of bureaucrats and politicians in three states and found significant variations between Minnesota and South Carolina with respect to disagreement in role perception. These variations were explained in terms of the nature of the respective civil service systems. Sheinfeld and Weinch (1981) studied service delivery in a community mental health center and observed the emergence of an administrative ideology as a consequence of selection or acculturation. The various components of this administrative ideology were tolerant professionalism, community service and pressure to increase client services. Ideological diversity among the five different units of the organization was also found. Klinger (1988) in a study of providers of university public service, found the existence of tension between maintaining academic credibility and user acceptance. The university culture tended to emphasize advancing knowledge rather than present utility or popular acceptance. In another study of personnel directors in the fifty states, Klinger (1988) analyzed the orientation of responses toward social equity goal of the administrators. A majority were found to be supportive of this goal. In Perry's fifty state study (1980) of personnel selection specialists, data were obtained about the training needs of these highly specialized personnel administrators. Among other things, most frequently cited deficiencies included analysis and interpretation of data.

Putt and Springer's (1980) Study of public service educators found that these professionals emphasized the value of "self-direction" and "self-control" as fundamental. Murray's survey of public administration (1976) identified writing and oral communication as the main skill deficiencies of young professionals in public management. Golembiewski (1983) saw the danger of "protectionism" related consequences of public service professionalism. Guy (1985) concluded that professionals mesh their goals with those of the organization and that a stable departmental structure served as a melting pot for professionals across disciplines. Fisher and Ludgin (1982) raised a question about the compatibility between public service professionalism and political activity of these professionals within their employing jurisdictions. Sauser and Smith (1983) attempted to empirically define public sector professionalism and suggest the existence five underlying dimensions of public sector professionalism: special skills, expertise, administrative duties, freedom from political interference and professional idealism.

Methodological Concerns in Public Service Professionalism

Survey research techniques have been used by social scientists for several administration studies. Political science researchers have studied background attributes, attitudes, and behaviors of state administrators from different conceptual perspectives. Herein, are summarized selected salient studies that have appeared in the literature during the last two decades.

An early empirical study of American state administrators was completed in the late sixties by Wright (1965). A national sample was used to study background profiles of state administrators in fifty states. The results of this study suggested a number of
generalizations about the social attributes of state administrators. Follow-up studies by Wright (1977) and Freeman (1989) produced findings of considerable interest to others interested in analyzing the extent to which the collective portrait of state administrators in the United States reflects the ideal type construct of representative bureaucracy. (Sheriff, 1974; Krislov, 1974).

A few others have analyzed state administrators, through studies with a fifty state focus. Organizational mobility among state administrators has been analyzed as the basis of a fifty-state study by Pearson (1987). Yeager (1984) utilized data from a fifty-state survey with a small response rate (N = 361) to analyze the orientation of state administrators' socialization systems in the United States. Another high response (70%) survey based study of state administrators was completed by Abney (1982). The role of key state administrators and their managerial styles in relation to the outside world were examined. Miller (1982) studied state administrators in fifty states with a conceptual focus on "Perception of influence matrix of agency policy decisions".

Aside from these nationwide sample survey data-based studies, a number of researchers have analyzed state administrators with much smaller data bases. Rehfus (1986) analyzed the representation of minorities and women among the members of the California career service. Lovrich (1989) conducted a quasi-experimental study to analyze attitudes of state administrators in Washington state toward a new appraisal system. Duncombe (????) studied the orientation of state budget administrators using both question and personal interview data. Bremer (1988) studied the strategies of women administrators in Oregon, and found them supportive of their professional mobility in public finance.

Works of other researchers using survey data on state administrators in one or more states are many. (Botner, 1974; Daniel & Rose, 1990; Grupp, 1975; Hall, 1977; Meyer, 1979; Beek, 1980; Abney, 1981; Decotis, 1981; Rose, 1981; Freeman, 1984; Yeager, 1985; Sylvia, 1986; Soden, 1988; Abney, 1981). All of these studies differ from one another in their conceptual focus but all have utilized survey research methodologies (e.g., mail survey, personal interview, telephone interview). In the last twenty years, these studies have documented the feasibility of conducting theoretically significant research about state administrators in the United States.

Relative variations found in survey research response rates of state administrator studies, deserves some consideration (see Table 4). A few researchers have never specifically reported their response rates which are influenced by a wide range of factors including topic of survey, length of questions, number of follow-ups, prestige of the survey sponsor, and other factors discussed by the methodologists (Dillman, 1978). Some researchers have obtained as high as 70% response in the fifty states, (Abney, 1982) and one researcher has reported only 20% response rate (Sylvia, 1986). It is argued that low response rates may be attributable to the fact that most state administrators frequently receive questionnaires for research purposes. Nevertheless, survey
research appears to be an appropriate methodological option in analyzing background attributes, values, and job-related issues involving state administrators.

Table 4
SELECTED SURVEY RESEARCH OF STATE ADMINISTRATORS INVOLVING STUDIES OF THE ASPECTS OF PROFESSIONALISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Aspects of Public Service</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gryski (1983)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction among state (N = 1,100) officials in Georgia</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Wright (1965)</td>
<td>Background characteristics of Wright and State Administrators (N = 718)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates (1978) (N = 1,393)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hall (1977)</td>
<td>Budgetary behavior of the state (N = 85) administrators in Delaware</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pearson (1981)</td>
<td>Values of state executives in (N = 1,000) seven states</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sylvia (1986)</td>
<td>Career plateauing among state (N = 300) administrators in Oklahoma</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Abney (1982)</td>
<td>External relations role of key (N = 300) administrators’ in fifty states</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMPORTANCE OF PRESENT STUDY

The literature suggests a number of conclusions. First, "professional socialization" seems to provide an appropriate conceptual framework for studying the impact of management training/public service education on public service professionalism of state administrators. Second, survey research is an appropriate methodology for identifying the orientation of state administrators toward public service professionalism. Finally, specific studies on public sector professionals suggest that the impact of managerial training programs of an agency on the professional socialization of state administrators has not been studied nationally, with a conceptual focus or methodological rigor. The NSF supported study of Kentucky state administrators (Mohapatra et al., 1989) is the only available completed study. It shows that a 50 state study with a rigorous theoretical research design is needed to fill this gap in professional socialization literature relative to American state administrators.
IV
CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF PRESENT STUDY

The comprehensive review of literature summarized in the previous section proposes the existence of many communalities and variations in the professional socialization process that ultimately influences professionalism orientations. This condition suggested the need to posit a conceptual model for this study. Work done at Kentucky State University on the basis of Kentucky state administrators has lent credence to the original conceptual model (see Figure 1). The conceptual model defined herein accommodates the diversity of management training, education and the elements of state administrative cultures which are crucial to the understanding of state administrators' orientation toward professionalism. Figure 2 provides a graphic representation of this model.

This model emphasizes participation of state administrators in management training and education programs as a contributing factor toward public service professionalism. Despite the diversity of the nature of this training (e.g. in-house, CPM, collaborative MPA, loosely structured Chautauqua formats) this construct considers it be important. Pre-entry education and anticipatory socialization toward public service have also been considered as antecedent variables.

Secondly, this model recognizes the influence of “state administrative culture” (a new concept proposed herein to understand and measure variations in the administrative system of the fifty states as a mediating variable influencing the relationships between education/training and professionalism and political acuity). Measurable elements of state administrative cultures have likewise been suggested in this model.

Finally, this model proposes composite measures to represent variations in the orientations of state administrators toward public service professionalism and political acuity. These represent the dependent variables in this study.
State Administrators' Orientations Toward Public Service Professionalism: A Conceptualization of Research Variables

Figure 2
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STUDY OBJECTIVES, SETTING AND DATA SOURCES

The conceptual model outlined above suggests the formulation of specific hypotheses to empirically test the relationships proposed among the independent, intervening and dependent variables. It was intended for the conceptual model to be comprehensive. Consequently, complete testing of the model is beyond the scope of any single study.

STUDY OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To develop a comprehensive mail survey instrument to collect reliable and valid survey data, from a representative random sample of state administrators in the fifty states.

2. To test four hypotheses about the nature of the relationship between management training/education of state administrators and their orientation toward public service professionalism. For this study, the following four null hypotheses will be tested.

   H-1. Participation in management/training education of the state administrators will not correlate with orientations toward public service professionalism and political acuity.

   H-2. Quantitative variations of professionalism and political acuity will not influence administrators' perception of the saliency of management/training education in public service.

   H-3. Variations in the delivery systems for training/education for state administrators will not influence public service professionalism and political acuity.

   H-4. Typologies of state administrative cultures, ethnicity and gender are not significant mediating variables influencing public service professionalism and political acuity.

Study Setting

Primary data for this study were collected via a self-reporting mail questionnaire and supported by the National Science Foundation. In order to ensure that a significant size sample of state public administrators having earned the MPA degree and/or CPM certificates, lists were solicited from all universities and state supported programs in the fifty states and Puerto Rico. Additional lists were solicited from personnel directors in the fifty states and Puerto Rico.

Of the 241 requests sent to MPA granting universities, only 41 responded. Six of the ten CPM program directors provided lists. Personnel directors from seven states and Puerto Rico provided mailing lists. Mailing lists for the remaining states were generated from names and addresses found in the "State Executive Directory" published by the Carroll Publishing Company of Washington, DC. Table 5 below contains the sample sources, number of questionnaires mailed, number returned and percentage returned.
Table 5
Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE IDENTIFICATION</th>
<th>NUMBER MAILED</th>
<th>NUMBER RETURNED</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE RETURNED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPM UNKNOWN</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPM GEORGIA</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPM KENTUCKY</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPM LOUISIANA</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPM NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>72.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPM OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPM UTAH</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>68.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIGHAM YOUNG</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANISIUS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPAUL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUKE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN MICHIGAN</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA STATE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA STATE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS TECH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA STATE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEAN COLLEGE OF NJ</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY STATE</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI STATE</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHEASTERN</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO STATE</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN ILLINOIS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHWEST MISSOURI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY-ALBANY</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>54.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS A&amp;M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. OF TEXAS &amp; AUSTIN</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>46.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRINITY UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. OF ARKANSAS LR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. OF CALIFORNIA &amp; BERKLEY</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL FLORIDA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. OF COLORADO</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. OF MISSOURI &amp; COLUMBIA</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. OF NEBRASKA &amp; OMAHA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. OF NEW HAVEN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. OF NORTH CAROLINA &amp; CH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. OF NORTH CAROLINA &amp; GRN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. OF PITTSBURGH</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICHITA STATE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>35.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>19.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>23.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>22.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Continued on Next Page
The survey instrument used in this study was a 39-item, comprehensive questionnaire with both closed- and open-ended questions. The 39 items were subdivided into five sections. One section (see Appendix I) contained items designed to be answered by...
individuals holding CPM certificates, while another section contained items designed to be answered by individuals having earned a MPA or equivalent degree. The remaining three sections were designed to be answered by all participants regardless of their academic and/or training background. Requested demographic data was minimal to avoid obtrusive inquiries into personal information. Table 6 below contains additional descriptive statistics of the study sample.

Table 6
General Profile of Study Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Training/Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACHELOR</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA AND/OR PHD/DPA</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER RELATED DEG/TR</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RELATED DEGREE</td>
<td>2973</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5980</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>4091</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5980</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>5152</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN-AMERICAN</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIVE AMERICAN</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLAND</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5980</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Continued on Next Page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Public Service</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 TO 9 YRS</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 TO 19 YRS</td>
<td>2199</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 TO 29 YRS</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 TO 39 YRS</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 TO 49 YRS</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5980</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Work Unit</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATA/PAPER</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE SERVICE</td>
<td>4034</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACHINE/PROD.</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5980</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Responsibility</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE/PROF</td>
<td>3375</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLERICAL</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISORY</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>215</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5980</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29 YRS</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 YRS</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 YRS</td>
<td>2671</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 YRS</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69 YRS</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79 YRS</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 YRS &amp; OLDER</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>328</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5980</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This report is based on data from 5,980 (i.e., 35.4% returned) usable questionnaires which have thus far been returned.

Table 6 projects a general profile of public managers who participated in this study. A majority of the participants are male (69.8%) with less than one third (30.2%) are female. Slightly over 86% of the participants are of European extraction, trailed by African-Americans (4.8%), Asian or Pacific Islanders (2.9%) and Hispanics (2.6%). The age distribution among the respondents shows the largest proportion to be between the ages of 40 and 59 years (75%), with 91.4% 59 years old or younger.

The educational profile of the sample indicates that over one half (58.7%) have earned at least one graduate degree, and 10.1% have some graduate work. Another 21.9% have earned a baccalaureate degree of some type. Only 9.3% report an educa-
tion history of less than a college degree. Overall state public administrators, according to this sample, seem to be a very literate group; however, almost one half of the respondents (49.7%) have not had any training or education related to public sector management.

When asked about their job responsibility, 58.9% of the respondents selected the administrative/professional category as best describing their functions. Another 24.5% selected supervisory chores.

An item on the questionnaire asked respondents to classify their organization. Nearly three quarters (71.1%) labeled their units as people/service oriented organizations. Twenty-four percent labeled their units as data/paper units, while the remaining 4.9% select machine/production.

The data show that 68.2% reported supervising 50 or less individuals. Another 18.9% indicated they supervised 51 to 200 employees, with the remaining 17.0% supervising over 200 individuals.

Well over one half of the respondents (58.6%) indicated they occupied a classified position in their state’s merit or civil service system. Slightly over one quarter (25.6%) of the sample reported occupying an appointed (i.e., political) position. A surprisingly large number indicated being employed by some other means than the normal categories (e.g., elected, appointed, merit). Upon investigation, it was discovered that other than some unusual contractual situations, many individuals employed in states such as Texas that does not have a merit system in the popular sense selected this category. Also, many individuals selected this category that described themselves as civil service appointees.

The seniority distribution among these public managers shows that only 17.8% have fewer than 10 years of service. The majority of the respondents (71.5%) reported between 10 and 29 years of service.

The general profile of this sample is that of a college educated and veteran work force. Most of them function in a people-service oriented organizational surrounded mostly by white males. Minorities and women comprise a relatively small portion of the sample.
Measuring Orientations Toward Public Service Professionalism and Political Acuity

As aforementioned, two professional socialization traits were thought to be found during the antecedent study (i.e., *Professionalism Index and Political Acuity*). These measures were discovered as the result of some structural analysis. In order to support, refine or refute their existence, similar measures were part of the questionnaire used for this study.

The items in question two was designed to measure the professionalism index. This is strictly a refinement of the measure in the original study. Since the discovery of what was believed to be a political acuity index was serendipitous, the item from the original study was significantly changed. The following sections describe the processes used to support, alter or refute their existence.

**Professionalism**

Question two (see Figure 2) contains three items designed to seek responses to items concerning training/education and professional activities. Each item was fitted with a four point Likert scale as shown in Figure 2.

- a. Public managers, regardless of their other educational background, need training and education in public administration

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

- b. Public managers should be familiar with the current developments in public administration

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

- c. Public managers should belong to one or more professional organizations that are concerned with public administration

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

The same statistical procedure used in the Kentucky study (i.e., *factor analysis*) was used to determine if the items in question two still held together as a single trait. The factor analysis was performed using the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS-X). Maximum Likelihood extraction was used to reduce the correlation matrix. As in the previous study the analysis yielded a one factor matrix. Table 7 below contains summary results of the factor analysis.
Table 7
Factor Analysis Summary Results for the Professionalism Items

**CORRELATION MATRIX:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V2A</th>
<th>V2B</th>
<th>V2C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V2A</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.5914</td>
<td>.3792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2B</td>
<td>.5914</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.4949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2C</td>
<td>.3792</td>
<td>.4949</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scree Plot

| E   | 1.982 | *     |
| T   |       |       |
| G   |       |       |
| N   |       |       |
| V   |       |       |
| A   |       |       |
| L   | .632  | *     |
| U   | .386  |       |
| S   | .000  | ---   |

One Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V2B</td>
<td>.8786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2A</td>
<td>.6730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2C</td>
<td>.5634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the initial study, it was decided not to use factor scores to construct the professionalism index. Factor scores are awkward when used as independent or reference variables because they are decimal fractions, both negative and positive. Integers function much better as references (Tatsuoka, 1971). Therefore, the following equation was used to calculate the index.

\[ PI = \text{RND}((2A + 2B + 2C)/3) \]

The frequency distribution in Table 8 shows the initial distribution of Professional Indices.
Again, the frequency distribution shown in Table 8 reveals that an extremely small number of the respondents fell in the lowest level. As in the initial study it was decided to collapse levels one and two into a single category, thus creating the final index shown in Table 9.

The titles Rejector, Ambivalent, and Enthusiast were again assigned to the three index levels. This three-level index is used throughout this report for professionalism measure. Whenever professionalism is used as a criterion, an adjusted factor score will be used. To eliminate negative values the factor scores have been converted to a distribution with a mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10.

Political Acuity

Daniel and Rose (1991) reported the identification of a trait thought to be part of the public administration professional socialization construct. Evidence for this inference was found among data collected as part of the initial survey of Kentucky state public administrators. Because of what seemed to be an important finding, an effort to better understand this phenomenon was made in the present study. To seek support for this trait—additional items were added to the questionnaire. The following items in the first section of the questionnaire were written expressly for this purpose.
I. As a state public administrator, how important do you believe it is to keep currently informed of the following? (Please circle appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Election voting patterns</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Public opinion poll results</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Legislators and their views</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Elected executives and their views</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Legislative candidates and their views</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Executive candidates and their views</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Specific policy issues e.g., educational, economic development, environmental</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Federal government grant programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Foreign affairs involving the U.S.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Public sector labor relations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Minority groups and their views on policy issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. General developments in the profession of public administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above items were analyzed, using the same factor analysis procedure as with the professionalism question. A priori, it was thought that the items found in question one shown above would all load heavy on a single factor (i.e., a political acuity factor). This was the case with an abbreviated question on the questionnaire used for the Kentucky study. However, this was not to be. Instead of a single factor, three (3) factors were found. Shown below in Table 10 are the summary results for these items.
Table 10
Factor Analysis Summary for The Political Acuity Items

**CORRELATION MATRIX:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>V1A</th>
<th>V1B</th>
<th>V1C</th>
<th>V1D</th>
<th>V1E</th>
<th>V1F</th>
<th>V1G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1A</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1B</td>
<td>0.51946</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1C</td>
<td>0.32728</td>
<td>0.33425</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1D</td>
<td>0.25492</td>
<td>0.25701</td>
<td>0.64715</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1E</td>
<td>0.41697</td>
<td>0.37660</td>
<td>0.46204</td>
<td>0.37679</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1F</td>
<td>0.36532</td>
<td>0.33124</td>
<td>0.37372</td>
<td>0.43589</td>
<td>0.76671</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1G</td>
<td>0.20216</td>
<td>0.21295</td>
<td>0.24012</td>
<td>0.24756</td>
<td>0.21400</td>
<td>0.23541</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1H</td>
<td>0.17665</td>
<td>0.18909</td>
<td>0.19174</td>
<td>0.16320</td>
<td>0.23340</td>
<td>0.19856</td>
<td>0.29126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1I</td>
<td>0.39113</td>
<td>0.30922</td>
<td>0.17129</td>
<td>0.16094</td>
<td>0.38248</td>
<td>0.34289</td>
<td>0.26363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1J</td>
<td>0.22871</td>
<td>0.20910</td>
<td>0.15572</td>
<td>0.18065</td>
<td>0.23121</td>
<td>0.23570</td>
<td>0.19555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1K</td>
<td>0.31391</td>
<td>0.33027</td>
<td>0.28285</td>
<td>0.26409</td>
<td>0.32219</td>
<td>0.32997</td>
<td>0.31526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L</td>
<td>0.16119</td>
<td>0.20817</td>
<td>0.12841</td>
<td>0.13461</td>
<td>0.22701</td>
<td>0.23720</td>
<td>0.18241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scree Plot for Item One**

```
 4.261 + *
 3.187 + *
 2.9591 1.00000
 1.325 + .36760 .46187 1.00000
 1.00000
```
Varimax Rotated Factor Loadings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.65546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.61079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.54187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.39896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.39744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1D</td>
<td></td>
<td>.76795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1E</td>
<td>.93129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1F</td>
<td>.68130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The item groupings on the three factors appear to make sense—see Table 11, consequently it was felt that the theoretical model should be refined to accommodate this finding as shown in Figure 3. Further, the four null hypotheses should be altered as follows to represent these findings.

Table 11
Political Acuity Factors

Factor One (Socio-political)

- Minority groups and their views on policy issues
- Public sector labor relations
- Foreign affairs involving the U.S.
- General developments in the profession of Public Administration
- Election voting patterns
- Public opinion poll results

Factor Two (Political Activity)

- Legislative candidates and their views
- Executive candidates and their views

Factor Three (Political Function)

- Elected executives and their views
- Legislators and their views
Figure 3
State Administrators' Orientations Toward Public Service Professionalism: Refined Conceptualization of Research

**Independent Variables**
- Participation in Public Service Education Management Training Programs
- Typological Variations: University based MPA programs, Consortium based CPM programs, Other In-House Management Training Programs for:
  - Top Management Officials
  - Middle Management Personnel
  - Supervisory Personnel

**Mediating Variables**
- Orientations Toward Public Service Training/Education
  - Perceived Job-relatedness of Public Service Training/Education
  - Involvement with Public Service Professional Organizations
  - Interactions with Public Service Educators/Training
  - Image of Administrative Training Institutions
  - Participation in Continuing Education Activities
- Career Goals in Public Service
  - Perceived Commitment of Peers Toward Public Service Values
  - Comparative Perceptions of Other Professionals in Public Service
  - Role Expectations of Hierarchical Decision-Makers

**Contextual Variables** (State Agency Administrative Culture)
- Public Image of State Public Service
- Level of Institutionalization of the Merit System
- Ombudsman Role of Elected Officials
- Representativeness of State Bureaucracies
- Politicization of Public Service Groups
- University-State Administrative Relationships
- Institutional Reward System
- Status of Non-Merit Personnel

**Dependent Variables**
- Professional Socialization
- Political Agency
  - Socio-Political Activity: Low, Medium, High
  - Political Function: Low, High

**Orientations Toward Professionalism**
- Enthusiast
- Ambivalent
- Rejector
H-1. Participation in management/training education of the state administrators will not correlate with orientations toward public service professionalism, socio-political, political activity and political function attitudes.

H-2. Quantitative variations of professionalism, socio-political, political activity and political function attitudes will not influence administrators' perception of the saliency of management/training education in public service.

H-3. Variations in the delivery systems for training/education for state administrators will not influence public service professionalism, socio-political, political activity and political function attitudes.

H-4. Typologies of state administrative cultures, ethnicity and gender are not significant mediating variables influencing public service professionalism, socio-political, political activity and political function attitudes.

Indices were created for the three factors or constructs were created by the following formulae.

\[ SPI = RND((V1A + V1B + V1I + V1J + V1K + V1L)/6) \quad \text{Socio-Political} \]
\[ PAI = RND((V1E + V1F)/2) \quad \text{Political-Activity} \]
\[ PFI = RND((V1C + V1D)/2) \quad \text{Political-Function} \]

Frequency distributions were generated for the three indices are shown in Table 12 below.

Table 12
Frequency Distributions for the Political Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Political Acuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1394</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3684</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5980</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Activity Acuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2808</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5980</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Function Acuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5980</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unlike the professionalism distribution and the original Political Acuity distribution, two of these factors do not appear to be distributed over an essentially, three level index. As shown in Table 12, the Socio-Political and Political-Function factors seem to be two level indices. There, it was decided to alter the Socio-Political and Political Functions factors to become dichotomies, the Political-Activity to become a three level index. For the Socio-Political index; levels one and two were collapsed to become the first category, while levels three and four were collapsed into the other category. The result of this action is illustrated in Table 13 below.

Table 13 Socio-Political Acuity Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low SPA</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium SPA</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4317</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5980</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Political-Function index; levels one, two and three were collapsed into the first category, while level four became the second category. The result of this action is illustrated in Table 14 below.

Table 14 Political-Function Acuity Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low PFA</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium PFA</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2808</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High PFA</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5980</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, for the Political-Activity index; levels one and two were collapsed to become level one, level three became level two and level four became level three. The result of this action is illustrated in Table 15 below.

Table 15 Political-Activity Acuity Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low PAA</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium PAA</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4010</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>5980</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above indices will be used throughout this report as independent measures. When one is all of the political acuity measures are used as the criteria, an adjusted factor score will be used. To eliminate negative values the factor scores have been converted to a distribution with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10.

Test of Independence of Professionalism and Political Acuity Indices

As with the Kentucky study it was felt that the items in questions one and two should be measuring unique latent traits. To determine the likelihood of this condition tests of independence were performed. R²'s were computed for all possible combinations of the professionalism and political acuity measures. The results are displayed in Table 16 below.

Table 16
R²'s for the Professionalism and Political Acuity Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Socio-Political</th>
<th>Political Activity</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Political</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political-Activity</td>
<td>.0048</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political-Function</td>
<td>.0087</td>
<td>.0044</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>.1756</td>
<td>.0206</td>
<td>.0027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The extremely low R²'s indicate that these traits seem to be independent of one another. The Socio-Political and Professionalism measures share more common variance than any of other combinations, and this only represents approximately 18%. Therefore, it seems safe to assume that for the most part these measures represent independent traits of the professional socialization process.
VI
TESTING OF THE RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The treatment of the data needed to test the four hypotheses are reported in this section. For all tests of significance the critical alpha value will be .05. *High means approach agreement and importance, and low means approach disagreement and unimportance.* In the case of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), only those univariate and stepdown tables needed to explain statistically significant differences will be presented.

H-1. Participation in management/training education of state administrators will not correlate with orientations toward service professionalism, socio-political, political activity and political function attitudes. To test this hypothesis, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed. The dependent variables were the professionalism and the three political acuity indices. The independent variable was the training variable *(i.e., trained and untrained).* Table 17 below contains the results of the multivariate $F$ test.

**Table 17**
Multivariate Test of Significance Professionalism, Socio-Political, Political-Activity and Political-Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Exact $F$</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of $F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.01578</td>
<td>22.62855</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5646.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.01603</td>
<td>22.62855</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5646.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.98422</td>
<td>22.62855</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5646.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roys</td>
<td>.01578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $F$ statistics are exact.

Table 17 indicates that a statistically significant difference does exist between managers that have received training *(i.e., academic and training)* and those that have not had any management training. In order to determine where the differences exist, univariate and stepdown $F$ test were performed. Table 18 below contains the results from these tests.

**Table 18**
Univariate and Stepdown Tests of Significance for Professionalism, Socio-Political, Political-Activity and Political-Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypoth. SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>Hypoth. MS</th>
<th>ErrorMS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig. of $F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>5868.91293</td>
<td>458163.495</td>
<td>5868.91293</td>
<td>81.10524</td>
<td>72.36170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol-At</td>
<td>137.07440</td>
<td>535137.498</td>
<td>137.07440</td>
<td>94.73137</td>
<td>1.44698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc-Pl</td>
<td>3092.94476</td>
<td>399550.080</td>
<td>3092.94476</td>
<td>70.72935</td>
<td>43.72930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol-Fc</td>
<td>92.46763</td>
<td>415884.525</td>
<td>92.46763</td>
<td>73.62091</td>
<td>1.25600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in Table 18, the univariate test indicates that the statistical differences (at alpha .05) do exist between the trained and untrained managers on the Professionalism and Socio-Political measures. In order to determine if any of the relationships exist among the dependent measures, all possible orders of the dependent measures were tested. The stepdown table that seems to be present the most parsimonious results is also presented in Table 18. As can be seen, even though the Political-Activity was not found to be statistically significant by the univariate $F$ test, when the influence of the Professionalism measure was partialled out this measure became significant. Consequently, it seems that changes in the Professionalism measure is causing opposite sympathetic changes in the Political-Activity measure. This condition probably means that as an individual's realization of the need for professional training increases, one feels it less important to maintain an interest in political activity going on outside of government (see Table 19 below).

### Table 19
**Cell Means and Standard Deviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Socio-Political Index</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>49.249</td>
<td>8.380</td>
<td>2813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>50.729</td>
<td>8.440</td>
<td>2838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td>49.992</td>
<td>8.442</td>
<td>5651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Political-Activity Index</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>50.152</td>
<td>9.819</td>
<td>2813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>49.840</td>
<td>9.647</td>
<td>2838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td>49.995</td>
<td>9.733</td>
<td>5651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Political-Function Index</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>49.882</td>
<td>8.675</td>
<td>2813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>50.138</td>
<td>8.485</td>
<td>2838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td>50.010</td>
<td>8.580</td>
<td>5651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Professionalism Index</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>48.991</td>
<td>9.011</td>
<td>2813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>51.029</td>
<td>9.001</td>
<td>2838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td>50.014</td>
<td>9.063</td>
<td>5651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, null hypothesis one can be rejected for the Professionalism and Socio-Political measures but not for the Political-Activity and Political-Function measures. However, a relationship does seem to exist between Professionalism and Political-Activity that is not affected by training.
H-2. Quantitative variations of professionalism, socio-political, political-activity and political-function will not influence administrators' perception of the saliency of management/training education in public service. Question four shown below lists a number of specific objectives of public service education/training.

4. Currently management training programs for public managers typically include a number of specific objectives. Listed below are some of these objective. In your opinion, please indicate how relevant these objectives are to the work of public managers (Please circle the appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly Relevant</th>
<th>Not Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. To enhance awareness of self and others</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. To examine the use of managerial time</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. To increase insight into managerial behavior and its effect on others</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. To identify the need for employee and organization development</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. To increase understanding of leadership styles</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. To examine communication concepts relative to leadership effectiveness</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. To understand when group decision making/consensus is appropriate</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. To understand the need to identify criteria for establishment of goals</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. To understand the need for objectives</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. To develop ethical standards related to management practices</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. To understand factors that contribute to a climate for self motivation</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. To develop approaches to integrating career and life strategies</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to reduce the data the items in this question were factor analyzed and it was discovered that they were measuring two traits of the underlying structure. Table 20 below contains the varimax rotated factor matrix.
Table 20
Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix for Question Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V4C</td>
<td>.65609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4E</td>
<td>.64844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4F</td>
<td>.58591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4D</td>
<td>.58335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4A</td>
<td>.57560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4K</td>
<td>.54306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4L</td>
<td>.54019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4G</td>
<td>.47788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4B</td>
<td>.47546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4H</td>
<td>.84731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4I</td>
<td>.80454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On examination it was felt that factor one (1) was measuring attitudes toward the relevance of training for organizational and people skills, while factor two (2) measured attitudes toward the relevance of training in goal and objective setting. Therefore, factor one was named organization training and factor two was named objective training. As with the professionalism and acuity measures the factor scores were converted to a distribution with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. These two measures are used as the dependent variables for this hypothesis, while the Professionalism and Political indices are used as the independent or reference variables. One-way MANOVAs were executed as the design tests.

Table 21 below contains the results for the Professionalism Index.

Table 21
MANOVA for Organization Training and Objective Training by Professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECT: Professionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 2, M = -1/2, N = 2836 1/2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.15779</td>
<td>243.08445</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11352.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.18735</td>
<td>265.75946</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11348.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.84221</td>
<td>254.40301</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11350.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roys</td>
<td>.15779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F statistic for WILK's Lambda is exact.

Univariate F-tests with (2,5676) D. F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var Hypoth. SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>Hypoth. MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org 56596.2214</td>
<td>390253.501</td>
<td>28298.1107</td>
<td>68.75502</td>
<td>411.57882</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj 22433.3714</td>
<td>440530.874</td>
<td>11216.6857</td>
<td>77.61291</td>
<td>144.52088</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the above table, statistical differences were found for both criteria (i.e., Organization and Objective measures). The dependent variables were rotated and stepdown F tests were performed. However, no relation between the two was found. In order to determine the magnitude and direction of these differences Scheffe Multiple Range tests were performed. Table 22 contains these results.
Table 22
Scheffe Multiple Tests for Organization and Objective by Professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization By Professionalism Index</th>
<th>G G G</th>
<th>r r r</th>
<th>p p p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.5801</td>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.5249</td>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.3700</td>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective By Professionalism Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G G G</th>
<th>r r r</th>
<th>p p p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.5476</td>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.7117</td>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.7230</td>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grp1=Rejector Grp2=Ambivalent Grp3=Enthusiast

As shown above all of the groups differed significantly from one another on both criteria. In each case the higher the level of the Professional Index, the greater the need for organizational and objective/goal setting training was reported.

Table 23 below contains the results for the Socio-Political Acuity Index.

Table 23
MANOVA for Organization and Objective Training by Socio-Political Acuity Index

| EFFECT Socio-Political Multivariate Tests of Significance (s = 1, M = 0, N = 2771) |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Test Name | Value | Exact F Hypoth. DF | Error DF | Sig. of F |
| Pillais .09291 | 283.92938 | 2.00 | 5544.00 | .000 |
| Hotellings .10243 | 283.92938 | 2.00 | 5544.00 | .000 |
| Wilks .90709 | 283.92938 | 2.00 | 5544.00 | .000 |
| Roys .09291 |

Note: F statistics are exact.

EFFECT Socio-Political

Univariate F-tests with (1,5545) D. F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var Hypoth. SS</th>
<th>Error SS Hypoth. MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org 34722.8281</td>
<td>403856.692 34722.8281</td>
<td>72.83259</td>
<td>476.74852</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj 10424.2131</td>
<td>443464.329 10424.2131</td>
<td>79.97553</td>
<td>130.34253</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen above, the results for Socio-Political Acuity are the same as for the Professionalism Index. To determine the direction and magnitude of the observed differences, means and standard deviations were generated for both criteria (see Table 24 below). The high Socio-Political Acuity group were found reporting significantly greater positive attitudes toward the appropriateness of organization and objective training.

Table 24
Cell Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>45.660</td>
<td>9.288</td>
<td>1401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>51.418</td>
<td>8.264</td>
<td>4146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td>49.964</td>
<td>8.938</td>
<td>5547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Political-Activity reference was the next test performed. Table 25 contains the results of the MANOVA.

Table 25
MANOVA of Organization and Objective Training by Political-Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.06652</td>
<td>96.50503</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11220.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.07126</td>
<td>99.90792</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11216.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.93348</td>
<td>98.20627</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11218.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's</td>
<td>.06652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F statistic for WILK'S Lambda is exact.

Univariate F-tests with (2,5610) D. F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Hypoth. SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>Hypoth. MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>25105.9520</td>
<td>417659.454</td>
<td>12552.9760</td>
<td>74.44910</td>
<td>168.61152</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj</td>
<td>7402.29564</td>
<td>449038.809</td>
<td>3701.14782</td>
<td>80.04257</td>
<td>46.23974</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen above, the results for Political-Activity are the same as for the Professionalism and Socio-Political Acuity Indices. To determine the direction and magnitude of the observed differences, Scheffe multiple range tests were performed for both criteria (see Table 26 below).
Table 25
Scheffe Multiple Range Tests for Organization and Objective Training by Political-Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G G G</td>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r r r</td>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p p p</td>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.0722</td>
<td>49.8327</td>
<td>52.9188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>* *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G G G</td>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r r r</td>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p p p</td>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48.4225</td>
<td>49.9205</td>
<td>51.5971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grp 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grp 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grp 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>* *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, all of the groups differed significantly from one another on both criteria. In each case the higher the level of the Political-Activity Acuity Index the greater the need for organizational and objective/goal setting training was reported.

The last reference to be tested is the Political-Function Acuity Index. Table 27 contains the results of the MANOVA.

Table 27
MANOVA Organization and Objective Training by Political-Function

**EFFECT - Political-Function**

**Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 0, N = 2831)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Exact F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.02733</td>
<td>79.56431</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5664.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.02809</td>
<td>79.56431</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5664.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.97267</td>
<td>79.56431</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5664.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roys</td>
<td>.02733</td>
<td>79.56431</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5664.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F statistics are exact.

**Univariate F-tests with (1,5665) D. F.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Hypoth. SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>Hypoth. MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Org</td>
<td>9200.58883</td>
<td>437934.570</td>
<td>79200.58883</td>
<td>119.01628</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj</td>
<td>4528.69704</td>
<td>457308.279</td>
<td>4528.69704</td>
<td>56.10016</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, as can be seen above, the outcome of these tests echoed the outcomes for...
the first three reference variables (i.e., Professionalism, Socio-Political and Political-Activity). The means and standard deviations shown in Table 28 below show the High Political-Function Acuity group placing greater importance on the need and appropriateness for organization and objective training.

Table 28
Cell Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>48.146</td>
<td>8.911</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>50.870</td>
<td>8.735</td>
<td>3833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td>49.988</td>
<td>8.883</td>
<td>5667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>48.704</td>
<td>9.257</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>50.615</td>
<td>8.852</td>
<td>3833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td>49.996</td>
<td>9.028</td>
<td>5667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the statistical significance found for the four design tests above, hypothesis two (2) is rejected.

H-3. Variations in the delivery systems for training/education for state administrators will not influence public service professionalism, Socio-Political, Political-Activity and Political-Function attitudes. As for the first hypothesis, Professionalism and the three Political acuities are used as the dependent variables for this hypothesis. The type of training/education represents the reference or independent variable. Table 29 below contains the results for the MANOVA executed for this hypothesis.

Table 29
MANOVA Results for Professionalism, Socio-Political, Political-Activity and Political-Function

**EFFECT - Training/education Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multivariate Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.02945</td>
<td>7.02233</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>8499.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.03017</td>
<td>7.11344</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>8489.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.97063</td>
<td>7.07193</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>7490.41</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roye</td>
<td>.02623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate F-tests with (3,2834) D. F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Hypoth. SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>Hypoth. MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pol-At</td>
<td>3248.92765</td>
<td>2070751.212</td>
<td>1082.97588</td>
<td>92.00819</td>
<td>11.77043</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol-Fc</td>
<td>510.75655</td>
<td>203752.322</td>
<td>710.25218</td>
<td>71.89567</td>
<td>2.36805</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>3438.32015</td>
<td>226410.041</td>
<td>1146.10672</td>
<td>79.89063</td>
<td>14.34595</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc-Pl</td>
<td>24.80469</td>
<td>202044.088</td>
<td>8.26823</td>
<td>71.29390</td>
<td>.11598</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The significance tests results shown above indicate significance differences for the Political-Activity and Professionalism criteria. A phenomenon similar to which occurred for hypothesis one (1) was discovered during the stepdown tests. That is, a measure not found to be significant on the ANOVA (i.e., Political-Function Acuity) became significant when the common variance shared with the Political-Activity Acuity measure was partialled out. As before, there seems to be a negative relation existing between the Political-Activity and Political-Function measures. As one increases in strength the other tends to diminish. To determine the magnitude and direction of the two differences noted on the ANOVAs, Scheffe multiple range tests shown in Table 30 were calculated.

Table 30
Scheffe Multiple Range Tests for Political-Activity and Professionalism by Nature of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Political-Activity</th>
<th>Professionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M O B C</td>
<td>M O B C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P T A P</td>
<td>T F A P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A H C M</td>
<td>H A C M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E H</td>
<td>E H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A R E</td>
<td>R A E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N L</td>
<td>N L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D R O</td>
<td>R D O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Group

49.0247 MPA AND/
49.9572 OTHER RE
50.3432 BACHELOR
52.5366 CPM **

Mean Group

50.4137 OTHER RE
50.6879 MPA AND/
51.2914 BACHELOR
54.1764 CPM **
As can be seen in Table 30, the CPM group reports significantly stronger measures of Professionalism and Political-Activity Acuity than do their academically educated counterparts. This is an unexpected outcome not explainable given the present data. Because of the test results, the null hypothesis three (3) is rejected for the political-Activity and Professionalism measures.

H-4 Typologies of state administrative cultures, ethnicity and gender are not significant mediating variables influencing public service professionalism, socio-political, political-activity and political-function attitudes. Dependent measures to be tested for this hypothesis are once again the Professionalism and Political Acuity measures. The three independent variables are Elazar’s Typologies, ethnicity and gender.

Elazar (1984) proposed eight different types of political culture and has classified the 50 states to fall in one of these eight different dominant political cultures. Table 31 shows the contour of political culture in the United States as proposed by Elazar.

**Table 31**

**Classification of American States by Political Culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Culture</th>
<th>States Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moralistic</td>
<td>Oregon, Utah, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Dakota, Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin, Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont, Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moralistic-Individualistic</td>
<td>Washington, Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montana, South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa, New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California, Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic-Moralistic</td>
<td>New York, Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nebraska, Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhode Island, Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic</td>
<td>Nevada, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delaware, Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic-Traditionalistic</td>
<td>Hawaii, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionalistic-Individualistic</td>
<td>Kentucky, West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florida, New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas, Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table continued on Next Page
Traditionalistic
Alabama, Arkansas
Georgia, Louisiana
South Carolina, Tennessee
Mississippi, Virginia

Traditionalistic-Moralistic
Arizona, North Carolina

As with the previous hypotheses, one-way MANOVAs will be used as the design tests. Table 32 below contains the results of the MANOVA for Typology.

Table 32
MANOVA Professional, Socio-Political, Political-Function by Elazar's Typologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Pillais</th>
<th>Hotellings</th>
<th>Wilks</th>
<th>Roys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.03324</td>
<td>0.03382</td>
<td>0.96703</td>
<td>0.02238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypoth. DF</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error DF</td>
<td>22232.00</td>
<td>22214.00</td>
<td>20030.26</td>
<td>20030.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. of F</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen above, statistical significance was found to exist for all of the criteria. The stepdown procedure did not detect any relationships between the dependent measures. Because of the multiple levels of the typology, it was necessary to perform multiple range tests. As before, the Scheffe procedure was used and the results are displayed in Table 33 below.

Table 33
Scheffe Multiple Range Tests for Professionalism, Socio-Political, Political-Activity and Political-Function by Elazar's Typologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vari</th>
<th>Hypoth. SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>Hypoth. MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soc-P 1</td>
<td>2595.49526</td>
<td>391208.230</td>
<td>370.78504</td>
<td>70.38651</td>
<td>5.26784</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol-At</td>
<td>3652.04269</td>
<td>519268.656</td>
<td>1137.74173</td>
<td>93.42725</td>
<td>12.17784</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol-Fc</td>
<td>4247.45049</td>
<td>504288.945</td>
<td>304.99821</td>
<td>72.74000</td>
<td>4.19299</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>4017.43023</td>
<td>450282.063</td>
<td>573.91860</td>
<td>81.01512</td>
<td>7.08409</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * *

Table Continued on Next Page
The multiple range test for the Socio-Political Acuity measure indicated that significant differences exist between the Traditionalistic states (i.e., Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia) and the Traditionalistic-Moralistic states (i.e., Arizona, North Carolina) and the Moralistic-Individualistic states (i.e., Washington, Idaho, Montana, South Dakota, Iowa, New Hampshire, California, Kansas). As can be seen above, the mean for the Traditionalistic group mean was greater than the means for the Traditionalistic-Moralistic and Moralistic-Individualistic groups. This indicates that public administrators in the Traditionalistic group feel more important to keep current on matters concerning social and political environment of their state and nation. The Individualistic-Traditionalistic states (i.e.,
Hawaii, Missouri) had the greatest mean value of any group for this measure, however, statistical significance was not found. This was probably due to unequal standard deviations.

The multiple range test for the Political-Activity Acuity measure indicated that significant differences exist between the Traditionalistic-Individualistic states (i.e., Kentucky, West Virginia, Florida, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma) and the Individualistic-Moralistic states (i.e., New York, Wyoming, Nebraska, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut); between the Traditionalistic-Moralistic states (i.e., Arizona, North Carolina), and the Individualistic-Moralistic and Individualistic states (i.e., Nevada, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Alaska); between the Traditionalistic states, and the other groups with the exception of the Traditionalistic and Traditionalistic-Moralistic states. The mean values for the Traditionalistic-Individualistic, Traditionalistic-Moralistic and Traditionalistic groups indicate that these states report a greater awareness of political behavior outside government than do their administrator counterparts in the states they differ from.

The multiple range test for the Political-Function Acuity measure indicated that significant differences exist between the Traditionalistic states, the Moralistic-Individualistic and Individualistic-Traditionalistic groups. The mean values indicate that administrators in the Traditionalistic states do not place as much importance on being current of the activities of elected officials (i.e., both executive and legislative). This seems to be true even for those groups they do not differ from statistically.

The multiple range test for the Professionalism measure indicated that significant differences exist between the Traditionalistic states, and the Moralistic-Individualistic, Individualistic, Moralistic and Individualistic-Moralistic states. Administrators in the Traditionalistic group report a higher commitment toward the need for training/education than do those states they differ from.

Overall, the Traditionalistic group reported stronger attitudes toward the Socio-Political, Political-Activity and Professionalism traits; and a weaker attitude toward the Political-Function trait than do their administrator counterparts. It should be pointed out that the states that compose the Traditionalistic group, all are located in the U.S. southeast. This area has probably remained more steadfast toward the notion of running one's own affairs, thus possibly explaining what seems to be the uniqueness of the consistent differences between them and the groups they differ from.

Table 34 below contains the MANOVA results for ethnicity.
Table 34
MANOVA for Socio-Political, Political-Activity, Political-Function and Professionalism by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.05145</td>
<td>17.90319</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>21984.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.05393</td>
<td>18.50913</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>21966.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.94869</td>
<td>18.23914</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16782.03</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's</td>
<td>.04852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate F-tests with (4,4946) D.F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Hypoth. SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>Hypoth. MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soc-P 1</td>
<td>17747.7445</td>
<td>370986.971</td>
<td>4436.93613</td>
<td>67.50127</td>
<td>65.73115</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>5163.48523</td>
<td>441865.609</td>
<td>1290.87131</td>
<td>80.39767</td>
<td>16.05608</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol-Fc</td>
<td>603.01529</td>
<td>395792.469</td>
<td>150.75382</td>
<td>72.01464</td>
<td>2.09338</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol-At</td>
<td>2042.94163</td>
<td>518948.935</td>
<td>510.73541</td>
<td>94.42302</td>
<td>5.40901</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, statistical differences were found to exist for the Socio-Political, Professionalism and Political-Activity measures because of ethnicity. To understand the direction and magnitude of the observed differences Scheffe multiple range tests were produced. Table 35 below contains the range test results.

Table 35
Scheffe Multiple Range Tests for Socio-Political, Professionalism and Political-Activity by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Political</th>
<th>By Ethnicity</th>
<th>NATIVE A</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>ASIAN OR</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>AFRICAN-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>ARC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.4996</td>
<td>NATIVE A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.4652</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.6226</td>
<td>ASIAN OR</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.1922</td>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.0047</td>
<td>AFRICAN-</td>
<td>** **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Continued on Next Page
As can be seen in Table 35, African-Americans have the greatest means for all three statistically significant criteria (i.e., Socio-Political, Political-Activity and Professionalism). African-Americans also differ significantly from Whites and Asian or Pacific Islanders on the three criteria; and differ from Native Americans and Hispanics on the Socio-Political. It was also found that Asian or Pacific Islanders (mean = 51.6226) differ from Whites (mean = 49.4652) on the Socio-Political measure. Hispanics (mean = 54.1922) differ from Native Americans (mean = 47.4996) and Whites (mean = 49.4652) on the Socio-Political measure. A difference was also noted between Hispanics (mean = 52.0652) and Whites (mean = 49.7279) on the Professionalism measure. Overall, it seems that all of the minority ethnic groups place greater importance toward becoming more professional, and more politically acute. The reason might possibly be feeling outside the colloquial “loop”.

The MANOVA results to test for possible gender differences on the criteria are shown in Table 36 below.
Table 36
MANOVA Socio-Political, Political-Activity, Political Function and Professionalism

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 1, N = 2772)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Exact F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.04372</td>
<td>63.38802</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5546.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.04572</td>
<td>63.38802</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5546.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.95628</td>
<td>63.38802</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5546.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's</td>
<td>.04372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F statistics are exact.

EFFECT: Gender

Univariate F-tests with (1, 5549) D. F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Hypoth. SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>Hypoth. MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soc-Pl</td>
<td>7968.97076</td>
<td>385126.671</td>
<td>69.40470</td>
<td>114.81889</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>1090.03062</td>
<td>454811.276</td>
<td>1090.03062</td>
<td>81.96275</td>
<td>13.29910</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol-At</td>
<td>13309.56845</td>
<td>12703.512</td>
<td>13309.56840</td>
<td>92.39566</td>
<td>144.04972</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol-Fc</td>
<td>41.47053</td>
<td>407811.238</td>
<td>41.47053</td>
<td>73.49274</td>
<td>.56428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roy-Bargman Stepdown F-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Hypoth. MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>StepDown F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soc-Pl</td>
<td>7968.97076</td>
<td>69.40470</td>
<td>114.81889</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5549</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>50.36387</td>
<td>67.91051</td>
<td>.74162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5548</td>
<td>.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol-At</td>
<td>12198.69010</td>
<td>90.72180</td>
<td>134.46262</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5547</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol-Fc</td>
<td>55.60319</td>
<td>72.66592</td>
<td>.76519</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5546</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, statistically significant differences were found to exist because of gender for the Socio-Political, Professionalism and Political-Activity criteria. Further, the stepdown F tests indicate that a significant relationship seems to exist between the Socio-Political and Professionalism measures. As can be seen in the stepdown table, when the mutual variance is partialled out, the Professionalism measure is significant. Since the converse is not true (i.e., Professionalism appearing first), suggests that becoming politically acute causes a differing affect on attitudes of either males or females. The present data will not allow the determination of which gender this impacts.

To learn the direction and magnitude of the statistical differences, means and standard deviations were generated for the significant criteria and are shown in Table 37 below.

Table 37
Means and Standards Deviations for Socio-Political, Professionalism and Political-Activity by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable .. Socio-Political</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>49.170</td>
<td>8.397</td>
<td>3885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>51.785</td>
<td>8.176</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For entire sample</td>
<td>49.955</td>
<td>8.416</td>
<td>5551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The means in Table 37 above indicate that females administrators report stronger attitudes toward the three criteria than do their male counterparts. The greatest difference occurring on the Political-Activity measure.

Because of the statistical differences noted above, hypothesis four (4) is rejected. Administrative cultures, ethnicity and gender are shown by these data to strongly impact attitudes toward Professionalism and the three Political Acuity measures.

It might seem that the number of statistical differences found for all four of the hypotheses is unusually large, and is probably the result of the large sample being analyzed. This condition is probably true, however by submitting the measures to treatment by analysis of variance—it is felt that some relationships have been uncovered that might have gone unnoticed if only means and standard deviations along with other descriptives had been used. Nevertheless, these analyses have produced evidence that tends to support the refined professional socialization model being tested. More will be said about this in the next and concluding section.
VII
Findings and Conclusions

This study was based upon a conceptual model of professional socialization (see Figure 2) of state public administrators. Mailing lists were obtained and/or created from various sources for the fifty states and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Administrators that had completed certified public manager (CPM) programs and academic programs (e.g., MPA) were identified by several states and universities.

A self reporting mail questionnaire was constructed and used to collect these data. Nearly 20,000 administrators were mailed questionnaires and nearly 6,000 usable questionnaires were returned for a 35.4% return rate. These data (see codebook Appendix II) were used to test the four null hypotheses.

Findings

Structural Analysis. As aforementioned, the study was designed according to the parameters described by the conceptual model. Primarily, the structural analysis was concerned with determining if these data supported the two dependent conceptual variables (i.e., Professionalism and Political Acuity).

These data supported the Professionalism trait. That is, responses to the items used to measure this trait supported its existence. A maximum likelihood factor analysis of these items produced a one factor matrix as expected. Two products were created from the factor analysis as shown below.

- Professionalism Factor Scores
- A Professionalism Reference Index

The factor scores were used as a dependent measure, for three of the four hypotheses, while the index was used as a reference variable for one hypothesis.

The items designed to measure the Political Acuity trait produced an unexpected result when factor analyzed. Instead of a single factor being produced as expected—three (3) factors were found to exist, and each made sense. As a result, the conceptual model (see Figure 3) and the null hypotheses were altered to reflect this finding. The three new political acuity constructs were assigned the following appropriate names.

- Socio-Political
- Political-Activity
- Political-Function

The Socio-Political construct appears to be measuring the importance that state public administrators place on knowing about the current social climate as impacted by the political circumstance; the Political-Activity construct appears to be measuring...
interest toward the conduct of political candidates; while, the Political-Function construct seems to be measuring interest shown toward the manners of elected officials. *A posteriori,* this finding was viewed as important for future study. As with Professionalism, factor scores and indices were constructed to be used in the various design analyses.

Question four (4) on the questionnaire was design to collect opinions of how relevant a number of training/education topics commonly found as part of management programs were to the professional socialization of state public administrators.

An initial design test (*i.e.*, MANOVA) using these items produced results that seemed to indicate that all were measuring the same trait. Though not part of the original design, knowledge of this condition appeared to warrant some structural analysis. A maximum likelihood factor analysis was made of these items and two traits were found to exist. One seemed to be measuring the relevance of developing organization and/or people skills, while the second trait seemed to measuring the relevance of developing objective/goal setting skills. Consequently, factor scores were produced for the two traits and were used as dependent variables in the appropriate design analyses.

**Design Analyses.** Overall, it can be stated that these data supported the conceptual model. Analysis of variance routines were used as the design tests, even though the sample was very large. Statistics of this sophistication are generally not needed when dealing with large samples; however, information gained by analyzing the multivariate space did produce some information that probably would not have been manifest if only means, standard deviations and non-metric statistics had been used as the design tests.

While it was discovered that training and/or education does impact the measures of Professionalism and Socio-Political Acuity in a positive manner, when the training category was further broken down as to type, additional and interesting information was generated. For whatever reason those respondents identified as certified public managers generally reported stronger positive attitudes toward the Professionalism and the three Political Acuity measures. It is imaged that as the strength of the attitudes shown toward these criteria increases, so does the degree of professional socialization. And somehow this increase has occurred because of the experience of becoming a certified public manager.

If these observed differences are the result of the CPM experience, then it might behoove university based MPA programs to become acquainted with what brings about this success. The present data is not capable of this determination. Before it can be determined whether these differences exist because of the CPM experience or because of other mediating variables, it probably would not be wise to significantly alter present MPA curriculum.
A number of differences were noted as the result of the administrative culture as defined by Elazar. However, one group of states (i.e., the Traditionalistics) were found to generally vary from the other eight groups to a greater degree. They usually reported more positive attitudes toward Professionalism, Socio-Political and Political-Activity than did their counterparts in the other administrative culture typologies. Of course these differences probably exist regardless of any training and/or academic influences — however, knowledge of the antecedents might be important for training directors and academic deans to understand.

Moreover, minority and female administrators generally reported attitudes that imply a greater degree of socialization than reported by their majority and male counterparts.

Professionalism and the three Political Acuteness indices were used as independent variables to test their affect toward the relevance of organizational and objective/goal setting skill development. No surprises were found, that is as the index level of each of the four indices increased, a corresponding increase was noted for both skill areas.

Conclusions

The preliminary findings reported here, seem to support the conceptual model, and in one instance provided information for refinement (i.e., Political Acuteness) of the model. Thus, given these results, the researchers feel that the present conceptual model can be used with confidence as an important tool for the design of future research, and for the design of diagnostics for the evaluation of administrator behavior, as well as training and education efforts.

Lastly, the results suggest that further research is needed to better understand the positive influences believed to exist for CPM training; why minority and female respondents generally reported greater levels of professional socialization; and furthermore why the same is true for the traditionalistic states.

As declared earlier, only part of the total data collected was analyzed and reported here. Analyses will continue until these data are exhausted.
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PUBLIC MANAGER QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Public Manager:

Here's hoping that the THIRD TIME is charm. You may recall that on two previous occasions I mailed you a survey questionnaire in connection with a National Science Foundation sponsored project. It may be remembered that this survey focuses on training and education of public employees. Specifically, it asked about types of training and education experience and their results.

To date I have received over four thousand responses from public managers in the fifty states and Puerto Rico. According to our records we are unfortunate in not having heard from you. Your response to this survey is vital, and will contribute to the knowledge that this project aims to generate.

If you have any questions about the project, please call Dr. Jack Rose at (502) 227-6500.

I thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Dr. Cassie Osborne, Jr., Director
Research Center for Public and International Policy

SECTION I: General Knowledge and Skills

1. As a state public administrator, how important do you believe it is to keep currently informed of the following? (Please circle appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Election voting patterns</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Public opinion poll results</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Legislators and their views</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Elected executives and their views</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Legislative candidates and their views</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Executive candidates and their views</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Specific policy issues e.g., educational, economic development, environmental</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Federal government grant programs</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Foreign affairs involving the U.S.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Public sector labor relations</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Minority groups and their views on policy issues</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. General developments in the profession of public administration</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Here are some statements that have been made about public managers as professionals. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of these statements. (Please circle appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Public managers, regardless of their other educational background, need training and education in public administration</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Public managers should be familiar with the current developments in public administration</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2 continued on the next page.
3. The following lists some skills topics that relate to workshops frequently offered as part of management workshops. Please indicate the extent you feel training in these areas would contribute to your growth as a public manager. (Please circle appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Extent</th>
<th>Little Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Assertiveness</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Team Building</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Business English</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Stress Management</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Presentation Skills</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Professional Image</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Writing Reports and Proposals</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Reading Effectiveness</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Writing Better Letters and Memos</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Negotiation Techniques</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Labor Relation Strategies</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Currently management training programs for public managers typically include a number of specific objectives. Listed below are some of these objectives. In your opinion, please indicate how relevant these objectives are to the work of public managers. (Please circle appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Relevant</th>
<th>Not Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. To enhance awareness of self and others</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. To examine the use of managerial time</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. To increase insight into managerial behavior and its effect on others</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. To identify the need for employee and organization development</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. To increase understanding of leadership styles</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. To examine communication concepts relative to leadership effectiveness | 4 3 2 1 |
g. To understand when group decision making/consensus is appropriate | 4 3 2 1 |
h. To understand the need to identify criteria for establishment of goals | 4 3 2 1 |
i. To understand the need for objectives | 4 3 2 1 |
j. To develop ethical standards related to management practices | 4 3 2 1 |
k. To understand factors that contribute to a climate for self-motivation | 4 3 2 1 |
l. To develop approaches to integrating career and life strategies | 4 3 2 1 |
m. Other Objectives | 4 3 2 1 |

5. Does your supervisor actively encourage management training/education for employees? Always Never

6. Do people you work with actively pursue management training/education? All of Them None of Them

7. Here are some statements that have been made about the workings of government agencies in the U.S. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of them. (Please circle appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Government agencies should provide high quality services to their clients.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Clients of government agencies are not satisfied with the services provided.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Government agencies should provide equal treatment to minorities and women.</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION II: Professional Activities

8. How many professional associations/societies related to your job do you belong to? 

9. How many professional journals/publications do you regularly read/subscribe to? 

10. How many professionally-related seminars/conferences have you attended in the past two years? 

11. In the past two years how many elective management education/training activities have you attended? 

BEST COPY AVAILABLE
SECTION A: Management Training Experience

If you have not completed or attended a management training program, Skip to Section IV.

12. Indicate the source of your training.
   a. [ ] City Government
   b. [ ] County Government
   c. [ ] State Government
   d. [ ] Federal Government
   e. [ ] Private
   f. [ ] University Academic Program

13. The following lists some management topics frequently offered by management training workshops. Please indicate the extent to which you feel training in these areas will contribute to your growth as a public manager? (Please circle the appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Conflict</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving and Decision Making</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Employment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management and Planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Information and Office Applications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Work Relationships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Under a Merit System</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Please indicate how often you have utilized what you learned during this training program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Please indicate the usefulness of the reading and reference material you received during your training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Never Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How valuable was your training in increasing your effectiveness?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Val.</th>
<th>Not Val.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. In which year did you last participate in training/education?

18. As a supervisor, which of the following are you now doing that you did not do before participating in your training program?

   a. [ ] Maintaining better working relationships
   b. [ ] Establishing better team goals
   c. [ ] Exercising better time management
   d. [ ] Being more assertive
   e. [ ] Being more positive
   f. [ ] No change
   g. [ ] Other: (specify)

19. In your opinion, what other areas of training should be included in a comprehensive management training program?

20. Listed below are some fields of knowledge that have been included in Public Administration degree programs. To what extent do you feel knowledge of each of these fields is necessary and important in your job as a public administrator? (Please circle the appropriate number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Management information systems and computer utilization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Program evaluation research methodology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Budget operations and financial administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Personnel management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Administrative law and legal issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Public relations and communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Policy analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. In your opinion, what other fields of knowledge should be included in a Master of Public Administration degree program?

22. Indicate the number of employees you directly supervise; that is, only those employees immediately beneath you on the organizational chart.

23. Indicate the total number of employees you are held responsible for? (Include both employees directly supervised and indirectly supervised through subordinate managers).

24. How many levels are there between you and the top person in your agency? (If you are the top person write X. If you report to the top person write 0 since you report directly to the top person if your supervisor reports to the top person write 1, and so on down through the organization).
25. How many levels are there below you to the level of first line supervisor or equivalent? (If you are the first line supervisor in your agency write X. If the first line supervisor reports directly to you, write 0. If there is one level of management between you and the supervisor write 1, and so on.)

26. How much discretion is there in your job, compared to your previous job? (Please circle the appropriate number)

Total Discretion No Discretion
a. Freedom to act independently of supervisor 4 3 2 1
b. Freedom to set own targets/objectives 4 3 2 1
c. Freedom to choose the methods for achieving objectives/goals 4 3 2 1
d. Freedom to choose the order in which different parts of the job are done 4 3 2 1
e. Freedom to choose whom I deal with in order to carry out my job duties 4 3 2 1

27. Please indicate below which of the following are male or female in your present organization.

Male Female
a. Your immediate supervisor 1 2
b. The colleague who has been most helpful in your present position 1 2
c. The person who did your job before you 1 2
d. How many current colleagues in your work section are male and how many are female? ___
e. How many of your immediate subordinates are male and how many are female? ___
f. Other people with the same position title as you in your organization? ___

28. Which of the following describes best the work unit(s) you are held responsible for?

a. Data/paper oriented
b. People/service oriented
c. Machine/production oriented

29. Which of the following categories best describes the jobs you are held responsible for?

a. Administrative, professional, technical
b. Clerical, office machine, administrative support
c. Supervisory, managerial
d. Service, maint., agricultural, construction
e. Law enforcement, investigative, protective

30. What is your present annual salary to the nearest thousand dollars? _______

31. Nature of your present appointment:

a. Elected official
b. Political appointee
c. Merit system employee
d. Other (specify) _______

32. What is the highest level of your education (To the nearest year)? _______

33. Please indicate any and all undergraduate and graduate degrees earned. _______
   _______
   _______
   _______
   _______
   _______

34. What specific college level degree, and/or course work or training have you had in Public Administration?

a. BA
b. MPA
c. Ph.D/DPA
d. CPM Graduate
e. Other (specify) _______

35. Gender M F

36. Ethnic Origin

a. White
b. African-American
c. Hispanic
d. Native American
e. Asian or Pacific Islander
e. Other (specify) _______

37. Date of Birth Mth Day Yr

38. Number of years in public service? _______

39. Please use the chart below to describe your career history over the last five (5) position changes in public service, starting with the most recent change. (If you have had less than five (5) changes, indicate those that you have had.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Year Moves (Enter yr)</th>
<th>Type of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change of Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 19</td>
<td>1 2 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd 19</td>
<td>1 2 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd 19</td>
<td>1 2 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th 19</td>
<td>1 2 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th 19</td>
<td>1 2 1 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Research Center for Public and International Policy at Kentucky State University wishes to thank you again for taking enough of your time to complete this questionnaire.

The information obtained from this survey will assist our nation's colleges, universities and state governments to continue providing education and training in Public Administration of the highest quality.
Sección I: Conocimientos y destrezas

1. Como gerente de administración, ¿qué considera que es más importante mantenerse informado? (Favor de circular el número correspondiente)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Muy Importante</th>
<th>Más Importante</th>
<th>Menos Importante</th>
<th>Muy Importante</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Patrones eleccionarios</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Resultados de encuestas de opinión pública</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Legisladores y sus puntos de vista</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Ejecutivos electos y sus puntos de vista</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Candidatos legislativos y sus puntos de vista</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Candidatos ejecutivos y sus puntos de vista</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Políticas específicas, puntos de disputa en la educación, desarrollo económico y ambiental</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Subvención concedida por el Gobierno Federal (Federal Grants)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Asuntos exteriores de relevancia a los Estados Unidos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Relaciones obrero-patronales en el Sector Público</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Puntos de vista de grupos minoritarios</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Desarrollo general dentro de la profesión de gerencia de administración pública</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. A continuación encontrará algunos comentarios expresados respecto a lo gerentes de administración pública como profesionales. Favor de indicar hasta que punto usted está de acuerdo o en desacuerdo en cada uno de los comentarios. (Favor de circular el número correspondiente)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Muy de acuerdo</th>
<th>Desacuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. A pesar de su educación los gerentes públicos necesitan adiestramientos y educación en administración pública.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Los gerentes públicos deben estar al tanto del desarrollo diario de la administración pública.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pregunta 2 continúa en la siguiente página.
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo

3. A continuación detallamos algunos tópicos especializados que se ofrecen frecuentemente como parte de seminarios gerenciales. Indique hasta que extremo usted cree que el adiestramiento en estas áreas contribuyen a su desarrollo como gerente público. (Favor de circular el número correspondiente)

a. Confianza en sus ejecutores (Assertiveness)  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

b. Desarrollo de equipo  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

c. Español comercial  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

d. Manejo de tensiones  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

e. Seguridad al presentarse  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

f. Imagen profesional  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

g. Escribir reportes y propuestas  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

h. Lectura efectiva  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

i. Escritura de cartas y memorandums  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

j. Técnicas de negociación  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

k. Estrategias de relaciones obrero-patronales  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

4. Actualmente, los programas de adiestramiento orientados hacia los gerentes públicos incluyen objetivos específicos. A continuación, le detallamos algunos de estos objetivos. En su opinión, indique la relevancia de estos objetivos para el gerente público. (Favor de circular el número correspondiente)

a. Realizar la conciencia personal y hacia los demás  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

b. Examinar el uso del tiempo gerencial  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

c. Aumentar el discernimiento sobre la conducta gerencial y su efecto sobre los demás  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

d. Identificar la necesidad del desarrollo del empleado y de la organización patronal  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

e. Aumentar el entendimiento de los diferentes estilos de liderazgo  
Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

5. ¿Fomenta su supervisor entrenamiento y educación gerencial para los empleados?

Siempre  Nunca
Todos los días  Ni un día

6. ¿Se motivan las personas que trabajan con usted a buscar adiestramiento y educación gerencial?

Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

7. A continuación le sometemos algunos comentarios referente al trabajo efectuado por las agencias gubernamentales de los Estados Unidos. Indique hasta que punto usted está de acuerdo o en desacuerdo en cada uno de los casos. (Favor de circular el número correspondiente)

a. Las agencias gubernamentales deben proveer a sus clientes servicios de calidad.

Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

b. Los clientes de las agencias gubernamentales no están satisfechos con los servicios que se les ofrecen.

Muy relevante  Muy en desacuerdo
4  3  2  1

Sección II: Actividades Profesionales

8. ¿A cuántas sociedades/asiaciones profesionales relacionadas con su trabajo pertenece usted?

9. ¿Cuántas publicaciones profesionales recibe con regularidad?

10. ¿En cuántos seminarios o conferencias profesionales ha participado durante los últimos dos años?

11. En los últimos dos años, ¿Cuántas actividades de educación y entrenamiento gerencial ha recibido usted?
12. Indique la fuente de su entrenamiento.

- Gobierno municipal
- Gobierno del Distrito
- Gobierno Estatal
- Gobierno Federal
- Privado
- Programa Académico Universitario

13. A continuación enumeramos algunos de los tópicos ofrecidos más frecuentemente en los talleres de entrenamiento administrativos. Favor de indicar hasta que grado usted cree que el entrenamiento en estas áreas puede contribuir a su desarrollo como administrador público. (Favor de circular el número correspondiente)

- Como entender conflicto 4 3 2 1
- Solución de problemas y toma de decisiones 4 3 2 1
- Disciplina 4 3 2 1
- Igualdad de oportunidades de empleo 4 3 2 1
- Administración de finanzas y planificación 4 3 2 1
- Información sobre computadoras y su uso en la oficina 4 3 2 1
- Administración de relaciones de trabajo 4 3 2 1
- Administración bajo un sistema de mérito 4 3 2 1
- Motivación 4 3 2 1
- Desarrollo gerencial 4 3 2 1
- Planificación estratégica 4 3 2 1

14. Favor de indicar con qué frecuencia ha utilizado usted lo aprendido durante este programa de entrenamiento. 4 3 2 1

15. Favor de indicar de cuanta utilidad fue para usted el material de lectura y referencia que recibió durante el entrenamiento. 4 3 2 1
5. ¿Cuánto leyes hay debajo del suyo, hasta el nivel del primer supervisor en línea o su equivalente? (Si usted es el primer supervisor en línea de su agencia escriba X. Si el primer supervisor en línea se reporta directo a usted escriba 0. Si hay un nivel de administración entre usted y el supervisor escriba 1, y así sucesivamente.)

26. ¿Cuánta discreción existe en su empleo en comparación con empleos previos? (Favor de circular el número correspondiente)

| Total | Ninguna
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Favor de indicar quienes de las siguientes personas son masculinos o femeninos en su institución presente.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masculino</th>
<th>Femenino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. ¿Cuáles de las siguientes categorías mejor describen sus responsabilidades en su trabajo?

a. Administrativo, profesional, técnico
b. Clerical, maquinaria de oficina, apoyo administrativo
c. Supervisión, administración
d. Servicio, mantenimiento, agrícola, construcción
e. Investigativo, protección, hacer cumplir las leyes

29. ¿Cuáles de las siguientes entidades mejor describen sus responsabilidades en su trabajo?

a. Total
b. Ninguna

c. Liberdad para actuar independientemente de su supervisor

d. Liberdad para fijar sus propios objetivos y metas

e. Liberdad para escoger los métodos para alcanzar objetivos/metas
f. Liberdad para escoger el orden en el cual se ejecutan las diferentes áreas del trabajo

g. Liberdad para escoger con quien usted trabaja en el desempeño de sus funciones

30. ¿Cuál es su salario anual actual en la milésima del dólar más aproximada?

31. Indole de su puesto actual:

a. Oficial electo
b. Nombramiento político
c. Empleado público de carrera
d. Otro (especifique)

32. Su más alto nivel de educación?

33. ¿Favor de indicar todos los grados de bachiller y maestría que ha obtenido en Administración Pública.

34. ¿Qué grado universitario específico y/o curso/entrenamiento ha obtenido usted en administración pública?

a. BA
b. MAP

c. Ph. D/DPA
d. CPM Graduado
e. Otro (especifique)

35. Género

36. Origen étnico

a. Blanco
b. Afro-Amerucano
c. Hispano
d. Americano Nativo
e. Asiático
f. Otro (especifique)

37. Fecha de nacimiento

38. Número de años en el servicio público

39. Favor de usar el cuadro de abajo para describir su historial de empleo a través de los últimos cinco (5) cambios en posición en el servicio público, empezando con el más reciente. (Si usted ha tenido menos de cinco (5) cambios, indíquelo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Número de cambios</th>
<th>Año (entre el año)</th>
<th>Cambio de Agencia</th>
<th>Cambio en Status</th>
<th>Cambio en Función</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ª</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ª</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ª</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4ª</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5ª</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

El Centro de Estudios Sobre Administración Pública y Política Internacional de KENTUCKY STATE UNIVERSITY le agradece encarecidamente el que haya tomado de su valioso tiempo para contestar este cuestionario.

La información obtenida de este sondeo proveerá a los colegios y universidades y los gobiernos estatales los medios para continuar ofreciendo educación y adiestramiento de la más alta calidad en el área de la administración pública.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDENTIFICATION NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Format: F7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Format: F7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTION VOTING PATTERNS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Values: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NOT VERY IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1B</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC OPINION RESULTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Values: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NOT VERY IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1C</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGISLATORS &amp; VIEWS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Values: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NOT VERY IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1D</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECT EXEC. &amp; VIEWS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Values: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NOT VERY IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1E</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGIS. CANDIDATES &amp; VIEWS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Values: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NOT VERY IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1F</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXEC. CANDIDATES &amp; VIEWS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Values: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NOT VERY IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 NOT IMPORTANT
2 NOT VERY IMPORTANT
3 IMPORTANT
4 VERY IMPORTANT
5 NOT APPLICABLE

V1G SPECIFIC POLICY ISSUES
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

1 NOT IMPORTANT
2 NOT VERY IMPORTANT
3 IMPORTANT
4 VERY IMPORTANT
5 NOT APPLICABLE

V1H FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAMS
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

1 NOT IMPORTANT
2 NOT VERY IMPORTANT
3 IMPORTANT
4 VERY IMPORTANT
5 NOT APPLICABLE

V1I U.S. FOREIGN AFFAIRS
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

1 NOT IMPORTANT
2 NOT VERY IMPORTANT
3 IMPORTANT
4 VERY IMPORTANT
5 NOT APPLICABLE

V1J PUBLIC SECTOR LABOR REL.
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

1 NOT IMPORTANT
2 NOT VERY IMPORTANT
3 IMPORTANT
4 VERY IMPORTANT
5 NOT APPLICABLE

V1K MINORITY GRPS & VIEWS
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

1 NOT IMPORTANT
2 NOT VERY IMPORTANT
3 IMPORTANT
4 VERY IMPORTANT
5 NOT APPLICABLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NOT VERY IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MILD EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRONG EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GREAT EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MILD EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRONG EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GREAT EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3C</td>
<td>BUSINESS ENGLISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MILD EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRONG EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GREAT EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3D</td>
<td>STRESS MANAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MILD EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRONG EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GREAT EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3E</td>
<td>PRESENTATION SKILLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MILD EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRONG EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GREAT EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3F</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL IMAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MILD EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRONG EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GREAT EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3G</td>
<td>WRITING REPORTS &amp; PROPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MILD EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRONG EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GREAT EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3H</td>
<td>READING EFFECTIVENESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MILD EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRONG EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GREAT EXTENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V3I  WRITING BETTER LETTERS
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

0  Value  Label
1  LITTLE EXTENT
2  MILD EXTENT
3  STRONG EXTENT
4  GREAT EXTENT
5  NOT APPLICABLE

V5J  NEGOTIATION TECHS
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

0  Value  Label
1  LITTLE EXTENT
2  MILD EXTENT
3  STRONG EXTENT
4  GREAT EXTENT
5  NOT APPLICABLE

V3K  LABOR RELATION STRATS
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

0  Value  Label
1  LITTLE EXTENT
2  MILD EXTENT
3  STRONG EXTENT
4  GREAT EXTENT
5  NOT APPLICABLE

V4A  ENHANCE AWARENESS
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

0  Value  Label
1  NOT RELEVANT
2  SOMewhat NOT RELEVANT
3  SOMewhat RELEVANT
4  HIGHLY RELEVANT

V4B  USE OF MANAGERIAL TIME
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

0  Value  Label
1  NOT RELEVANT
2  SOMewhat NOT RELEVANT
3  SOMewhat RELEVANT
4  HIGHLY RELEVANT

V4C  INCREASE INSIGHT
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

0  Value  Label
1  NOT RELEVANT
2  SOMewhat NOT RELEVANT
3  SOMewhat RELEVANT
4  HIGHLY RELEVANT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Print Format</th>
<th>Write Format</th>
<th>Missing Values</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V4D</td>
<td>IDE NEED FOR ORG DEV</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT NOT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HIGHLY RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4E</td>
<td>UNDERSTANDING OF LEAD. STYLES</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT NOT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HIGHLY RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4F</td>
<td>EXAM COMM CONCEPTS</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT NOT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HIGHLY RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4G</td>
<td>UNDERSTAND WHEN GROUP DM IS APPROP</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT NOT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HIGHLY RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4H</td>
<td>NEED CRITERIA FOR GOALS</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT NOT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HIGHLY RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4I</td>
<td>NEED FOR OBJECTIVES</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT NOT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HIGHLY RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Section</td>
<td>Print Format</td>
<td>Write Format</td>
<td>Missing Values</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4J</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT NOT RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HIGHLY RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4K</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT NOT RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HIGHLY RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4L</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT NOT RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HIGHLY RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4M</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT NOT RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>HIGHLY RELEVANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NONE OF THEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FEW OF THEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MANY OF THEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ALL OF THEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7A</td>
<td>GOVT PROVIDE QUALITY SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V7B</th>
<th>CLIENTS R NOT SATISFIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V7C</th>
<th>AGENCIES PROVIDE EQUAL TREAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V7D</th>
<th>POLITICAL PULL IMPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V7E</th>
<th>DEMO PRINP. CANNOT BE APPLIED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V7F</th>
<th>OFFS. SHLD CARE PUBLIC OP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V7G  CITIZENS NOT KNOWLEDGE
Print Format: F5.2
Write Format: F5.2
Missing Values: 9.00
0  Value  Label
   1.00 STRONGLY DISAGREE
   2.00 SOMEWHAT DISAGREE
   3.00 SOMEWHAT AGREE
   4.00 STRONGLY AGREE

V7H  OFFS. RESPONSIVENESS
Print Format: F5.2
Write Format: F5.2
Missing Values: 9.00
0  Value  Label
   1.00 STRONGLY DISAGREE
   2.00 SOMEWHAT DISAGREE
   3.00 SOMEWHAT AGREE
   4.00 STRONGLY AGREE

V7I  MERIT SYS IS POLITICAL
Print Format: F5.2
Write Format: F5.2
Missing Values: 9.00
0  Value  Label
   1.00 STRONGLY DISAGREE
   2.00 SOMEWHAT DISAGREE
   3.00 SOMEWHAT AGREE
   4.00 STRONGLY AGREE

V8   # ASSOC/SOC BELONG TO
Print Format: F2
Write Format: F2
Missing Values: 99

V9   # JOURNALS TAKEN
Print Format: F2
Write Format: F2
Missing Values: 99

V10  # CONFS ATTENDED
Print Format: F2
Write Format: F2
Missing Values: 99

V11  # ELECTIVE COURSES
Print Format: F2
Write Format: F2
Missing Values: 99

V12  SOURCE OF TRAIN
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9
0  Value  Label
   1  CITY GOVERNMENT
   2  COUNTY GOVERNMENT
   3  STATE GOVERNMENT
   4  FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
   5  PRIVATE
   6  UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC PROGRAM
   7  MULTIPLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V13A</th>
<th>UNDERSTANDING CONFLICT</th>
<th>57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Print Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing Values: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MILD EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRONG EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GREAT EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V13B</th>
<th>PROBLEM SOLVING</th>
<th>58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Print Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing Values: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MILD EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRONG EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GREAT EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V13C</th>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>59</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Print Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing Values: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MILD EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRONG EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GREAT EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V13D</th>
<th>EEO</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Print Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing Values: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MILD EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRONG EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GREAT EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V13E</th>
<th>FIN. MGMT.</th>
<th>61</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Print Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing Values: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MILD EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRONG EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GREAT EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V13F</th>
<th>COMP. INFO &amp; OFF APPS</th>
<th>62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Print Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write Format: F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing Values: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MILD EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>STRONG EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>GREAT EXTENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13G</td>
<td>Work Relations Mgmt</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13H</td>
<td>Managing Under Merit Sys</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13I</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13J</td>
<td>Performance Mgmt</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13K</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>How Often Used Mgmt</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V15 USEFULNESS OF REF MATERIAL
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NEVER USEFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMETIMES USEFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>USEFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VERY USEFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V16 HOW TRAIN > EFFECTIVENESS
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NOT VALUABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT NOT VALUABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOMEWHAT VALUABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VERY VALUABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V17 YEAR LAST TRAINED
Print Format: F2
Write Format: F2
Missing Values: 99

V18A BETTER WORK RELATIONS
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

V18B BETTER TEAM GOALS
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

V18C BETTER TIME MGMT
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

V18D MORE ASSERTIVE
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

V18E MORE POSITIVE
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

V18F NO CHANGE
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

V18G OTHER CHANGES
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

V19 OTHER AREAS OF TRAIN
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RESPONSE GIVEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NO RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20A</td>
<td>ORG. BEHAVIOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20B</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE OF POL INST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20C</td>
<td>STATISTICAL ANALYSIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20D</td>
<td>MIS &amp; COMPUTER UTIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20E</td>
<td>PROGRAM EVAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20F</td>
<td>BUDGET OPERATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V20G PERSONNEL MGMT
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9
0 Value Label
   1 NOT IMPORTANT
   2 NOT VERY IMPORTANT
   3 IMPORTANT
   4 VERY IMPORTANT
   5 NOT APPLICABLE

V20H ADMIN LAW & LEGAL ISSUES
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9
0 Value Label
   1 NOT IMPORTANT
   2 NOT VERY IMPORTANT
   3 IMPORTANT
   4 VERY IMPORTANT
   5 NOT APPLICABLE

V20I PUBLIC RELATIONS
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9
0 Value Label
   1 NOT IMPORTANT
   2 NOT VERY IMPORTANT
   3 IMPORTANT
   4 VERY IMPORTANT
   5 NOT APPLICABLE

V20J POLICY ANALYSIS
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9
0 Value Label
   1 NOT IMPORTANT
   2 NOT VERY IMPORTANT
   3 IMPORTANT
   4 VERY IMPORTANT
   5 NOT APPLICABLE

V21 OTHER FIELDS OF KNOWLEDGE
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9
0 Value Label
   1 RESPONSE GIVEN
   5 NOT APPLICABLE
   9 M NO RESPONSE

V22 # REPORT DIR TO YOU
Print Format: F2
Write Format: F2
Missing Values: 99
0 Value Label
   98 98 OR MORE

V23 TOTAL # OF EMPS
Print Format: F3
Write Format: F3
Missing Values: 0, 999
0 Value Label
   998 998 OR MORE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>1ST DCWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>2ND DCWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>3RD DCWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>4TH DCWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>5TH DCWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>6TH DCWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>7TH DCWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>8TH DCWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>9TH DCWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>10TH DCWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11TH DCWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12TH DCWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13TH DCWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14TH DCWN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>1ST LINE SUPER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>2ND UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>3RD UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>4TH UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>5TH UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>6TH UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>7TH UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>8TH UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>9TH UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>10TH UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11TH UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12TH UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13TH UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14TH UP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NO DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MODERATE DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TOTAL DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NO DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LITTLE DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MODERATE DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TOTAL DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### V26C CAN CHOOSE METHODS
- **Print Format:** F1
- **Write Format:** F1
- **Missing Values:** 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NO DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LITTLE DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MODERATE DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TOTAL DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V26D CAN ORDER PARTS OF WORK
- **Print Format:** F1
- **Write Format:** F1
- **Missing Values:** 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NO DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LITTLE DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MODERATE DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TOTAL DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V26E CAN CHOOSE W/WHOM TO DEAL
- **Print Format:** F1
- **Write Format:** F1
- **Missing Values:** 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NO DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LITTLE DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MODERATE DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TOTAL DISCRETION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V27A IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR
- **Print Format:** F1
- **Write Format:** F1
- **Missing Values:** 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V27B MOST HELPFUL COLLEAGUE
- **Print Format:** F1
- **Write Format:** F1
- **Missing Values:** 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V27C PERSON BEFORE YOU
- **Print Format:** F1
- **Write Format:** F1
- **Missing Values:** 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V27AM # OF MALE COLLEAGUES
- **Print Format:** F2
- **Write Format:** F2
- **Missing Values:** 99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>98 OR MORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V27AF</td>
<td># OF FEMALE COLLEAGUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V27EM</td>
<td># OF MALE SUBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V27EF</td>
<td># OF FEMALE SUBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V27FM</td>
<td># OF MALE SAME POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V27FF</td>
<td># OF FEMALE SAME POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V28</td>
<td>TYPE WORK UNIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V29</td>
<td>JOB RESPONSIBLE FOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V30</td>
<td>ANNUAL SALARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V31</td>
<td>Nature of Appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V32</td>
<td>Level of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V33A</td>
<td>Degree Type A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V33B</td>
<td>Degree Type B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### V33C DEGREE TYPE C

- **Print Format:** F2
- **Write Format:** F2
- **Missing Values:** 99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OTHER BACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OTHER MASTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>DDS-DMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>JD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V33D DEGREE TYPE D

- **Print Format:** F2
- **Write Format:** F2
- **Missing Values:** 99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OTHER BACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OTHER MASTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>DDS-DMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>JD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V33E DEGREE TYPE E

- **Print Format:** F2
- **Write Format:** F2
- **Missing Values:** 99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OTHER BACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OTHER MASTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>DDS-DMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>JD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V34A BA

- **Print Format:** F1
- **Write Format:** F1
- **Missing Values:** 9

### V34B MPA

- **Print Format:** F1
- **Write Format:** F1
- **Missing Values:** 9
V34CPHD/PDA
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

V34CPM
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

V34E OTHER
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

V35 GENDER
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

0 Value Label
1 MALE
2 FEMALE

V36 ETHNICITY
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

0 Value Label
1 WHITE
2 AFRICAN-AMERICAN
3 HISPANIC
4 NATIVE AMERICAN
5 ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER
6 OTHER

V37M BIRTH MONTH
Print Format: F2
Write Format: F2
Missing Values: 99

V37D BIRTH DAY
Print Format: F2
Write Format: F2
Missing Values: 99

V37Y BIRTH YEAR
Print Format: F2
Write Format: F2
Missing Values: 99

V38 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE
Print Format: F2
Write Format: F2
Missing Values: 99

V391ST FIRST JOB CHANGE YR
Print Format: F2
Write Format: F2
Missing Values: 99

V391STCA 1ST, CHANGE AGENCY?
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

0 Value Label
1 YES
2 NO
V391STCS 1ST, CHANGE STATUS?
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9
0 Value Label
   1 YES UP
   2 NO CHANGE
   3 YES DOWN

V391STCF 1ST, CHANGE FUNCTION?
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9
0 Value Label
   1 YES
   2 NO

V392ND SECOND JOB CHANGE YR
Print Format: F2
Write Format: F2
Missing Values: 99

V392NDCA 2ND CHANGE AGENCY?
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9
0 Value Label
   1 YES
   2 NO

V392NDCS 2ND CHANGE STATUS?
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9
0 Value Label
   1 YES UP
   2 NO CHANGE
   3 YES DOWN

V392NDCF 2ND CHANGE FUNCTION?
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9
0 Value Label
   1 YES
   2 NO

V393RD THIRD JOB CHANGE YR
Print Format: F2
Write Format: F2
Missing Values: 99

V393RDCA 3RD CHANGE AGENCY?
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9
0 Value Label
   1 YES
   2 NO

V393RDCS 3RD CHANGE STATUS?
Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9
0 Value Label
   1 YES UP
   2 NO CHANGE
   3 YES DOWN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Print Format</th>
<th>Write Format</th>
<th>Missing Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V393RCF</td>
<td>3rd Change Function?</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V394THCH</td>
<td>Fourth Job Change Yr</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V394THCA</td>
<td>4th Change Agency?</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V394THCS</td>
<td>4th Change Status?</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V394THCF</td>
<td>4th Change Function?</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V395THCH</td>
<td>Fifth Job Change Yr</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V395THCA</td>
<td>5th Change Agency?</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V395THCS</td>
<td>5th Change Status</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>YES UP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NO CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>YES DOWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>YES DOWN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**VS5STHCF 5TH CHANGE FUNCTION?**

Print Format: F1
Write Format: F1
Missing Values: 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEMP STATE OF EMPLOYMENT**

Print Format: F2
Write Format: F2
Missing Values: 99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ALASKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>COLORADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DISTRICT OF CO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>HAWAII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>IDAHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>INDIANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>IOWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>KANSAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>MAINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>MONTANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>NEVADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>MEXICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>OREGON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>TEXAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>UTAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>VERMONT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>WYOMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>PUERTO RICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>PACIFIC ISLANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>UNKNOWN STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAVE</td>
<td>RESPONSE WAVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>FIRST MAILING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SECOND MAILING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>THIRD MAILING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QSOURCE</th>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>CPM UNKNOWN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CPM GEORGIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CPM KENTUCKY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CPM LOUISIANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CPM NORTH CAROLINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CPM OKLAHOKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CPM UTAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>BRIGHAM YOUNG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>CANISIUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>CLARK ATLANTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>CLEVELAND STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>DEPAUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>DUKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>EASTERN MICHIGAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>FLORIDA STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>GEORGIA STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>ILLINOIS TECH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>INDIANA STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>KEAN COLLEGE OF NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>KENTUCKY STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>MISSISSIPPI STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>NORTHEASTERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>OHIO STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2041</td>
<td>OHIO UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2042</td>
<td>SOUTHERN ILLINOIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>SOUTHWEST MISSOURI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048</td>
<td>SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2049</td>
<td>SUNY-ALBANY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2051</td>
<td>SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2054</td>
<td>TEXAS A&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2057</td>
<td>U. OF TEXAS &amp; AUSTIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2060</td>
<td>TRINITY UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2061</td>
<td>U. OF ARKANSAS LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2063</td>
<td>U. OF WISCONSIN &amp; MIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2066</td>
<td>U. OF CALIFORNIA &amp; BERKLEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2069</td>
<td>CENTRAL FLORIDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2070</td>
<td>U. OF COLORADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2072</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2075</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2078</td>
<td>U. OF MISSOURI &amp; COLUMBIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2081</td>
<td>U. OF NEBRASKA &amp; OMNIKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2084</td>
<td>U. OF NEW HAVEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2087</td>
<td>U. OF NORTH CAROLINA &amp; CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2090</td>
<td>U. OF NORTH CAROLINA &amp; GRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2093</td>
<td>U. OF PITTSBURGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2096</td>
<td>U. OF SOUTHERN MAINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2099</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2102</td>
<td>WICHITA STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2999</td>
<td>UNKNOWN UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001</td>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3002</td>
<td>ALASKA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3003</td>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3004</td>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3005</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3006</td>
<td>COLORADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3007</td>
<td>CONNECTICUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3008</td>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3009</td>
<td>DISTRICT OF CO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3010</td>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3011</td>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3012</td>
<td>HAWAII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BEST COPY AVAILABLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3013</td>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>3014</td>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>3015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3016</td>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>3017</td>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>3018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3019</td>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>3020</td>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>3021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3022</td>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>3024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3025</td>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td>3026</td>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>3027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3028</td>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td>3029</td>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>3030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3031</td>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>3032</td>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>3033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3034</td>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>3035</td>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>3036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3037</td>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>3038</td>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>3039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3040</td>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>3041</td>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>3042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3043</td>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>3044</td>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>3045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3046</td>
<td>NORTHERN IRISH</td>
<td>3047</td>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>3048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3049</td>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>3050</td>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>3051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3052</td>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td>3053</td>
<td>PUERTO RICO</td>
<td>3054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3055</td>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>3056</td>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>3057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3058</td>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>3059</td>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>3060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3061</td>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td>3062</td>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td>3063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3064</td>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>3065</td>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>3066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3067</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>3068</td>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>3069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3070</td>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>3071</td>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>3072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3073</td>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>3074</td>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>3075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3076</td>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td>3077</td>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td>3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3079</td>
<td>PUERTO RICO</td>
<td>3080</td>
<td>PACIFIC ISLANDS</td>
<td>3081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3082</td>
<td>UNKNOWN STATE</td>
<td>3083</td>
<td>UNKNOWN STATE</td>
<td>3084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>BA ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>MPA ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>PHD/DPA ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>CPM ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>OTH. ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>BA &amp; MPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>BA &amp; PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>BA &amp; CPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>BA &amp; OTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>BA, MPA &amp; PHD/DPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>BA, MPA &amp; CPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>BA, MPA &amp; OTH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>BA, PHD/DPA &amp; CPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>BA, PHD/DPA &amp; OTH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>BA PHD/DPA &amp; CPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>BA PHD &amp; OTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>BA CPM &amp; OTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>BA MPA CPM OTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>MPA &amp; PHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>MPA &amp; CPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>MPA &amp; OTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>MPA PHD &amp; CPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>MPA PHD &amp; OTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>MPA CPM &amp; OTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>MPA PHD CPM &amp; OTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>PHD &amp; CPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>PHD &amp; OTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>PHD CPM &amp; OTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>CPM &amp; OTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>ALL CATEGORIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>&lt;1-4 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5-9 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10-14 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15-19 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20-24 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25-29 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>30-34 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>35-39 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>40 &amp; &lt; YRS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10 AND MORE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10 AND MORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1OGRPO</td>
<td>SEMINARS ATTND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOSNY</td>
<td>GROUPED YEARS OF EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTYP</td>
<td>SAMPLE TYPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>AGE OF RESPONDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAGE</td>
<td>GROUPED AGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10 AND MORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10 AND MORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>CPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20-29 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30-39 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>40-49 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>50-59 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>60-69 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>70-79 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>80 YRS &amp; OLDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10-14 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>15-19 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>20-24 YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>25-30 YRS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISC1</th>
<th>REGR FACTOR SCORE 1 FOR ANALYSIS</th>
<th>Print Format</th>
<th>Write Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F11.5</td>
<td>F11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Elazar's Political Cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Moralistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Moral-Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Individual-Moral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Individualistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>Individ-Tradi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>Trad-Individial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>Traditionalistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>Trad-Moral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professionalism Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Rejector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Enthusiast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grouped Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Some College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grouped Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Minority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Old Political Acuity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Naive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Apolitico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Politico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trained/Untrained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Notrained/ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Trained/ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grouped Serv yrs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1 to 9 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10 to 19 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>20 to 29 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>30 to 39 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>40 to 49 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADJDIS</th>
<th>Print Format: F8.2</th>
<th>Write Format: F8.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISC</td>
<td>Print Format: F8.2</td>
<td>Write Format: F8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPTYP</td>
<td>GROUPED APPT. TYPE</td>
<td>Print Format: F8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00 MERIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GETHNIC</td>
<td>GROUPED ETHNICITY</td>
<td>Print Format: F8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00 WHITE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 AFRICAN-AMERICAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00 OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJOBCLS</td>
<td>GROUP JOB CLASS</td>
<td>Print Format: F8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00 ADMINISTRATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 SUPERVISORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00 OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISLEV</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION LEVEL</td>
<td>Print Format: F8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing Values: 9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00 NO DESCRETION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 LITTLE DESCRETION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00 GREATER DESCRETION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00 TOTAL DESCRETION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISLEV1</td>
<td>WORK DESCRETION</td>
<td>Print Format: F8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing Values: 9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00 LOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 HIGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPTYP</td>
<td>RELATED TRN/DEGREE</td>
<td>Print Format: F8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value Label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 CPM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 BACHELOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 MPA AND/OR PHD/CPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 OTHER RELATED DEG/TRN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 NO RELATED DEGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGNCYNRG</td>
<td>AGENCY HEIGHT</td>
<td>Print Format: F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>SOCIO-POLITICAL ACUITY</td>
<td>Print Format: F8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Print Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAAPOLITICAL ACTIVITY ACUITY</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>F8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFA</td>
<td>POLITICAL FUNCTION ACUITY</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V23GRPD</td>
<td>GROUPED TOTAL ENPS SUPER</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1-10 EMPLOYEES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>11-50 EMPLOYEES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>51-200 EMPLOYEES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>201-500 EMPLOYEES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>501-997 EMPLOYEES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1,000 AND MORE EMPLOYEES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V32GRPO</td>
<td>ED VITA</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>NOT HS GRADUATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL GRAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>SOME COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>COLLEGE GRAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>SOME GRAD WORK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>AT LEAST 1 GRAD DEGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONRES</td>
<td>RELATED DEGREES</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>MPA OR HIGHER DEGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>BACCALAUREATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPI</td>
<td>SOCIO-POLITICAL</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAI</td>
<td>POLITICAL ACTIVITY</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFI</td>
<td>POLITICAL FUNCTION</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Label</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Print Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFIA</td>
<td>Print Format: F8.2</td>
<td>Write Format: F8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIADJ</td>
<td>ADJ SOCIO-POL</td>
<td>Print Format: F8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAADJ</td>
<td>ADJ POL-ACTIVITY</td>
<td>Print Format: F8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFADJ</td>
<td>ADJ POL-FUNCTION</td>
<td>Print Format: F8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRI</td>
<td>REGR FACTOR SCORE</td>
<td>1 FOR ANALYSIS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRADJ</td>
<td>ADJ PROFESSIONALISM</td>
<td>Print Format: F8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL1</td>
<td>REGR FACTOR SCORE</td>
<td>1 FOR ANALYSIS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL2</td>
<td>REGR FACTOR SCORE</td>
<td>2 FOR ANALYSIS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGSKILL</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION SKILL DEV.</td>
<td>Print Format: F8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJSKILL</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE/GOAL SKILL DEV.</td>
<td>Print Format: F8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>