

1960

Validation of an observational instrument for measuring role behavior in social work groups as one aspect of maturity

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/24554>

"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."

737007
BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

VALIDATION OF AN OBSERVATIONAL INSTRUMENT
FOR MEASURING ROLE BEHAVIOR IN SOCIAL WORK GROUPS
AS ONE ASPECT OF SOCIAL MATURITY

A group thesis

Submitted by

Roberta Irene Reid
(A.B., Talladega College, Talladega, Ala., 1958)

Richard Henry Rowland
(B.S., University of Wisconsin, 1953)

Judith V. Sargent
(A.B., Pembroke College in Brown University, 1958)

Thomas V. Vassil
(A.B., Boston University, 1951)

Emma S. Vigilia
(A.B., Philippines Christian Colleges, Philippines, 1952)

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Science in Social Service

1960

PREFACE

This thesis is a follow-up of last year's project and has grown out of the recommendations made by the Thesis Committee in 1959.

This year's Thesis Committee consisted of five students majoring in social group work who became interested in developing further work begun by the Thesis Committee last year.

The Boston Human Relations Center again cooperated in the development and guidance of the thesis and "loaned" an NIMH Research Fellow to assist in the work of the research project.

We were able to obtain the cooperation of the following group service agencies for the field application of the instrument both for pretesting and actual charting purposes:

Roxbury Neighborhood House
United South End Settlements
Brookline-Brighton-Newton Jewish Community Center.

Our special thanks go to the group workers who acted as experts and to the students for assuming the parts of observers and charters:

Arthur Eisenberg	Edward Levitt
Donald Feldstein	Richard Roye
Josephine Lambert	Camilla Sewall
Jeane Levinson	

This project was indeed a group project. The Thesis Committee met weekly since October to plan, discuss and carry out the research presented here. Insofar as possible the responsibilities of the thesis were equally shared by all the five students; this included data gathering, data analysis and the write-up of the chapters.

The collaborative and cooperative relationship which prevailed throughout this effort is a tribute to the ability of the thesis group to work together and place task above personal interests. It was a rewarding experience for all participants in this project.

Louis Lowy
Assistant Professor
Faculty Advisor

Marvin Snider
Research Affiliate of the
Boston University Human
Relations Center

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	
Background and Purpose	
Planning	1
Developing and Testing of Group Observational Instrument in 1959	2
Result	3
Clarification and Supplement to Survey of Theoretical Literature	
Role Theory.	6
Systematic Observation	11
Validation	
Overview	13
Hypothesis	13
II. METHODS OF PROCEDURE	
Instrument	17
Validation	18
Pretest.	23
Test.	23
III. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	
Introduction	27
Validation	27
Comparison of Expert with and Expert without Instrument	27
Comparison of the Student with an Expert with the Instrument	28
Comparison of Student with and Student without Instrument	38
Comparison of Student and Expert without Instrument	39
Discussion of Findings	42
IV. CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
Conclusions	44
Limitations	
Instrument	46
Time	47
Data Collections	48
Fatigue	49
Training	50
Recommendations	
Research	50
Practice	51

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. SUMMARY	
Purpose and Overview	53
Method and Procedure	
Selection of Groups for Observation	53
Validation Procedure	53
Results	
Results of Group I	55
Results of Group II	55
Comparison Between Two Groups	56
APPENDICES	
I. DATA CHART	
A. EXAMPLE OF WEIGHTING	57
B. OBSERVATION WITH INSTRUMENT - GROUP I	58
C. OBSERVATION WITH INSTRUMENT - GROUP II	59
II. FORMS	
D. BACKGROUND DATA ON GROUP	60
E. GROUP COMPOSITION	62
F. INSTRUMENT--ROLE CATEGORIES FOR GROUP OBSERVATION.	63
G. "ROLES OCCURRING IN GROUP MEETING UTILIZED BY NON-INSTRUMENT USERS	64
H. POST-OBSERVATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EXPERTS AND STUDENTS WITHOUT INSTRUMENT.	65
I. QUALIFICATION SHEET FOR EXPERT AND NON-EXPERTS (STUDENT)	70
J. BENNE-SHEATS ROLE CLASSIFICATION	71
BIBLIOGRAPHY	73

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Hypothesis Table	32
2. Group Characteristic	33
3. Validation Table	40
4. Maturity Rating Scale	41

FIGURE

1. Validation Figure	21
--------------------------------	----

BOSTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I Background and Purpose

Social Group Work has grown rapidly in the past thirty-five years and considerable progress has been made in working effectively with groups.

Essential for group work practice is to improve this functioning of both individuals and groups in more mature directions. Consequently discovering objective ways for evaluating their work is an important concern in the group work field today.

Last year's thesis committee developed an observational instrument to measure role behavior in social work groups. The focus of the present thesis committee is on a method of validation of the instrument.

Planning

The development of an observation instrument for measuring role behavior in social work groups emerged out of the thinking of Professor Saul Bernstein of the Boston University School of Social Work, and later the Group Research Committee

of Boston University.¹ The objectives of this group were to develop an instrument to measure individual and group progress, applicable to many different kinds of groups. This led to a research proposal in 1956 that was focused on developing an instrument for group work practice for on-going evaluation. It was intended for significant elements in group work practice related to group movement and social maturity. Last year's thesis began as an outgrowth of the work of the Group Research Committee.

Developing and Testing of Group Observation Instrument in 1959

Last year's thesis committee decided to measure social maturity. After re-examining the work of the Group Research Committee and Professor Bernstein's original formulations of charting group progress, they organized a list of elements essential to the concept of social maturity. Out of these the variable selected by the thesis group was distribution of roles within the group. This was especially suitable since there was enough material

1

The participants were: Prof. Bernstein, Chairman; Gerald Barnes, Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology; Kenneth Benne, Director of Human Relations Center; Robert Chin, Department of Psychology; Bernard Hymovitch, Division of Research; Nathan Macoby, Director, Division of Research, S.P.R.C., and Chairman of the University Psychology Department; Beatrix Park, School of Social Work; and Ralph Kolodny, Director of Research, Children's Aid Association, Boston.

In 1958 the following members were added to the committee and some of the original members became inactive. Those added were Katherine Spencer and Louis Lowy, School of Social Work; Richard Burke and Warren Bennes, Human Relations Center.

in the sociological and social psychological literature to help in constructing an instrument. Also roles seemed to be more comprehensive in scope than the other variables.

Analysis of a number of studies of small group behavior led them to choose a measuring instrument in which role classification could be checked. For social work groups, the Benne-Sheats² role classifications seemed most appropriate. Encouraged by the experimental results with the Benne-Sheats classifications, the group thesis committee of 1959 sought to make it more useful for social work groups. By consolidating and simplifying some of the material the categories of the instrument were more clearly defined. A self-oriented category was added to cover individuals satisfying their own needs, negative to the group, and an indeterminate category to cover unclassifiable observations. The instrument then was pretested using group work process records, and satisfied that the role categories were applicable, the thesis committee decided to test it in five groups in the field. The investigation included pre-meeting background data in the group, introducing the observer to the group, and post meeting questionnaire to cross check the data.

Results

The field observation of groups provided an opportunity to observe what problems arose in its actual administration. Each member of the thesis committee tested the applicability of the instrument on adolescent social work groups.

2

See Appendix

The thesis committee found that once trained in its use, the instrument was easy and simple to use. The investigators realized no reliability had been determined for the instrument before its field applications, but believed that important contributions would emerge from its field use.

Comparisons of the groups was limited because the groups ranged from friendship to planning council, and from single sex to co-educational. One result that emerged from this was that the instrument was more applicable to decision making and planning groups. The limitations of comparisons also indicated that the measuring procedure had to be refined.

The hypothesis themselves were not all clearly understood by the committee. For example, the group recognized that hypothesis II had not been well defined nor were they sure of its meaningfulness. On the other hand, hypothesis III was felt to be crucial and most revealing.

The thesis committee attempted to compare the groups ranked on percentage measures they had some confidence in, as over against what each observer felt in their respective professional judgment, as to the maturity of the ranked group. Here too there were significant variations between these two reference points. This points to the fact that the procedure used to relate the hypothesis and social maturity may be inadequate.

Investigating the distribution of participation of the members, it was found that a large percentage of the participation was centered in a few members and the worker; among the members,

usually one participated much more than the others, and the worker's participation was gauged it seemed, by the participation of the indigenous leader.

The committee concluded that the reliability of the instrument should be determined. Such factors as emotional overtones, content of discussion, and intra-group relationships, important for group work practice, are not included in the categories of the instrument, yet affects the results. There is the further thought of its use in training functions, especially to develop skill and insight in diagnostic role requirements. The instrument does not provide clear information about patterns of role distribution in groups. The thesis committee felt that while these groups could not be compared meaningfully, there is a possibility that the instrument could be used to measure change in a group over a given period of time.

The thesis committee of 1959 recommended that:

... for future exploration with the instrument we also recommend that groups from a wider variety of types of agencies be used and that it be tried out on activity groups as well as discussion groups. We are especially aware of the need for further exploration of methods of validating the instrument. We are able only to suggest procedures for testing its validity, as in the use of the post-meeting assessment questionnaire and process records of the sessions. For the further development of validation procedure, the active participation of practitioners in the field will be needed in working out criteria for levels of role performance and/or "social maturity" based on such independent sources of data." 3

This year the group thesis committee felt that our aim would be to follow some of the recommendations made last year and attempt a method of validation of the instrument. Our focus would be on sharper definitions of the hypothesis and measuring role behavior as one index of social maturity rather than to continue on role maturity per se.

II. Clarification and Supplement to Survey of Theoretical Literature

A. Role Theory

To understand the instrument more adequately, this year's thesis committee added new theoretical view points. The importance of frame of reference by different people on the same or various levels is emphasized and demonstrated by the additional literature. For any instrument a consistent frame of reference is necessary. The additional theoretical material is made in terms of role at the cultural, group, and the individual level.

1. Definition of Roles at Different Social Levels:

a. Role and culture

A definition of role in terms of culture and society is summarized by Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason and Alexander W. McEachern.⁴ In their reference to Ralph Linton, they state that status is the polar position in patterns of reciprocal behavior, a collection of rights and duties. When the individual puts these rights and duties to work, status takes on a dynamic aspect, "role." Status and role

⁴ Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and A. W. McEachern, Exploration in Role Analysis, Wiley Co., N.Y. 1958

combined become guides for conduct. Role is not the behavior of the individual as much as the ascribed behavior of society for the persons occupying the status.

Florian Znaniecki sees role as a dynamic system composed of four basic components; social circle, self, status, and function. He focused on the cultural influences on personality.

The individual in the course of his life performs a number of different roles, successively or simultaneously; the synthesis of all the social roles he has ever performed from his birth to death constitute his social personality.⁵

Social role constitutes one general class of social system, and is used to explain the patterns of society. The individual performing the social role is the social person. The smaller or larger set of people within which the role is performed is the social circle. The person is conceived by his circle as an organic and psychological entity who is a self, with awareness of how others regard him, and conscious of this own body and soul. There is a definite social status, essentially rights granted and enforced by the social circle. The social function is the obligation of the social person to achieve certain tasks needed by the social circle.

b. Role at the Group Level

Definitions in terms of groups deal with roles as the behavior of actors occupying social positions. The concern is on how the individual actually performs rather than on how he

⁵ Florian Znaniecki, The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge, p. 14

is supposed to perform. This was the point of view which last year's thesis group chose as the principal theoretical orientation of the thesis. Theodore Sarbin's definition represents this view.

A role is a patterned sequence of learned action or deeds performed by a person in an interaction situation. The organizing of the individual actions is a product of the perceptual and cognitive behavior of person A upon observing person B. B performs one or a number of discrete acts which A observes and organized into a concept, a role. On the basis of this conceptualization of the action of B, A expects certain further actions from B. The expectation is the equivalent of saying 'locates or names the position of the other.' Once having located or named the position of the other, A performs certain acts which have been learned as belonging to the reciprocal position... locating the position of the other may be placed in a continuum from deliberate to automatic, from witting at unwitting. 6

(1) Sarbin's Definition of Role Position

Sarbin defines position as an organized system of role expectations. Role expectations consist of both rights and obligations. Rights as anticipated actions from reciprocal roles, obligations as performance of certain actions directed toward action of the reciprocal role. The interdependency of role and position in terms of action in reciprocal roles is essential to Sarbin's theory. His theory is further elaborated in considering the types of roles which are acquired (intentional instruction) or adopted (incidental learning).

⁶ Theodore R. Sarbin, "Role Theory," in Handbook of Social Psychology, p. 225.

(2) Sarbin's Definition of Role, Acts, and Perception.

Perception of roles, he knows, is an

...organized response of a person to stimuli in a social context. Perception itself is an intra-organismic response of the organism to stimulate objects and events. 7

Categorized social acts are perceptual responses, which allow for inferred and observed behavior. Motoric behavior is essentially the act itself.

(3) Role and Self

The self originates in social interaction and is co-ordinated with role. Both are inter-dependent on the other.

Sarbin summarizes this interdependency thus:

The self is what the person is, the role is what the person does. Then interested in the self we regard the person as an organization of qualities. When we study roles we regard the person as an organization of acts. Parenthetically, direct observation reveals only action systems, resulting from the interplay of self and role. 8

Sarbin's theory of role also introduces an approach to observing small face-to-face groups meaningfully.

C. Role at the Individual Level

In terms of the individual, role is defined on the basis of the actor's orientation to a situation (i.e., on perception). The orientation is psychological and the individual's attitudes toward his own role are central. Gross, Mason, and McEachern give as one

⁷ Ibid., p. 229

⁸ Ibid., p. 254

example Sargent's definition of role.

A person's role is a pattern or type of social behavior which seems situationally appropriate to him in terms of the demands and expectations of those in his group. 9

2. Definitions of Group

Last year's thesis group used the definition of George Homans who defines a group as:

A number of persons who communicate with one another often over a span of time and who are few enough so that each person is able to communicate with all the others, not at second-hand, through other people, but face-to-face. 10

Ralph M. Stogdill notes that the most satisfying definition at the present is by M. Smith, a social psychologist. His definition of group is:

A social group is a unit consisting of a plural number of organisms (agents) who have collective perception of their unity and who have the ability to act, or are acting, in a unitary manner toward the environment. 11

Smith's definition provides for our purposes the clearest description of actual social work groups.

⁹ Neal Gross, Ward S. Mason, and A. W. McEachern, Exploration in Role Analysis, Wiley Co., N.Y., 1958.

¹⁰ George Homans, The Human Group.

¹¹ Marpheus Smith, "The Psychology of the Corporate Acts," in Psychological Review. Vol. 52, 1945

B. Systematic Observation

Systematic observation is essential to achieving adequate validation of the instrument. As yet the importance of observation as a sound methodological procedure has not always been fully appreciated in Social Work. Warren Bennis characterizes the nature of observation thus:

There is a lot of activity going on in most groups and what the observer perceives depends on what he attends to, as well as the acuity of perception...hence, the observer has to start by being sensitive only to certain aspects of the situation, and peacefully oblivious to other. 12

This points out that in order to meaningfully interpret observation, it is important to consider the frame of reference used in making the observation.

1. Rating Scales and Categorization

There are two basic systems used for observation. The observer is either asked to classify the behavior he sees into categories, or assign numerical value to it. Ideally one would expect no difference between behavior observation in either the category or rating scale. All behavior classified in a given category has equal weight with respect to the category, and with any other entry in any other category. We measure in this system, the frequency of occurrence in a given category. Rating scales differ in that they require assignment of a number to a concept.

¹² Warren Bennis, Group Observation, Boston University Human Relation Center.

Both systems have their dangers. Rating scales run the risk of statistical seduction. Category systems, while useful in obtaining data, often are vague and unclear. Both scales, Lippitt and Heyns note require careful specifications of their respective dimensions.

2. Effect of Observer on Group Behavior.

Another item is the effect of the observer on behavior in the group under observation. Some facets to be considered are the nature of the observation, the activity of the observer, and the method by which the observer's task has been structured.

3. The Unit of Observation.

Lippitt and Heyns define unit thus:

The unit to be scored is the smallest discriminateable segment of verbal or non-verbal behavior to which the observer using the present set of categories after proper training can assign a classification under conditions of continuous serial scoring. 13

The author lists potential areas of difficulty, such as the amount of observable behavior classifiable into the categories, the extent of inference allowed in verbal and non-verbal behavior, whether the categories are discrete or continuous, the range of applicability, and the sampling process especially with respect to time.

The survey thesis committee chose to use a combination of both rating scale and category classifications for the validation procedure. Our unit of observation was the smallest behavioral act

classifiable by a trained expert and trained student. Introducing the observers to the group was included in the training program and their pressure continued during the data collection process.

III Validation

A. Overview

Before last year's instrument can be useful to group work practice, it needs to be evaluated in terms of reliability and validity. Validity and reliability are interrelated. We consider it most desirable to investigate the instrument's validity first. However, reliability will also need to be confirmed.

The basis of our validation procedure is to assess the extent to which the use of the instrument facilitates the assessment of a group's maturity in the use of role behavior. In so doing we have implicitly attempted to see whether the intuitive judgment of the trained worker can be aided and/or duplicated using the instrument by either a trained or untrained social work practitioners.

B. Hypothesis

Essential to our validation are seven theoretically derived hypothesis, which are refinements of last year's hypothesis. They are a statement of the relationship between role behavior and social maturity.

Last year's hypothesis were as follows:

1. A group is more mature the larger the ratio of group oriented role behavior to self-oriented role behavior.

2. A group is more mature the greater the distribution of the total group's role behavior over all role categories, and the lesser the concentration in certain specific role categories.
3. A group is more mature the greater the distribution of each member's role behavior over all role categories.
4. A group is more mature the larger the ratio of member enacted role behavior, to worker enacted role behavior. 14

The present group thesis committee found it necessary to refine these hypotheses because the calculations developed last year did not precisely follow the verbal statements of the hypotheses themselves. The alterations were with respect to quantity and quality. Quantity is defined as the frequency of the acts of role behavior. Quality refers to the discrete role categories themselves.

The present hypotheses are stated as follows:

1. A group is more mature the larger the ratio of group oriented role behavior to total role behavior.
2. A group is more mature
 - a. the greater the distribution of role categories over all role categories
 - b. the greater the distribution of the number of responses over total responses.
3. A group is more mature
 - a. the greater the distribution of each members responses over all responses by the group.
 - b. the greater the distribution of each members role categories over all possible role categories.

¹⁴ Alfred Brown, et. al, op.cit. p.19

4. A group is more mature
 - a. the larger the ratio of the number of responses enacted by members to the total number of responses.
 - b. the smaller the ratio of role categories filled by the worker over all total role categories.

We decided to exclude the indeterminate role category since experience has shown it to have no effect on the calculations.

Next we had to evaluate the relative weight of each of these four hypotheses since they are not all equally important. After each of the four hypotheses had been weighted, the next step was to designate the difference in relative importance of the sub-hypotheses. These were arrived at by consensus judgment of the group thesis committee. To test our hypotheses, we structured a 7 point scale on which the experts' and students' judgment could be scored. The ratings were made in terms of percentages, for each hypotheses, of high, medium, low. Both end points in the scale reflect minimum and maximum maturity-rating for a group. The social maturity ratings for each of our two groups would be represented by a single index. Recognizing the danger of rating complex behavior in a single number, it was found necessary to look at both the index and profile of the category judgment. The profile consisted of examining each members behavior in each of the four hypotheses.

With small samples as we used, only tentative pilot study statements can be made. Implicit too, is the assumption of equal training and faulty use of the instrument by one observer.

Our expectations were that the trained experts and student would provide a crude indication of reliability. We felt that the

method of validation would indicate that the instrument was valid for a pilot study. We hope that both verbal and non-verbal behavior could be charted, and that the instrument would be applicable to both discussion and activity-oriented groups. We had confidence that the success of our research would enlarge the scope of knowledge in group work, and present new opportunities for future study important to the field.

CHAPTER II

METHODS OF PROCEDURE

I Instrument

An instrument to measure role behavior in social work adolescent planning groups, as an aspect of social maturity, was adapted from the Benne and Sheats' role classification charts by the group thesis committee in 1958. The instrument consists of Task, Building and Maintenance, and Self-oriented role categories.

The Task category is divided into five sub-categories:

1) initiating, expediting and energizing, 2) seeking information, opinion, orientation, 3) giving information, opinion, orientation, 4) clarifying, elaborating, coordinating, summarizing, 5) consensus testing, evaluating and criticizing.

Building and Maintenance roles are subdivided into four categories: 1) encouraging and enabling, 2) mediating, compromising, harmonizing, 3) expressing group feelings, 4) standard setting.

Self-oriented behavior is the third principal category of the instrument and is not further subdivided.

The instrument also contains an indeterminate category for unclassifiable behavior. This category was included in the instrument to indicate how much of the observed behavior could not be covered by the role categories. This category was not included in the 1959 thesis; we therefore decided not to utilize this category in our data analysis.¹

¹ See Appendix C for complete instrument

Each role enacted by a group member or worker is charted in the corresponding instrument column by the instrument user. Each individual role interaction was separately charted for every member and group worker. If the role function changed during an individual's act, each separate role category was charted.

We chose to use the instrument on two groups, one adolescent planning group as in the 1959 thesis, and one combination planning-activity oriented adolescent group. Although the groups were somewhat different in orientation, they were similar in regard to planning procedure.

II Validation

In our effort to validate the instrument we arrived at a procedure for using two sets of experts and two sets of students that would observe the same adolescent social work group.

One expert and one student would chart the group using the instrument. Another expert and student would also observe and evaluate the group but without the use of the instrument. The expert and student without the instrument were given a list of role criteria on which to base their independent judgments of social maturity for the group.²

Because of time limitations and the limited scope of the study, it was decided to carry out the validation analysis on only two actual test groups. Although we recognize the serious limitation

² See Appendix D

imposed by a sample as small as this, we feel that a useful function is being served in this validation attempt, both to the writers as a learning experience and to the future development of the instrument.

Our group thesis committee consisted of five members, all second year social work students majoring in group work. Three of the members conducted individual pre-testing sessions with different social work groups. The other two members served as student instrument users, each charting different groups during the two actual test sequences. All five thesis committee members participated in group discussion sessions and participated in joint planning and decision-making operations.

Because of the importance attached to the expert's judgment in social work settings, it was decided to test the instrument's findings against the independent judgment of an expert. We defined expertness as that quality found in the judgment of a graduate social worker having at least two years group work practice in the field.

We then selected four such experts currently practicing social group work in the Boston area. Two of the experts were trained in the use of the instrument in individual sessions by thesis members. Training in instrument use was seen as important, and necessitated thorough practice sessions in charting. The expert was considered trained when able to chart as well as his trainer.

Two members of the thesis group conducted the individual instrument training sessions for the experts and administered the actual test sessions. Two thesis committee members also served as the student instrument users during the testing sessions. The

training sessions for the expert instrument users consisted of familiarization with the instrument and practice charting from group process records and role play situations. Charting of actual group meetings and comparison of the experts' and trainers' results was undertaken in both of the individual training situations. The trainers and thesis committee members derived their training from similar procedures engaged in during the numerous thesis formulation meetings.

The two experts, and the two students who were not members of the thesis committee, without the instrument were given a list of role criteria and asked to arrive at an evaluation of social maturity using the given aspects of role behavior on which to base their judgment. No attempt was made to train the non-instrument using observers. However they were asked to become familiar with the criteria. The criteria consisted of the instrument's role categories appearing in a scrambled form.

The purpose of furnishing the non-instrument judges with a scrambled copy of the role criteria used in the instrument was to attempt to insure that all observers would be using the dimension of role behavior in arriving at their conclusions. Originally, much thought and discussion went into this aspect of the thesis regarding the danger involved in prejudicing our judges by furnishing the identical indices that the instrument was constructed on. However we felt that both groups ought to be looking at role behavior from the same dimension and identical role criteria would furnish the most logically comparable basis for our data analysis.

By using the two categories of experts and students, both with and without the instrument, we hoped to compare the results and arrive at a degree of validation.

The validation principle is based on examining an untested measure in the light of a known measure. In general our strategy was to assume that the expert without instrument gives the most correct judgment. Our procedure was then to assess each of the other observers directly or indirectly against this reference point.

FIGURE I

	Expert No-Instrument (E_{NI})	Student Instrument (S_I)
Expert Instrument (E_I)	(1) $E_I - E_{NI}$	(2) $E_I - S_I$
Student No-Instrument (S_{NI})	(4) $E_{NI} - S_{NI}$	(3) $S_I - S_{NI}$

Figure I illustrates possible comparisons that need to be considered between both expert and non-expert results.

(1) We first compared expert with instrument - expert no instrument ($E_I - E_{NI}$). The E_{NI} judgment is assumed to be correct and we tested to see if the instrument detracted from the expert's expertness. If the results are the same, we assume the instrument does not detract from the expert's judgment. If the results are significantly different we can assume that:

- a) the expert with instrument does not have enough instrument training, or
- b) the instrument does in fact detract from the expert's expertness.

(2) The expert with instrument was then compared to student with instrument ($E_I - S_I$). Since both parties are using the instrument, any difference is attributable to the degree of expertness assuming equal skill in the use of the instrument. This comparison determines whether or not the student's judgment with instrument can approach the expert's judgment with the instrument.

(3) Next we compared students with the instrument to the students with no instrument ($S_I - S_{NI}$). Here we expected a difference. If the results are the same, then the instrument has little effect on the quality of judgment. We assumed that the educational backgrounds of the students were similar for the purposes of this study, and the differences, if any, would be due to the degree which a student's judgment is improved by use of the instrument.

(4) The fourth comparison made was contrasting the expert with no instrument with the student with no instrument ($E_{NI} - S_{NI}$). Here we were checking the quality of judgment of the no-instrument student against the no-instrument judgment of the expert.

Although each of the above comparisons is of value when examined singly, validation is only achieved when the combination of all four comparisons is considered.

III Pretest

Before administering the actual testing sessions three of the thesis committee members engaged in a pre-test charting session using the instrument. One session was used to allow for the observer's presence. The charting was done at a subsequent session and the results reported back to our thesis committee meetings to assist in the design of our actual testing sessions. The pre-test charting sessions were conducted at the Brookline, Brighton and Newton Jewish Community Center, Roxbury Neighborhood House and the South End House, using adolescent social work groups similar in size and type to those used in our actual testing sessions. In addition to ironing out the difficulties in our testing methodologies, it served to give three thesis committee members an opportunity to experience a "live" charting session. Information concerning observer fatigue, seating arrangements, dangers of being drawn into group interaction and the observer's effect on the group was gained through the pre-test sessions. This information was used in conducting the actual testing sessions.

IV Test

Our two full-scale charting operations were set up and run separately by two of the thesis committee members.

The Brookline, Brighton and Newton Jewish Community Center and the Roxbury Neighborhood House were the two social agencies in the actual testing sessions. The groups consisted of one adolescent planning group (Group I) and one adolescent combination planning and activity group (Group II). Both groups were led by graduate social group workers. The agencies, groups and leaders were chosen on the

basis of their representativeness and availability.

The charting procedures consisted of three sessions with the two experts and two student observers present: an initial familiarization session, an informal charting session and the final session at which our instrument data would be gathered and the independent judgments collected. Because of inadequate expert instrument training, both groups were extended to a four-session sequence. The test data were collected at the fourth session and the three earlier sessions were used for familiarization and practice instrument charting.

Each group was charted for one hour. This was found to be the maximum period that the instrument users could operate without undue fatigue. One group meeting lasted one hour and was charted totally; the other group (planning-activity) lasted one and one-half hours and was charted the first hour only.

The observers were seated apart from the group to minimize their presence and avoid being drawn into the group process. The observers were also seated separately to prevent them from influencing each other's observations.

Instructions to the group and explanations about the observer's presence at the meetings were handled by the group leaders. Each group was asked if it would consent to having observers present at its meeting to observe the group in action.

Initially, we were concerned with the large number of observers (four) required at the sessions and their effect on the group process. It was decided that the three preliminary sessions would diminish the danger of the observer's inhibiting or provoking

group behavior. More important was the fact that we were comparing agreements in observed role behavior and not the absolute maturity or immaturity of the groups. Because our purpose was to validate the instrument, the observers effect on the group would only be important if their presence distorted or limited group behavior so that the instrument could no longer be meaningfully used.

After the test data had been collected, the non-instrument using experts and students were administered a post-test evaluation sheet and asked to rate the group on a maturity index scale.³ This was done to determine the ratings or judgments made by the non-instrument users and allow us to compare the findings with the instrument results. The post-test evaluation was administered in individual interview sessions to both the student and expert non-instrument users. This was done by a thesis committee member who also served as the session's student instrument user.

After making their initial group role maturity rating, the non-instrument using experts and students were asked the factors on which they had based their judgments. We were interested in the rationale behind their particular decisions. We also asked if the criteris furnished them were adequate for making a judgment. Here we hoped to come across any role misinterpretation or aspects leading to the improvement of the original instrument.

The experts and students were then asked to make judgments on hypotheses dealing with the number of role behavior responses

³ See Appendix E.

observed.⁴ On a separate sheet they were asked to make a second rating of social maturity to see if the hypotheses affected their rating in any way.

These independent ratings of social maturity were then compared to their earlier ratings and the bases for their changes were ascertained. The initial social maturity ratings were then compared to the instrument-derived rating scale which converted the instrument users' results to an identical maturity index scale.

For the data derived from the instrument, the thesis group set up a conversion table⁵ to process the raw instrument data and arrive at a numerical index rating. This numerical rating was applied to a seven point scale to allow for comparison of the social maturity ratings with that of the non-instrument users. Identical seven point social maturity scales were used in comparing all of the observer judgments both the instrument and non-instrument users.

The seven point scale seemed the most reasonable index to use from a social work point of view. The seven levels of judgment seemed more useful for our purposes than either the five or eleven point conventional judgment scales.

⁴•See Appendix E.

⁵•See Appendix A.

CHAPTER III

DATA ANALYSIS

I Introduction

In general our approach to testing the validation and useability of the instrument is to compare the observations of experts (trained and experienced social group workers) and non-experts (students). This will take the form of four comparisons. As indicated, the assumption underlying these comparisons is that the expert with no instrument judgment is considered to be correct. The comparisons to be made will assess to what extent use of the instrument aids the non-expert to approximate the judgment of the expert. The first comparison of the expert with and the expert without the instrument is to determine whether or not the instrument detracts from the expert's experience and knowledge. The second comparison of the expert and student's observations using the instrument is to determine to what degree their observations were similar. Our next concern was how the observations of the student with the instrument compared to the expert with the instrument to see if the instrument made a significant difference in the rating of group role maturity. The final comparison was between student and expert without the instrument to assess how the student's judgment without the instrument compares with the expert.

II Validation

A. Comparison of Expert with and Expert without Instrument (Table III)

In group I the expert using the instrument gave the group

a maturity rating of 3 and his final computed rating as a result of the data analysis was 2. The expert without the instrument assigned the group a 2. For our purposes it was decided on the basis of group consensus that a difference of one unit or less on the maturity scale was considered to be sufficiently close to be similar. In evaluating this difference it should be kept in mind the different ways in which the instrument user and the non-instrument user achieved their ratings. The expert using the instrument in Group II initially designated a 5 maturity rating, whereas the expert without the instrument judged the group a rating of 1. Based on this gross discrepancy, in addition to the profile analysis and our knowledge of the student rater led to the conclusion that the expert with the instrument in Group II was not sufficiently familiar with the instrument for his data to be meaningfully utilized and therefore his data was excluded from the analysis.

From these ratings we conclude that the instrument did not detract from the expert's use of his training and experience and secondly, the computed rating was consistent with the observed rating suggesting that the computation procedure was meaningful.

B. Comparison of the Student with and Expert with the Instrument
(Table IV)

Having shown that the instrument does not detract from the expert's judgment we considered how the student with the instrument compared to the expert using the instrument. In other words we were interested in determining the extent to which expertness is reflected in the use of the instrument. This comparison is based on the results of a profile analysis and the findings of the seven hypotheses.

1. The profile analysis (see Table III) was utilized to assess the degree to which observers charted similar distributions of observations over the ten role categories. This was to check to see to what degree similar ratings of maturity by different observers was based on a similar pattern of observations. Application of the Spearman Rank Order Correlation resulted in high agreement ($r = .88$) for the two charters in Group I, an agreement which occurs in chance one time in a hundred. In Group II we found low agreement ($r = .16$) which is no different than chance agreement. This indicates that the two observers say very different patterns of behavior.

2. As a preliminary step in the computation of a maturity role index we compared the expert and student's observation on seven hypotheses. The results of the hypotheses appear in Table 1. This table is to be considered in conjunction with Table II (group characteristics) which is necessary to give an adequate interpretation to the findings of the hypotheses. As stated earlier the hypotheses were defined in the following operational ways:

- 1) The group is more mature the larger the ratio of the group oriented behavior to self-oriented behavior

$$\frac{T+M}{T+M+S} \quad \frac{\text{Task+Maintenance}}{\text{Task+Maintenance Self-oriented}}$$

- 2) A group is more mature the greater the distribution of the total group's behavior over all categories and the lesser the concentration in certain specific categories

a) $\frac{T}{T+M} \quad \frac{\text{Task responses}}{\text{Task+Maintenance responses}}$

b) $\frac{N.R.C.}{T.R.C.} \quad \frac{\text{Total number of role categories used}}{\text{Total role categories}}$

- 3) The group is more mature the greater the distribution of each individual member's role behavior over all categories

$$a) \frac{\sum (R.O.I) \times (N.Re)}{\sum (R.O.I) \times \frac{T.N.Re}{N.I}}$$

The sum of the rank order correlation of indiv's x's number of responses

The sum of the rank order correlation of indiv's x's total number of responses over number of indiv's

$$b) \frac{\sum (R.O.I) \times (N.R.)}{\sum (R.O.I) \times \frac{T.N.R}{N.I}}$$

Same as 3a except that responses are substituted by roles

4. The group is more mature the larger the ratio of member enacted roles to worker enacted roles

$$a) \frac{T.W.Re}{T.G.Re} = \frac{\text{Total Worker Responses}}{\text{Total Group Responses}}$$

$$b) \frac{T.W.R}{T.I.R.} = \frac{\text{Total Worker Roles}}{\text{Total Individual Roles}}$$

We were interested in the above formula of the proportion of worker responses and roles to the total group responses and roles. However because of our desire to form a single index of maturity it was considered desirable to have a high proportion reflect high maturity. As the proportion of worker responses and roles to total group responses and roles increases this is considered to reflect low maturity. Therefore, to be consistent we calculated the compliment of this proportion, namely the $1 - \frac{\text{Total Worker Responses}}{\text{Total Group Responses}}$ which gives the proportion of member responses to total responses and reflects high maturity the larger the proportion. This follows since total group responses is composed of total group responses plus individual responses or

$$\frac{\text{Total Member Responses}}{\text{Total Group Responses}} - \frac{\text{Total Worker Responses}}{\text{Total Group Responses}} = 100\%$$

Therefore, $100 - \frac{\text{Total Worker Responses}}{\text{Total Group Responses}} = \frac{\text{Total Member Responses}}{\text{Total Group Responses}}$

The final formula for hypothesis 4 is as follows:

$$a) \frac{T.M.R.}{T.G.R.} = 100 - \frac{T.W.Re}{T.G.Re} = \frac{\text{Total Member Responses}}{\text{Total Group Responses}} = \frac{100 - \text{Total Worker Responses}}{\text{Total Group Responses}}$$

$$b) \frac{T.M.R.}{T.G.R.} = 100 - \frac{T.W.R}{T.G.R} = \frac{\text{Total Member Roles}}{\text{Total Group Roles}} = 100 - \frac{\text{Total Worker Roles}}{\text{Total Group Roles}}$$

TABLE I
HYPOTHESIS TABLE

HYPOTHESIS	SUB HYPOTH.		GROUP I		GROUP II	
			STUDENT	EXPERT	STUDENT	EXPERT
1		$\frac{T \quad M}{T \quad M \quad S}$	88.9%	94%	72.9%	
2	a	$\frac{T}{T \quad M}$	87.8%	80.4%	40.3%	
	b	$\frac{N.R.C.}{T.R.C.}$	100%	100%	80%	
3	a	$\frac{\neq (R.OI) \times (N.Re)}{\neq (R.OI) \times (T.N.Re)} \left(\frac{N.I.}{N.I.} \right)$	68%	56.1%	90.6%	
	b	$\frac{\neq (R.OI) \times (N.R.)}{\neq (R.OI) \times (T.N.R.)} \left(\frac{N.I.}{N.I.} \right)$	67%	60.3%	55%	
4	a	$\frac{T.M.Re}{T.G.Re} = 100 - \frac{T.W.Re}{T.G.Re}$	62%	60%	77%	
	b	$\frac{T.M.R.}{T.G.R} = 100 - \frac{T.W.R}{T.G.R}$	0%	10%	0%	

TABLE II
GROUP CHARACTERISTICS

GROUP CHARACTERISTICS		GROUP I	GROUP II
1	Type of group	Planning group	Planning-activity
2	Number of Members	8	(at time of observation 8 (5 members were attending
3	Sex	Co-educational	All boys
4	Ages	13 - 16 years	13 - 16 years
5	Setting	Brookline-Brighton-Jewish Community Center	Roxbury Neighborhood Settlement House
6	Socio-economic class	Middle class	Lower middle class

In Table I we note for hypothesis 1 a relatively high correlation between the student and expert in Group I. The high percentages which each observer found indicates that the observed behavior was highly group oriented (89% and 94%). Since reliability of the two students using the instrument is high in looking at the same behavior (because of equal training), it can be concluded that Group II behavior showed considerably lower group oriented (72%) behavior than was found in Group I. We might speculate that there were various factors which contributed to this with respect to the group characteristics (Table II). For example, Group II consisted of all boys who were members of a planning-activity club; in addition, the members came from a lower socio-economic class than Group I. It is conceivable that these differences may have contributed to the different ways in which the members relate to each other in a group.

Looking at hypothesis 2a we find that there was approximate agreement (difference of 7% between expert and student in Group I with respect to the proportion of task oriented behavior. In contrast to Group I, Group II showed a great deal less task oriented behavior (40% relative to 80 and 80% in Group I). This difference between groups may stem from the somewhat dissimilar purpose of the groups where Group I is a planning group and Group II is a planning-activity group (according to the chartings, Group II required more maintenance behavior).

Looking at hypothesis 2b we find that expert and student are in agreement in Group I. In this group, behavior was observed in all of the ten possible role categories. In Group II eight out

of the ten role categories were used. The two missing role categories were "standard setting" and "expressing group feeling." In addition, Group II showed three times as much self-oriented behavior as was found in Group I. These combined findings, i.e., more self-oriented behavior and fewer categories used, suggests that there is less organization with respect to role behavior in Group II. This assumes of course that a deficiency of task oriented behavior coexistent with a high degree of self-oriented behavior is indicative of disorganization. On the other hand this might suggest that a predominance of task roles existing with appropriate self-oriented behavior results in effective organization.

Our interest in hypothesis 3 was based on the assumption that all other things being equal, an equal distribution among the members of number of responses and use of role categories reflects high maturity. Therefore, we assessed this hypothesis by measuring the degree to which the observed distribution of behavior varied from the ideal distribution. This was accomplished in the following way.¹ For both the ideal and the observed conditions the individuals in the group were rank-ordered relative to the frequency of observed responses. A weighting was obtained by multiplying the number of responses by their rank order. These were then totalled for all members of the group. This total was then compared to a similarly obtained total for the ideal group by way of proportion where the former is numerator, the latter denominator.

The proportion gained from the student's rating in Group I was found to be considerably higher (68% than that observed from the

¹ See Appendix for example

expert's rating (56%). From this we may conclude that the student in Group I saw greater response distribution among individuals than did the expert. Since we have assumed that they were equally trained in the use of the instrument, such a difference may be attributed to the expert's more experienced judgment. This assumption is open to some question in the finding of considerably more responses from the student.

With regard to Group II we find significantly greater equality in respect to distribution of responses (90% relative to 68 and 56% in Group I). To be consistent with previous considerations this higher percentage is likely to reflect equal distribution in non-mature directions rather than towards maturity.

Hypothesis 3b was calculated in a similar way to 3a except that use of role categories was used instead of number of responses. Here it is interesting to note the relatively high agreement between Group's I and II. In view of the other differences already noted this would suggest that hypothesis 2b may not be sufficiently discriminating in terms of role maturity.

In determining hypothesis 4a and 4b we took the complement of the ratio of worker responses to total group responses so that the resulting high percentages reflected high maturity. For hypothesis 4a close agreement was found between student and expert in Group I (60 and 62%). This is in contrast to the higher rating made in the observation by the student in Group II (77%). This indicates that the worker in Group I participated considerably more than the worker in Group II. The nature of the kind of Group I i.e.,

planning, might have resulted in greater participation of the worker, rather than implying lower maturity.

Hypothesis 4b showed similarly close agreement between student and expert in Group I (10% and 0%). For all practical purposes the worker used as many different role responses as was accounted for by the group. To the degree to which these groups represent a different degree of maturity, this item is not a very discriminating one relative to group maturity.

3. Interrelationships between Hypotheses (Table I)

As has been implied earlier, consideration of any single hypothesis independent of others is likely to give an inadequate estimate of group maturity. In addition to this is the assumption that the hypotheses are not equal in importance. In order to take these considerations into account and to provide an overall maturity rating a weighting procedure was developed. The weighted composite of the seven hypotheses was compared to a theoretical maximum which is based on a 100% maturity rating on each of the hypotheses. This proportion was then converted to a rating on a seven point scale on the basis of a conversion table derived by group consensus which in turn is based on available knowledge and experience. Group consensus for setting standards in our analysis would have been more meaningful if it had been possible to form this consensus by using experts in the field rather than students of the thesis committee, however practical limitations prevented this.

The final computed ratings of the expert and student in Group I based on the weighting procedure were almost identical (student rating of 65% equalled scale value of 2, expert rating was 65% which is slightly below scale value of 2) which indicates high agreement as did the profile analysis.

C. Comparison of Student With and Student Without Instrument (Table III)

The comparisons of the above profile and hypotheses of the student and expert using the instrument does not tell us whether this agreement could be achieved by the student without the instrument. To check on this possibility we looked at the comparison of the student with instrument compared to the student without the instrument in which we found high agreement (2 and 3) in Group I. This is contrasted by the student with instrument and student without instrument in Group II ($1\frac{1}{2}$ and $3\frac{1}{2}$). Having decided that a difference of one unit in judgment is not considered meaningful, it seems from this that a student without the instrument can achieve a similar rating to the student with the instrument which raises a question as to the utility of the instrument. However, in making this judgment it is important to keep in mind the limitation here of using just a single rating as a basis for comparison. We intended to have a better check on how the non-instrument observers arrived at their ratings by asking them in question form the hypotheses (these appear on the questionnaire in appendix). However, due to misunderstanding concerning the meaning of the questions this data had to be excluded from our interpretation.

D. Comparison of Student and Expert Without Instrument
(Table III)

To further assess rating of the student without the instrument, we compared the ratings of the student and expert without the instrument. Although this comparison is somewhat implicit in the previous comparison it was desirable to make this comparison. From these ratings (student 3 and expert 2 in Group I, student 3½ and expert 1 for Group II) our concern of the validity of the instrument is further questioned because a student is able to approximate an expert's judgment independent of the instrument. Therefore, the instrument does not seem to add anything to a non-expert's judgment. One further consideration is reflected in our restriction of a small sample. It may be that a larger sample would not show this degree of agreement.

TABLE III
VALIDATION TABLE

	GROUP I				GROUP II			
	INSTRUMENT USERS		NON-INSTRUMENT USERS		INSTRUMENT USERS		NON-INSTRUMENT USERS	
	STUDENT	EXPERT	STUDENT	EXPERT	STUDENT	EXPERT	STUDENT	EXPERT
Maturity ratings based on weighted percentages	65%	63%	Not obtained *	Not obtained *	61.4%	Not obtained *	Not obtained *	Not obtained *
Maturity scale ratings	2	2	3	2	1.5		3.5	1

* See Discussion in text.

III. Discussion of Findings

As indicated earlier it is important to re-emphasize that our findings can only be considered exploratory because of the restricted nature of our sample. However, we are assuming that our sample although limited is nevertheless sufficiently representative for these exploratory findings to provide a useful step in the evaluation of this instrument.

An important finding is that considerable question is raised as to the usefulness of the instrument as we have analyzed the data since it did not appear to have any considerable effect on the quality of judgments made. A remaining contribution of the instrument is in the data it provides on the descriptive distributions of role behavior in planning groups.

These interpretations should be viewed in the perspective of the assumptions upon which the data analysis is based. For the assumptions upon which the data analysis is based. For example, in considering the expert with and expert without the instrument, the comparison was based on a single index rating. It is possible that this rating on a seven point scale is not discriminating or reliable enough to give an accurate maturity rating. We had intended to minimize this difficulty in two ways, one by providing the observer with a frame of reference in regard to role behavior, two, to determine the way in which the observers judgments were made by asking his assessment of the four hypotheses dealing with the number of responses. Unfortunately, a misinterpretation of the hypotheses by these observers invalidated using this data. As a result we were unable to clarify the basis of the judgments by the observers without the instrument.

Another assumption which may be subject to question in the data analysis is the procedure for weighting the four hypotheses. This was based on the available combined experience of the the thesis committee members. Greater expert knowledge and experience might have resulted in different weights to the four hypotheses. For example, hypothesis 4b, according to our decision was given the greatest weight, based on the group opinion that the proportion of worker responses to group responses was the most significant index of maturity of the four hypotheses. This may or may not coincide with the judgment of a trained person with more experience.

A further assumption which could be questioned is the use of a seven point maturity scale and the manner in which the percentages were converted to rating scale values. The seven point scale was used because we felt the seven categories was the most meaningful discrimination that the observers were able to make in practice. This conversion of percentages to the scale was made by group consensus. As before, both of these procedures are based more on intuition than empirical fact.

A slight modification in any of the above assumptions could have made significant difference in the findings of the data analysis.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Conclusions

In evaluating the results of this research we need to separate out the utility of the instrument from the particular way in which we have chosen to analyze the data. Therefore it is more correct to say that we have tested one way of interpreting the data which is gathered by the instrument rather than the instrument itself. Test of the instrument itself can come only when the instrument has been used under the range of all conditions for which it was intended and evaluated under a variety of assumptions that may be meaningful.

To the extent that we have measured it, the instrument appears to have validity. That is, it provides a measure of role maturity in groups consistent with expert judgment. However, its usefulness appears limited in that it provides no better judgment than the student without instrument. The instrument would have been considered invalid if the experts and non-experts had not agreed.

Inherent in the nature of social work practice is the necessity to make judgments on samples of behavior. Therefore, the sampling process becomes of much concern. The instrument becomes useful to the degree that it samples enough of the relevant social behavior to provide for meaningful assessment and prediction. The nature of the instrument and our use of it has raised the

question in our minds as to whether the assessment of primarily verbal role behavior, as such, is an adequate judgment of the relevant behavior necessary to making a judgment of prime interest to social group work practice.

Other necessary considerations are the nature of the content, affect, patterns of personal interaction, sequence of role behavior, etc. An instrument which would judiciously assess these dimensions would probably be of considerable value. For these reasons it would seem that attention might be more profitably turned towards developing more conclusive instruments rather than continuing towards more complete testing of this instrument.

Another important concern is clear specification of the general concept of maturity, and particularly that of role maturity. It could be useful to consider under what conditions a group is demonstrating mature role behavior. What may be mature in one situation may not be mature in another. If this is the case, any instrument intended to measure role behavior would need to take this kind of variation into account.

Another question of concern to social work practice is that given the complexities and technical complications in designing and utilizing such instruments, to what degree may such activity be undertaken by the average social group worker? Does this reflect a need for development of social workers with particular skills in research or may this be accomplished by utilization of resources in allied fields. This last possibility raises the question as to what extent a non-social work oriented person is able to effectively deal with social work problems?

In assessing behavior in the total sense as is implicit in our use of the instrument, concern arises about a basic practice in social work which is: When working with a group, to what extent are we dealing with individuals and to what extent are we dealing with phenomena among individuals? Since these are often very closely interwoven, it raises some question of emphasis in training in casework or group work, per se. It may be of more long term value to provide generic social work training which in some way intergrates the knowledge and skills of all social work methods.

II Limitations

A. Instrument:

The instrument itself was limited in many ways. It is not likely to adequately reflect the feeling tone of the group being charted. This gives a limited view of what kinds of roles were taken at the meeting compared to what actually occurred at the meeting. Therefore, it is important for the observers with instrument to assess the feeling tone of the group while charting it. Also, the fact that all members are not present at a given meeting can change the feeling tone. This indicates the need for some narrative interpretation of the results of the instrument whenever it is used. The most satisfactory practice would be to chart a group several times over a long period of time.

Another limitation of the instrument is that it doesn't measure the content of discussions or the nature of intra group relationships other than overt role behavior, which are also important for the group worker to consider when assessing the social maturity of a group.

A further major limitation of the instrument is that the third major category of self-oriented behavior is not sub-divided as are the task and maintenance categories. This would be desirable in order to achieve the same uniformity, clarity, and equal weight of all categories. Perhaps one reason this was not originally sub-divided was that self-oriented behavior was thought of as negative and therefore was not really used in assessing the maturity of the group except as it detracted from it. We know from the practice of social group work, however, that self-oriented behavior can be positive in terms of individual behavior and can under certain conditions even contribute towards group maturity, and therefore, some thought should be given to this in working out new formulae for the calculation of instrument results in order to assess the "real" social maturity of the group.

B. Time

A major limitation of this project was time. Beginning a thesis project in the second year of graduate study by the thesis committee necessarily limited the amount of work that could be done as the first semester was spent in planning the project and acquiring knowledge and skills in doing this type of research. This left only the second semester for the actual data collection and analysis.

Because of limited time available, the scope of our study was also limited since we were only able to use a sample of two groups. We tried to select the groups to be as representative of social work groups as possible. This small sample does detract considerably from validation. However, as mentioned in an earlier

chapter, we felt that even with this great limitation, our study was a beginning step in the validation process in addition to providing an important research experience for the thesis committee.

C. Data Collection

The training of the expert with instrument in Group II was adequate due to circumstances beyond our control. This accounts for the low correlation in the profile analysis ($r = .16$).

We felt that there was a lack of a common frame of reference in understanding the concept of role behavior. For the instrument users, the role categories were explicitly explained in the instrument itself, whereas this was not done for the non-instrument users. Their role interpretations seemed, at times, different from those in the instrument. There was a subjective interpretation on the part of the instrument users as to which role category the enactment belonged especially in Group II which made for a difference in the results. We felt that this was due primarily to a lack of familiarity with the instrument. This indicates a need to improve the training process perhaps by preparing explicit material (verbal and narrative) explaining role behavior and its necessity to understanding group behavior.

There were also difficulties in using the post-meeting questionnaire. Apparently there was a lack of clarity and understanding of the meaning of the questions despite the fact that the questionnaire was verbally explained to those who used it and the response was elicited in the presence of the student with instrument. We felt that we couldn't use the hunches of the student

and expert without instrument about the percentage of various role behaviors exhibited in the group meetings because of later determined differences in use of the role concept. As a result, we only have a single maturity index rating by non-instrument users for comparison to the judgments of the expert with instrument and the student without instrument. The student and expert with instruments have a more definitive basis for comparison of their results because of the use of the instrument.

The second rating of the student and expert without instrument, as was provided for in the questionnaire, was not used because we were not able to take into consideration the intervening questions about the hypotheses and how they would have effected their judgments as was pointed out above. Having only a single rating without the underlying bases of judgment which the expert and student non-instrument users had considered detracts from the confidence we can place in these judgments.

D. Fatigue Factor

We found that the actual charting of roles in a group meeting was very fatiguing and could only be done for one hour at a time. For a group meeting longer than one hour, the results of charting might not give an adequate and truthful view of what actually went on in a total meeting as roles change throughout any session. Therefore, when judging a group's maturity in role behavior, some notation of whether or not an entire meeting was charted should be made since instrument results are only valid for the time actually charted.

E. Training

A basic understanding of role behavior is needed for training in the use of the instrument. For practical reasons, we used some written group records in our own training for charting. This method is insufficient as written records are usually selective, whereas in live groups all behavior must be charted. Also, in live groups, there is rapid interaction which necessitates thorough familiarity with the instrument.

F. Summary

In general, this research can only be looked at as a pilot study because of limited time, limited training, and limited scope. It was felt however that the results are sufficient to raise question about the utility of the instrument in the situation used.

III. Recommendations

A. Research

Further work should be done in the validation of the instrument as we only used two groups as our sample which does not give conclusive evidence of validity. A variation in groups according to type and age is recommended for this. In this way, the instrument's applicability or lack of it to more social work type groups can be ascertained. The instrument should be used at spaced intervals over a long period of time to assess the group's movement in social maturity.

In our project we chose a seven point maturity scale because it seemed to be a most meaningful one for practice. It most closely approximates the degree to which judgments can be

differentiated. More work should also be done in meaningfully anchoring a maturity scale rather than arbitrarily selecting a range for the judgment of a group's maturity.

The reliability of the instrument should also be established through further research. Reliability refers to the procedure wherein two or more independent observers can simultaneously record the same behavior in a given situation. If the instrument is to be meaningful, it must be reliable.

B. Practice

We feel that the instrument can be used as a training technique for a new agency worker. The raw judgment of the new worker and his charting results could be assessed against the judgment of an expert without instrument. Every social group worker should be aware of the various roles enacted in a group and what meaning they have for understanding the group process. The use of the training technique described above is one way that such awareness may be created.

Every social work group should be periodically assessed in terms of its movement toward social maturity. The instrument should be used at spaced intervals over a period of time so that such movement may be measured. Role behavior is only one aspect of social maturity, however, so that other factors making up maturity should be considered in these periodic assessments.

One question that arises in the practical use of the instrument is whether or not maintenance and task roles can be neatly separated in social work groups. Both verbal and non-verbal

behavior may have dual role interpretations, i.e., one action may represent two roles in either the task or maintenance category or may represent one task role and one maintenance role. Both interpretations should be charted in order to get a truthful picture of the group.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

I. Purpose and Overview

The primary purpose of this project was to validate an observational instrument that measures role behavior in social work groups as was conceived by the 1958-59 thesis committee. We approached validation by starting with last year's hypotheses and then proceeded to refine them. Validation was accomplished by assessing the degree to which the judgments of non-experts (students) approximated the judgments of experts (trained social workers.)

II. Method and Procedure

A. Selection of Groups for Observation

Practical limitations necessitated limiting our observations to two groups for this project - one a planning group (as in the 1959 thesis) and the other a combination planning-activity oriented group. Both were adolescent groups meeting regularly as member groups of their respective social agencies.

B. Validation Procedure

1. Description of Instrument: The instrument consisted of ten role categories, four task roles, five maintenance roles and one self-oriented role, which were judged by the thesis committee of 1958-59 to be those which would be present in every social work group.

2. Description of Observers: Four observers were used in each group. The expert and student instrument users charted roles as they saw them enacted in the groups. The expert and

student without the instrument observed the use of roles in the group using the role criteria as a guide.

3. Evaluation of Observation: The observations of the observers with instrument were evaluated using a profile analysis and the findings of the seven hypotheses. A profile analysis was performed to check the similarity of distribution of observed behaviors over the ten categories of the instrument.

The seven hypotheses utilized in this thesis were considered to involve major factors necessary to assessing role maturity. Although the hypotheses are of interest on an individual basis, it was felt that they would be of maximum utility when all were considered as a unit. Since hypotheses are not of equal importance, it was necessary to weight them before combining them to yield a single index of maturity. The weighting was accomplished in the following manner: Hypothesis I was the least important. The others were weighted as follows: Hypothesis II is twice as important as I, Hypothesis III is three times as important as I, and Hypothesis IV is four times as important as I. The two most important of the seven hypotheses are IIIb and IVa. Next in importance from high to low are IIb, IVb, IIIa, and IIa.

The observations of the people using the instrument were converted to "role maturity" ratings based on a conversion index derived from theoretical and practical considerations.

After the group meeting, the role maturity assessment of the non-instrument users was obtained by means of a questionnaire. We intended to follow a profile analysis with the non-instrument

users using the questionnaire data. However, misinterpretation in filling out the questionnaire made this impossible. As a result, we were limited to the single evaluation by the non-instrument users. All ratings were measured against the expert's judgment without the instrument as basis of validation. Comparison of the ratings of all observers was made possible by having all ratings on a seven point scale. This type of scale was used because it most closely approximated the degree to which judgments can be differentiated in social work practice.

III. Results

A. Results of Group I

In Group I, the expert with instrument and the student with instrument compared favorably on the profile analysis and the ratings derived from the hypotheses. (Profile Analysis correlation - .88; rating scales agreed with one unit.) Likewise the student with instrument and the student without instrument also compared within one unit. The expert without instrument and student without instrument compared closely and the expert with instrument and expert without instrument also had high agreement.

B. Results of Group II

As seen above, in the data analysis, four major comparisons of the student and expert observers were made to test the validity of the instrument. Because of insufficient understanding of the instrument by the expert with instrument in Group II, however, only two comparisons were made. There were high correlations both between the student with instrument and the student without the instrument,

and between the expert without instrument and student without instrument.

C. Comparison Between the Two Groups

The training of the students with the instrument gave some basis for comparing the observations in the two different groups insofar as they relate to the expert without instrument. In this comparison, Group I was considered generally more mature than Group II. It was felt that the backgrounds of the group members and the difference in type of group contributed to this difference.

APPENDIX A

EXAMPLE OF WEIGHTING

I.	.10	94	9.4
II. a.	.07	80.4	5.6
b.	.13	100	13
III. a.	.10	56.1	5.6
b.	.20	60.3	12.1
IV. a.	.27	40	10.8
b.	.13	10	1.3
			TOTAL 57.8

$$\frac{57.8}{1000} = 57.8\%$$

APPENDIX B

RAW DATA TABLE

GROUP I: OBSERVATION WITH INSTRUMENT EXPERT AND STUDENT

Role Categories Task	EXPERT												STUDENT											
	Response of members								Total Responses with worker		Total Responses w/o worker		Responses of member								Total Responses with worker		Total Responses w/o worker	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	worker	F	%	F	%	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	worker	F	%	F	%
a. initiating	0	0	2	1	6	0	1	10	20	61	10	4.3	0	0	4	0	4	0	1	6	15	2.9	9	2.4
b. seeking information	2	2	11	6	15	3	2	14	55	16.9	41	17.6	10	7	13	11	21	5	6	33	106	20.3	73	19.3
c. giving information	13	4	15	15	50	3	0	16	116	35.6	108	42.9	17	17	19	16	66	8	6	23	172	33.	149	39.4
d. clarifying	1	1	1	7	12	0	0	17	39	12.	22	9.4	9	3	12	14	18	2	1	30	89	17.1	59	15.6
e. consensus testing	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	5	8	2.5	3	1.3	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	10	15	2.9	5	1.3
f. MAINTENANCE mediating	1	0	1	2	7	0	0	12	23	7.1	11	4.7	2	2	1	1	14	0	2	20	42	8.1	22	5.8
g. encouraging	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	5	1.5	4	1.7	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	7	1.3	1	.3
h. expressing group feeling	7	2	6	2	6	1	2	6	32	9.8	26	11.2	0	3	4	4	1	0	2	11	25	4.9	14	3.7
i. standard setting	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	12	14	4.3	2	.9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	1.0	4	1.1
j. self-oriented	0	0	3	3	5	1	2	0	14	4.3	14	6.0	6	1	0	6	8	2	19	3	45	8.6	42	11.1
TOTAL	24	9	41	36	108	8	7	93	326		233		45	3	5	5	13	14	40	143	521		378	

APPENDIX C
RAW DATA TABLE

GROUP II: OBSERVATION WITH INSTRUMENT EXPERT AND STUDENT

This data was not utilized ★

Role Categories	EXPERT ★										STUDENT									
	Responses of members						Total Responses with worker	Total Responses w/o worker	Responses of members						Total Responses with worker	Total Responses w/o worker				
	1	2	3	4	5	worker	7	70	7	70	1	2	3	4	5	worker	7	70	7	70
a. initiating seeking	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.4	0	0	4	2	2	2	2	16	28	7.2	12	3.8
b. information giving	13	1	4	5	3	6	37	17.5	26	18.4	13	11	5	5	1	2	37	9.5	35	11.0
c. information giving	7	1	2	3	2	12	27	14.8	15	10.6	12	5	8	8	7	8	48	12.3	40	12.6
d. clarifying	3	0	2	2	1	5	13	7.1	8	5.7	3	1	0	0	0	2	6	1.5	4	1.3
e. testing consensus	7	3	3	1	3	2	19	10.4	17	12.1	1	0	1	0	0	3	5	1.3	2	.6
f. encouraging	2	1	1	3	1	9	17	9.3	8	5.7	20	15	37	41	24	39	176	45.1	137	43.2
g. mediating	3	0	0	1	0	6	10	5.5	4	2.8	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	.5	1	.3
h. expressing group feeling	5	2	5	9	7	0	28	15.3	28	19.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	0
i. standard setting	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	1.6	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	.5	0	0
j. self-oriented	2	2	1	9	12	-	26	14.2	26	18.4	6	4	25	44	7	0	86	22.1	86	27.1
★ 0	7	42	10	18	33	29	51	183	132		59	38	78	101	41	73	370		317	

APPENDIX D

BACKGROUND DATA ON GROUP

Name or No. of Grp. _____

Leader _____

Agency _____

Date _____

1. What type of group?
 activity ___ friendship ___ council ___ coed ___ all boys ___
 all girls ___
2. Date of original formation of group? _____
 No. of members _____.
 Any interruption in the continuum _____
 Explain.
3. Length of your association with the group? _____
4. Time and frequency of meeting? _____
5. What is the meeting place? _____
6. What dues or fees and to whom? _____
7. Membership:
 No. of active members _____
 No. of inactive members _____
8. What is the relation of this group to other groups?

<u>In agency</u>	<u>Outside agency</u>
------------------	-----------------------

9. Kinds of activities:

	<u>In agency</u>	<u>Outside agency</u>
a. service oriented	_____	_____
b. recreational	_____	_____
c. educational	_____	_____

10. Are there officers for the group? _____ Have there ever
been? _____ elected _____ appointed _____

If elected, how often are elections held? _____

Explain any changes _____

11. Does this group use parliamentary procedure? _____

If so, what type? _____

Do the members raise their hands for recognition during the
discussion period? _____

12. Are there any rivalry or conflict situations in the
group? _____

indigenous leader _____ sub-groups _____ inter-ethnic _____

scapegoating _____ inter-group _____ others _____

Explain.

13. Are there any other things that would be helpful to know about
this group?

GROUP COMPOSITION

<u>Name of Member</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>School Grade</u>	<u>Sex</u>	<u>Race</u>	<u>Ethnic Background</u>	<u>Religion</u>	<u>Comments</u>
-----------------------	------------	---------------------	------------	-------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------

GROUP COMPOSITION

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX F

INSTRUMENT - ROLE CATEGORIES FOR GROUP OBSERVATION

	ROLES	NAMES
TASK ROLES	a) INITIATING, EXPEDITING AND ENERGIZING Proposing task or goals; defining a group problem; suggesting a procedure or ideas for solving a problem; performing tasks for group; prodding group to action or decision.	
	b) SEEKING INFORMATION, OPINION, ORIENTATION Requesting facts; seeking relevant information about a group concern; asking for suggestions or ideas; seeking position of group; requesting goals or direction.	
	c) GIVING INFORMATION, OPINION, ORIENTATION Offering facts; providing relevant information about group concern; stating a belief; giving suggestions or ideas; defining position of group; relating group goals and direction.	
	d) CLARIFYING, ELABORATING, COORDINATING, SUMMARIZING - Interpreting or reflecting ideas and suggestions; clearing up confusions; indicating alternatives and issues; giving examples; pulling together activities of members.	
	e) CONSENSUS TESTING, EVALUATING, CRITICIZING Sending up trial balloons to see if group is reaching a conclusion; checking with group to see how much agreement has been reached; questioning or reflecting on practicality, logic, facts and procedures.	
MAINTENANCE ROLES	f) ENCOURAGING AND ENABLING - Being friendly, warm and responsive to others and their contributions; giving them opportunity for recognition; attempting to keep communication channels open, facilitating participation of others.	
	g) MEDIATING, COMPROMISING, HARMONIZING Attempting to reconcile disagreements; reducing tension through "pouring oil on troubled waters"; qualifying one's position by yielding status or admitting error.	
	h) EXPRESSING GROUP FEELINGS - Sensing feeling, mood, relationships within the group including joking for tension release.	
	i) STANDARD SETTING - Expressing standards for group process; applying standards in evaluating group function and production.	
	j) SELF-ORIENTED BEHAVIOR - Attempts by members to satisfy individual needs which are irrelevant or negatively oriented to task or maintenance functions.	
	k) INDETERMINATE	

Total

APPENDIX G

"ROLES" OCCURRING IN GROUP MEETING
UTILIZED BY NON-INSTRUMENT USER

- a) SEEKING INFORMATION, OPINION, ORIENTATION.
E.g., requesting facts; seeking relevant information about a group concern; asking for suggestions or ideas; seeking position of individuals in group; requesting goals or direction; etc.
- b) STANDARD SETTING.
E.g., expressing standards for group process; applying standards in evaluating group functioning and production; etc.
- c) SATISFYING INDIVIDUAL NEEDS.
E.g., not oriented towards needs of the group, etc.
- d) ENCOURAGING AND ENABLING.
E.g., being friendly, understanding warm and responsive to others; accepting others and their contributions; giving them opportunity for recognition; attempting to keep communication channels open; facilitating participation of others; etc.
- e) CONSENSUS TESTING, EVALUATING, CRITICIZING.
E.g., sending up trial balloons to see if group is reaching a conclusion; checking with group to see how much agreement has been reached; questioning or reflecting on practicality, logic, facts and procedures; etc.
- f) EXPRESSING GROUP FEELINGS.
E.g., sensing feeling, mood, relationships within the group, including joking for tension releases, etc.
- g) INITIATING, EXPEDITING, ENERGIZING.
E.g., proposing task or goals; defining a group problem; suggesting a procedure or ideas for solving a problem; performing tasks for group; prodding group to action or decision; etc.
- h) CLARIFYING, ELABORATING, COORDINATING, SUMMARIZING.
E.g., interpreting or reflecting ideas and suggestions; clearing up confusions; indicating alternatives and issues; giving examples; pulling together activities of members; etc.
- i) MEDIATING, COMPROMISING, HARMONIZING.
E.g., attempting to reconcile disagreements; reducing tension through "pouring oil on troubled waters"; qualifying one's position by yielding status or admitting error; etc.
- j) GIVING INFORMATION, OPINION, ORIENTATION.
E.g., offering facts; providing relevant information about group concern; stating a belief, giving suggestions or ideas, defining position of group; relating group goals and direction; etc.
- k) OTHERS

APPENDIX H

POST-OBSERVATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EXPERTS AND STUDENTS

WITHOUT INSTRUMENT

Now that you have observed this adolescent group, we would like you to indicate how socially mature you feel this group is with respect to the way they use and distribute various role behaviors. Using only the criteria with which we have provided you, place a check at the point on the scale shown below that corresponds to the group level of social maturity.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very immature role behavior for this age group	Moderately immature role behavior for this age group	In-between immature and slightly mature role behavior for this age group	Average mature role behavior for this age group	Better than average mature behavior for this age group	Quite mature behavior for this age group	Very mature role behavior for this age group

What are the primary factors upon which your rating of social maturity in the use of roles is based?

Are there criteris that were not included on our list that should have been? If so, what are they?

Were you able to confine yourself only to the criteria of our list?

If you were to include the criteria you felt should have been on our list, would this have changed your rating of socially mature role behavior?

If so, to what extent (in terms of scale units.)

- I. To what extent do you feel that group oriented and individually self-oriented role behavior were exhibited by the group members?

What percentage of role behavior was group oriented? _____

What percentage of role behavior was individually self-oriented? _____

What are the factors that led you to their judgment? _____

- II. To what extent did the group exhibit all the role categories listed on the criterion sheet?

Of the eleven role categories listed on the criterion sheet, which two main-role categories were used most frequently by the group?

(1) _____ (2) _____

Estimate the percentage of role behavior filled by the each of the two most frequently used role categories.

(1) _____ (2) _____

- III. To what extent did the individual members "play" the the total range of available role behavior categories as listed on the criterion sheet?

Please estimate:

1. Percentage of members filling many different roles. _____

2. Percentage of members filling a moderate number of different roles. _____

3. Percentage of members filling only a few different roles. _____

IV. To what extent did the number of roles enacted by the members compare to the number of roles enacted by the worker?

Please estimate:

1. Percentage of total member-enacted role behavior. _____
2. Percentage of total worker-enacted role behavior. _____

Reasons for judgment.

Using the judgments you have just made on the four "phases of role behavior," we would like you to rate social maturity for the group again. The scale is exactly the same as that used earlier.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very immature role behavior for this age group	Moderately immature role behavior for this age group	In-between immature and slightly mature role behavior for this age group	Average mature role behavior for this age group	Better than average mature behavior for this age group	Quite mature behavior for this group	Very mature role behavior for this age group

Compare the first and the last ratings on the social maturity scale.

1. If the ratings are the same, the interview is completed.
2. If the ratings are different, how are their differences accounted for?

Did the "four phases of role behavior" that you were asked to analyze in this questionnaire (page3) effect your second rating on the social maturity scale?

If so, how?

APPENDIX I
 QUALIFICATION SHEET
 FOR EXPERT AND NON-EXPERTS (STUDENT)

NAME	ROLE	YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	PRESENT POSITION	EDUCATIONAL DEGREE
Group I D. F.	Expert	6	Prog. Dir.	MSSS-1954
J. Le.	Expert	2	Staff Worker	MSSS-1958
E. L.	Non Expert	-	Student volunteer	-
Group II C. S.	Non Expert	-	Student social work	B.A.
J. La.	Expert	13	Prog. Dir.	MSSS-1954
R. R.	Expert	2	Dir. of Aft. Activities	Candidate for MSSS

APPENDIX J

BENNE-SHEATS ROLE CLASSIFICATION

- (1) Group Task Roles. These roles are related to the task which the group is deciding to undertake or has undertaken.
- a. Initiator--suggests or proposes to the group new ideas or a changed way of regarding the group problem.
 - b. Information seeker--asks for clarification of suggestions made, for authoritative information or facts pertinent to the problem being discussed.
 - c. Opinion seeker--asks for a clarification of the values pertinent to what the group is undertaking.
 - d. Opinion giver--states his belief or opinion pertinently to a suggestion made or to alternatives suggested.
 - e. Information giver--offers facts or generalizations which are authoritative.
 - f. Elaborator--spells out suggestions in terms of examples, offers a rationale for suggestions made.
 - g. Coordinator--shows or clarifies the relationships among various ideas and suggestions, pulls them together.
 - h. Evaluator--subjects the accomplishment of the group to some standard of group functioning in the context of the group task.
 - i. Energizer--prods the group to action or decision.
 - j. Procedural technician--expedites group movement by doing things for the group.
 - k. Recorder--write down suggestions, makes a record of group discussions.

- (2) Group Building and Maintenance Roles. These roles are oriented toward the functioning of the group as a group.
- a. Encourager--praises, agrees with the accepts the contributions of others.
 - b. Harmonizer--mediates the differences between other members, relieve tension.
 - c. Compromiser--operates from within a conflict in which his idea or position is involved.
 - d. Gate-keeper and expeditor--attempts to keep communication channels open by encouraging or facilitating the participation of others by proposing regulations of the flow of communication.
 - e. Standard setter--expresses standards for the group to attempt to achieve in its functioning or applies standards in evolving the quality of group process.
 - f. Group observer--keeps records of various aspects of group process and feeds such data with proposed interpretations into the group's evaluation of its won procedures.
 - g. Follower--goes along with the movement of the group, more or less passively accepting the ideas of others.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Articles

- Bales, Robert F. Interaction Process Analysis. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Press, 1950.
- Benne, Kenneth, and Sheats, Paul. "Functional Roles of Group Members," Journal of Social Issue, vol. 4 (Spring, 1948), pp 41-49.
- Bernstein, Saul. "Charting Group Progress," in Readings in Group Work, Dorothea Sullivan (ed.). New York: Associated Press, 1953. pp. 46-72.
- Gross, Neal, Ward Mason, and Alexander McEachern. Exploration in Social Analysis.
- Jahoda, Marie, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart W. Cook. Research Methods in Social Relation, Vols. I and II. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.
- Lippitt, Ronald, and Heyns, Roger W. "Systematic Observational Techniques," in Handbook of Social Psychology, Gardner Lindzey (ed.). Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., Vol. 1, 1954. p. 275.
- Neiman, L.J. and Hughes, J.W. "The Problems of the Concept of Role -- A re-survey of the Literature" Social Force, vol. 30 (Summer, 1951), pp. 141-149.
- McMillan, Wayne. Statistical Methods for Social Workers. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952.
- Sarbin, Theodore R. "Role Theory" in Handbook of Social Psychology Gardner Lindzey (ed.). Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954. pp. 223-259.
- Selltiz, Claire, Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart W. Cook. Research Methods in Social Relations. Revised. Henry Holt and Co., 1959.
- Smith, Marpheus, "The Psychology of the Corporate Acts, in Psychological Review, Vol. 52, 1945.
- Slater, Philip E. "Role Differentiation in Small Groups," in Small Group Studies in Social Interaction. Hare, A. Raul, Edgar Edgar E. Borgatta, and Robert E. Bales. (ed.). New York: Alfred S. Knopf, 1955. pp. 498-516.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

A STUDY OF THE PROFESSIONAL VALUES AND PERCEPTIONS
OF SOCIAL WORKERS

A Thesis

Submitted by

Coetta Lou Berry

(B.A., Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma, 1958)

Emma M. Dawson

(B.A., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y., 1923
M.A., Columbia University, New York, N.Y., 1927)

Moragh Lesslie Shepherd

(B.A., Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, 1949
B.S.W., University of Toronto, Canada, 1950)

Sally Ann H. Wood

(B.A., Mt. Holyoke College, Holyoke, Mass., 1954)

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for
The Degree of Master of Science in Social Service

1960

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PROFESSIONAL VALUES OF SOCIAL WORKERS	7
III. THE IMAGE OF A SOCIAL WORKER	25
IV. A COMPARISON OF OCCUPATIONAL RANKINGS	46
V. SUMMARY.	68
APPENDIX.	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY	84

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Distribution of Social Workers' Responses with Regard to the Things a Young Man Should Consider in Choosing a Career . .	13
2. Distribution of Business Students' Responses with Regard to the Things a Young Man Should Consider in Choosing a Career	14
3. Things a Young Man Should Consider in Choosing a Career . .	18
4. Distribution of Responses Expressing Concern about Professional Situations	20

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The profession of social work has continued to be the subject of many articles and studies ever since 1915 with the appearance of Dr. Flexner's article, "Is Social Work a Profession?"¹ Now, forty-five years later, with social work generally conceded to be a profession, there continues to be much concern over its nature, role, function and values.

The purpose of this study is to explore the professional values of social workers, their self-image, and their perception of themselves in relation to other professional groups. To some extent this is a continuation of a study completed in 1959 which explored the interprofessional relationships between social workers on the one hand, and physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists and clergymen on the other.²

Considerable study has gone into the investigation of values in social work. There is good evidence to support the notion that values held by an individual have an effect on the self-image. In this study we attempt to elicit the values of the social worker, and to see if these values influence her perception of herself, and if so, in what ways.

¹ Abraham Flexner. "Is Social Work a Profession?", Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, 1915.

² Barbara Keller, Roger W. Phelps, Evelyn I. Shickman and Carol Slade, "A Study of the Interprofessional Relations of Social Workers with Physicians, Psychiatrists, Psychologists and Clergymen."

We are further concerned with the social worker's perception of herself in relation to other professional groups, and how social work values may influence this perception.

Methods of Research

The questionnaire was chosen over the interview because it would secure for us a larger number of respondents in a limited time. In addition the questionnaire provides a more standardized method of answering questions. The further advantage of anonymity perhaps did not pertain as much as we had hoped, for even though the respondents were not asked for their names, a number could be identified through the answers to questions about age, sex and education. This seems to have aroused some anxiety lest the questionnaire be used in other ways than for this specific study. Two social workers known to us, and implying this, apologized for failing to complete and return the questionnaires, while a third, a board member, left some questions unanswered. It may be that because of conflicting opinions in the field of social work, some workers hesitated to disclose attitudes or give job descriptions or educational backgrounds which they thought might put them in some jeopardy.

Two groups were used in the study - a group of social workers and a group of students enrolled in the Evening Division of the College of Business Administration. The business student group was used for comparison. A comparison, which may also be a contrast, serves to highlight differences and to emphasize qualities intrinsic to the objects compared. We felt, therefore, that the selection of a group of business students would yield data which would help in delineating

more clearly the values of the social worker. We felt that the image held by the business student is perhaps an indication of what the public image is. In addition the way the business student ranked social work, both in terms of its actual prestige, and the prestige he thinks it should have, would further reveal his image of the social worker.

The questionnaire used in the previous study was expanded with the purpose of eliciting responses falling in the following categories: job values, the image of social work, the prestige and status of social work.

The questionnaires were mailed out with a covering letter and a stamped, self-addressed envelope to 199 social workers selected at random from the Eastern Massachusetts Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers. The random sample was obtained by choosing every fourth name on the alphabetical membership list. A total of 86 questionnaires was returned. The covering letter addressed the recipient as "Dear Social Worker." Actually the group receiving the letter included research workers, students, teaching and retired social workers. Of this group who returned the questionnaires, and who may not have thought of themselves as "social workers", a certain proportion did not answer the questionnaire at all. This accounts for some of the 11 incomplete questionnaires of the 86 returned. There may have been other questionnaires not returned by people in similar categories. In addition two social workers known to us expressed reluctance to disclose their views on a questionnaire. Another social worker, now part-time, telephoned to ask if her answer would be disqualified since she is no longer a full-time worker.

It is apparent, therefore, that there was some ambiguity among the social work group about qualifications for answering the questionnaire. Further reasons for the failure of the remaining social workers to complete and return their questionnaires can only be a matter for conjecture.

The group of business students was also given the questionnaire but in slightly modified form. This group was composed of 86 students enrolled in the Evening Division of the College of Business Administration. The questionnaires were distributed and filled out during a class hour, and collected at that time. Of the total of 86, 14 were eliminated as partly incomplete, leaving a total of 72 completed questionnaires.

Since we were four students the work was divided in the following ways. One student compiled and interpreted the questions dealing with job values, a second with the questions concerned with the status and prestige of the social worker, and a third with the image of the social worker, both the self-image and the image given by the business student. To the fourth student fell the task of writing the introduction and the summary. In addition the fourth student analyzed to some extent the background characteristics of the two groups of respondents.

Background Characteristics of Respondents

Of the group of social workers who answered the questionnaires, fifty-seven were women and eighteen were men. The median age was 40, the youngest being 23 and the oldest 70.

The positions held by these social workers fell into the following categories:

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number</u>
1. Students	8
2. Caseworkers	31
3. Supervisors) Educators) Consultants)	10
4. Administrators) Directors)	17
5. Researchers	4
6. Board Members) Retired Workers)	5

The caseworkers, numerically the largest group, also included the largest number with Master's degrees in social work, 27 out of 31.

The median number of years on the job was 11.

In reviewing the educational background of the fathers of social workers we find that 24 fathers had grade school education, 18 had completed high school, while 32 had college and or professional training.

Of the group of students enrolled in the Industrial Management Classes of the College of Business Administration, 72 completed the questionnaires, 68 men and 4 women. The median age was 27, with the youngest 18 and the oldest 45.

The positions held by these individuals covered a wide variety of jobs, ranging from gas station attendant and truck driver to electronic engineer. All 72 had completed high school, 7 had earned college degrees and more than half had had further vocational training through night courses or otherwise. The median number of years on the job was 2.

The educational background of the fathers included 19 who did not go beyond grade school, 34 who did not go further than high school,

while the remaining group of 21 included 9 with college degrees, 2 with graduate degrees, 2 with law degrees, and 1 with an M.D.

In comparing the two groups of respondents, it appears then that the group of social workers on the whole was older, more educated, with more years of job experience and with a larger number of more highly educated fathers.

In making this study we expected to find different values emerging from social workers and business students. We also expected that the values of the social workers would influence their self-perception in contrast to the perception of social workers held by the business students. We expected that the prestige and status accorded the social worker would be judged low by both groups but that the social worker, because of her values, would feel that her profession should be granted higher status.

CHAPTER II

PROFESSIONAL VALUES OF SOCIAL WORKERS

Introduction

Basic to every profession is its value structure. In other words, "there are basic and fundamental beliefs, the unquestioned premise upon which the very existence of the profession rests."¹

The concept of values permeates much of the social work literature. However, little empirical data is to be found in regard to the values held by social workers. As Boehm says, one of the reasons for this may be the difficulty in getting information on values.

Values are essentially human emanations and intangible because in the realm of ideas and attitudes and have not lent themselves easily to observation, classification and quantification.²

An effort will be made in this chapter to systematically point out what some of the professional values of social workers are and also to compare these values with the values held by business students. This will be done in two ways: first, by analyzing and comparing what the social workers and business students think are the important considerations in choosing an occupation; and second, by analysing and comparing what these two groups regard as undesirable

¹ Ernest Greenwood, "Attributes of a Profession," Social Work, Vol. 2 (July, 1957), p.52.

² Werner Boehm, "The Role of Values in Social Work," The Jewish Social Service Quarterly, Vol. 26 (June, 1950), p. 430.

traits of a professional person or a professional job. We are of the opinion that values will tend to be reflected in these responses. Williamson's article points out that "we do not act without revealing, implicitly or explicitly, subjectively chosen values."³

Methodology

This portion of the study was based on a total of 147 questionnaires, 75 coming from a selected group of social workers of the Eastern Massachusetts Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers and 72 from a selected group of evening students at Boston University College of Business Administration.

The data for this chapter of the study were gathered from Questions 1 and 2 of the questionnaire which can be seen in Appendix A.⁴ It is interesting to note that all respondents completely answered these two questions while there was a varying number of incomplete responses for the other questions in the questionnaire.

Professional Values as Reflected by Considerations Involved In Choosing An Occupation

Method

Question 1 was designed to elicit answers that would yield clues as to the respondents' values in choosing an occupation. In a study done by Ginzberg, et al, it was found that occupational choices

³ Edmund Williamson, "Value Orientation in Counseling," Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 36 (April, 1958) p. 524.

⁴ Henceforth, I will refer to these as Question 1 and Question 2, respectively.

are frequently formed around values.⁵

Since a part of the analysis will include a comparison with parts of the National Opinion Research Center's study, we decided to use a question similar to the one used in that study. The only modification was a request for "the two most important things for a young man to consider when he is choosing his life's work" rather than "the single most important thing for a young man to consider when he is choosing his life's work." The rationale for the change was based on our feeling that the National Opinion Research Center's study did not sufficiently provide for those persons who would consider categories related to both the job and to the individual. For example, financial aspects of the job, physical aspects of the job, security and stability aspects of the job, are all job considerations. Interest, service to humanity, native ability, aptitude and personality, as well as most of the other categories are more related to the individual. In addition to the above stated factor, we felt that by giving two choices we might get a more extended idea of the professional values of the social workers and business students. For example, in giving respondents two choices we were interested to find out if they were highly person-oriented, highly job-oriented, or whether, in their two responses they would give one person-oriented and one job-oriented response.

5

Eli Ginzberg, Sol Ginsberg, Sidney Axelrod, John Herma, "The Problem of Occupational Choice," *The Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, Vol. 20 (April, 1950), p. 177.

It can be noted from the National Opinion Research Center's study that respondents were not asked their criteria in choosing their own occupation, but were to judge what was important for a "young man" to consider. This device was used to establish a more uniform frame of reference for all respondents. ⁶

The National Opinion Research Center has worked out a series of categories for this question and for the most part we have used their categories to facilitate comparison of findings with the national sample. The content of the categories as we see them is specified below:

INTEREST-We mean by interest an awareness by the individual that he can gain greater than average gratification by devoting his energies to one rather than another area of activity.

NATIVE ABILITY, APTITUDE, PERSONALITY-Here are clustered responses that indicate the possession of those personal qualities necessary for success in a selected area.

FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF THE JOB-Here are included the responses which fitted into one or more of the following descriptions: the extent to which the average salary received by those in practice in the profession being considered was considered to be adequate by the person contemplating entering the field; the adequacy of pay in a particular field to provide its members with the means of maintaining middle-class ideals such as education of children, family security in the event of death or after retirement; possession and maintenance of some of the material symbols of middle-class America.

OPPORTUNITY FOR ADVANCEMENT-Here are grouped those responses that simply list opportunity for advancement and future of the job.

6

National Opinion Research Center, National Opinion On Occupations, p. 111.

SECURITY AND STABILITY ASPECTS OF THE JOB-Here are included those responses concerned with the continued value the profession will give to the individual and to society.

PREPARATION FOR THE JOB-Included within this category are responses dealing with training and cost of education.

SERVICE TO HUMANITY-Responses included under this classification are those concerned with the altruistic character of the work. In other words, the extent to which practice in the field can be considered to be uplifting to mankind.

PHYSICAL ASPECTS OF THE JOB-This category contains responses having to do with factors such as short hours, safe work, clean work and other aspects relating to the pleasantness of the job.

ETHICAL ASPECTS OF THE JOB-Here are grouped responses having to do with moral standards, honesty, responsibility. For example, one response was "fair play."

PRESTIGE-This category included statements of respondents who felt social position attached to the job to be of importance. This included statements holding a subjective evaluation of status of the profession to be very important, objective evaluation of status to be important or combination of both to be important.

MISCELLANEOUS-Here are included a number of miscellaneous responses, most of which were not clear and therefore impossible to place in any of the other categories.

Each response made by the social workers and business students was tabulated. For some respondents, this meant that it was necessary to tabulate more than the two considerations called for in the question. In order not to give undue emphasis to the considerations mentioned by these respondents, we decided to weight them. This involved dividing the total number of responses given under each part of the question into one so that there would be a total of one consideration credited to each respondent in each part of the question.

This method of handling multiple responses was chosen in favor of omitting the responses from the analysis or arbitrarily selecting the first, second, or third response.

Analysis of Data

The distribution of responses by social workers and business students into the eleven categories may be seen in Tables 1 and 2. While there is a good deal of similarity in the distribution of their responses, there are also a number of important differences.

The 75 social workers came up with a total of 167 responses, while the 72 business students gave a total of 148 responses. The fact that social workers are likelier to depart from the instructions of the question and to give more than two considerations is perhaps a reflection of their greater concern for "the total situation." Just as they have elsewhere been more reluctant than the business students to rank occupations, so have they here been more reluctant to list only the two most important considerations for a young man to consider when he is choosing his life's work. Another possible explanation for the multiple responses of social workers might be an over-all ambivalence as to what really are the "most" important considerations. This could be due to their constant dealing with the many components that enter into decision making. A more practical factor in relation to social workers' multiple responses is that they had more time to ponder the question whereas business students had to respond to the entire questionnaire within a set time limit.

Looking first at "interest" as a consideration in choosing a career, we can see that the social workers and business students

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL WORKERS' RESPONSES WITH REGARD TO THE THINGS A YOUNG MAN SHOULD CONSIDER IN CHOOSING A CAREER

Categories	Part I				Part II				Total No. of Responses Combined	Weighted No of Responses Combined	% of the Total No. of Responses
	Single Response	Double Response	Triple Response	Sub Total No. of Response	Single Response	Double Response	Triple Response	Sub Total No. of Response			
1. Interest	37	10		47	15	1		16	63	58	38%
2. Ability, Aptitude and Personality	20	9		29	17	1		18	47	42	28
3. Financial aspects of the job		1		1	14	2	2	18	19	16	11
4. Opportunity for advancement	2			2	6	1	1	8	10	9	6
5. Security and stability aspects of the job				0	6			6	6	6	4
6. Preparation for the job	1			1	1		2	3	4	3	2
7. Service to humanity	4			4	7			7	11	11	7
8. Physical aspects of the job				0				0	0		
9. Ethical aspects of the job				0				0	0		
10. Prestige				0		1	1	2	2	1	1
11. Miscellaneous	1			1		4		4	5	5	3
TOTALS				85				82	167	150	100%

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF BUSINESS STUDENTS' RESPONSES WITH REGARD TO THE THINGS A YOUNG MAN SHOULD CONSIDER IN CHOOSING A CAREER

Categories	Part I				Part II				Total No. of Responses Combined	Weighted No. of Responses Combined	% of the Total no. of Responses
	Single Response	Double Response	Triple Response	Sub Total No. of Responses	Single Response	Double Response	Triple Response	Sub Total No. of Responses			
1. Interest	43	2		45	11	1		12	57	55	38%
2. Ability, Aptitude and Personality	15	3		18	9			9	27	25	18
3. Financial aspects of the job	2			2	20			20	22	22	15
4. Opportunity for advancement	6			6	10			10	16	16	11
5. Security and Stability aspects of the job				0	4			4	4	4	3
6. Preparation for the job		1		1	3			3	4	3	2
7. Service to Humanity				0	5	1		6	6	5	4
8. Physical aspects of the job				0				0	0		
9. Ethical aspects of the job	1			1	3			3	4	4	3
10. Prestige				0	1			1	1	1	1
11. Miscellaneous	1			1	6			6	7	7	5
TOTALS				74				74	148	144	100%

have practically identical proportions of their responses under this category. In both groups, too, they have much more frequently listed a response classified as "interest" under the first consideration asked for, perhaps suggesting that they think of this as an important consideration. They have responded to the question as though we were asking them to list the two considerations on a hierarchical basis. While we did not intend hierarchical responding to Parts 1 and 2 of the question, the placing of a 1 and 2 on the questionnaire may have been suggestive. This observation seems justified when we note that "interest" was placed under Part 1 three times more often than it was placed under Part 2. It is also interesting to note that Ginzberg et al. seem to feel that Interest is one of the more important factors that confronts an individual in selecting a career.⁷

A noticeable difference between the social work group and business group is evident in the category "service to humanity." Seven per cent of the social workers' responses fall in this category in comparison to 4 per cent of the business students' responses. This makes sense in view of the nature of the social work profession and its orientation toward helping people. One might possibly wonder, however, why there was not an even greater percentage of social work respondents in this category. Perhaps the answer is that "service to humanity" is so basic a value it has been taken for granted by the social workers. Another possible reason for the small proportion of

⁷ Eli Ginzberg, Sol Ginsberg, Sidney Axelrod, John Herma, "The Problem of Occupational Choice," The Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 20 (April, 1950) p.177.

responses in this category is that "service to humanity" is an idealistic value and would therefore not be listed too frequently as an explicit factor to take into consideration in choosing one's career. It is also interesting to compare our distribution of responses with the distribution of responses that was obtained in a random national sample by the National Opinion Research Center.⁸ Material is presented on the distribution of responses of professionals in that study, and we can see, in Table 3, that the proportion of responses of these professionals and of our sample of social workers is identical in the category of "service to humanity." It seems that in spite of the different training and services rendered by the various professional groups, there exists among them certain common values. The fact that professionals have often been required to take similar courses, in addition to or before concentrating upon those specifically related to study in their selected profession, might also account for the groups' sharing of certain basic values.

Individual considerations (i.e., interest, native ability, aptitude and personality, service to humanity) were held in high esteem by social workers, whereas business students seemed to have felt that those considerations relating more to the job (i.e., financial aspects of the job, opportunity for advancement, security and stability aspects of the job) were of greater importance. This is understandable in view of the fact that one of the more recognizable characteristics of the social work profession is the value placed on working with

⁸ National Opinion Research Center, National Opinion On Occupations, p. 112.

people and particularly helping people.

The most marked difference in the responses of the social workers and business students appeared under the category "ability, aptitude and personality." Twenty-eight per cent of the social workers' responses were in this category in comparison to 18 per cent of the business students' responses. Perhaps due to the intensive kind of introspection that social workers undergo in professional training, they would tend to be more aware of the importance of, or alert to, such personal qualities as aptitude, ability and personality in the selection of a career.

The two categories that business students placed more value on than did social workers were "financial aspects of the job" and "opportunity for advancement." In view of the probable economic background of the business students as well as the orientation of their profession, we would expect them to be more profit oriented. Here we note that 15 per cent of the business students felt this to be important whereas only 11 per cent of the social workers placed value on this category.

The business students' concern regarding "opportunity for advancement" could have basis in the fact that many of our sample are interested in going into business or working in a business firm. Since the "business world" is considered to be highly competitive and success is often equated with a man's ability to move up the hierarchy, one could more readily see the business students' concern with this category. The figures in Table 3 show that 11 per cent of the business students' replies were in this category in comparison to 6 per cent of the social workers' replies.

TABLE 3
 THINGS A YOUNG MAN SHOULD CONSIDER
 IN CHOOSING A CAREER

Categories	Percentage Responses by Groups				
	Social Workers	Business Students	Professionals*	Northeast* Region	United* States
Interest	38%	38%	41%	29%	33%
Native Ability, Aptitude Personality	28	18	22	18	16
Financial Aspects of the Job	11	15	6	17	14
Opportunity for Advancement	6	11	10	10	10
Security and Stability Aspects of the Job	4	3	4	10	8
Preparation for the Job	2	2	4	4	5
Service to Humanity	7	4	7	3	4
Physical Aspects of the Job	0	0	2	2	2
Ethical Aspects of the Job	0	3	1	0	1
Prestige	1	1	0	1	0
Miscellaneous	3	5	3	6	7

*National Opinion Research Center, National Opinion on Occupations, p. 112.

These responses were included to give the reader opportunity to compare our responses with those of a national study.

The categories in which the social work group and business groups were farthest apart (native ability, aptitude, personality, financial aspects of the job and opportunity for advancement) might be explained on the basis of the uniqueness of the training of the two fields. Because of this training, we would expect social workers to be concerned with the personality factors involved in adjusting to a job, while we would expect business students to be more concerned with the nature of the job alone.

Professional Values As Reflected By Professional Concerns

Method

Question 2 was asked to gain insight into the values of a number of social workers and business students by asking them to indicate from a list of seven the three that would trouble them most about a professional person or job.

The statements described a professional performing under one of the following situations: (1) interested mainly in monetary gain, (2) not properly valued by the community served, (3) treats clients discourteously, (4) insufficient knowledge of job, (5) paid inadequate salary, (6) interested mainly in prestige and (7) not concerned with helping clients. Items 1, 3, 6, and 7 are concerned with the attitudes and values of our hypothetical professional, items 2 and 5 are related to the climate of the community served, while item 4 is concerned with professional knowledge.

Analysis of Data

Examination of Table 4 reveals that the item most mentioned by social workers as one that they would be troubled by is "The professional person who is not concerned about helping his clients

TABLE 4
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES EXPRESSING
CONCERN ABOUT PROFESSIONAL SITUATIONS

Items	Total Number of Responses and Percentage			
	Total	Social Workers Percentage	Business Total	Students Percentage
1. The professional person who is mainly interested in monetary gain.	16	7%	32	15%
2. The professional person who is not properly valued by the community he serves.	9	4	17	8
3. The professional person who treats his clients or patients discourteously.	39	17	13	6
4. The professional person who does not know his job well.	55	24	59	27
5. The professional person who is paid an inadequate salary.	6	3	8	4
6. The professional person who is mainly interested in increasing his prestige	22	10	24	11
7. The professional person who is not concerned about helping his clients or patients.	78	35	63	29

or patients." Business students were in accord with social workers but to a lesser degree. This seems to indicate that social workers as well as business students saw this item as a major concern. The social workers' higher rating of this item is in keeping with the value that their profession seems to have placed on helping those whom they serve. In the study by Keller, et al. it is pointed out that the social workers' ability to help people is a source of satisfaction to them.⁹

"The professional person who does not know his job well," seems to be another major concern to both social workers and business students. The 3 per cent higher rating given by social workers indicates a somewhat greater degree of concern regarding professional knowledge. In considering the type of intensive training a social worker is subjected to and the essentiality of competent professional skill for effective practice, we can see why social workers may tend to value this item to a greater extent than business students. Kidneigh so aptly says:

Because of its concern for people, social work education feels deeply the responsibility for the education of professional social workers who will adequately serve the people. ¹⁰

The importance of professional knowledge to the social work profession is also stressed by Regensburg, who points out that "experiences with

⁹ Keller, et al., "A Study of the Interprofessional Relations of Social Workers With Physicians, Psychiatrists, Psychologists and Clergymen", p. 135

¹⁰ John C. Kidneigh, "People, Problems, and Plans", Social Work Journal, Vol. 32, (April, 1951), p. 81

the common crises of human life are a prerequisite for professional competence." 11

The professional person who treats his clients or patients discourteously is seen by social workers as another major concern. Here the social workers and business students are in marked disagreement, with the social workers having 17 per cent and the business students 6 per cent of their responses in this category. The social workers' focus upon the individual is here evidenced again. Respect for the client is repeatedly affirmed in the social work literature. In view of the fact that social workers want their clients to be self-respecting, they too must be respectful. In Friedlander's Introduction To Social Welfare this very basic tenet is set forth.

The objective of social welfare is to secure for each human being the economic necessities, a high standard of health and decent living conditions, equal opportunities with his fellow citizens, and the highest possible degree of self-respect and freedom of thought and action without interfering with the same rights of others. 12

Such items that would indicate how a professional person is treated (i.e. the professional person who is not valued by the community he serves and the professional person who is paid an inadequate salary) are of less concern to social workers than to business students. Perhaps the fact that social workers are dedicated to helping their clients leads them to place more emphasis upon those factors that indicate the client is not being properly helped,

11 Jeanette Regensburg, "Professional Attributes, Knowledge, and Skills in Practice: Educational Priorities", Social Work Journal, Vol. 34, (April, 1953, p. 53.

12 Friedlander, Walter A., Introduction to Social Welfare, pp. 4-5.

and less emphasis upon those factors that indicate the professional is not being properly treated.

Social workers and business students gave fairly similar responses to "the professional person who is mainly interested in increasing his prestige." However, social workers tended to be less concerned about this item than business students. In view of the nature of the social work profession, it would seem that social workers would be more troubled by this item. Yet their responses seemed to be indicative of what Goodall sees as a dissatisfaction among social workers regarding their prestige within our society.

We are not wholly satisfied with our present status.
We feel that we should be better rewarded, and the
work we do should be better appreciated. ¹³

It seems that the social worker is not concerned about prestige for purely personal gratification, but there is a deeper motivation behind these feelings for more prestige.

It looks to us as though our prestige does not match the importance of the work we do, and we wonder why there shouldn't be the highest kind of respect for the basic services which affect human well-being so deeply. ¹⁴

Summary and Conclusions

Some of the values of the social work group are reflected in the responses that they have given to the questions asking them for the things a young man should consider when he is choosing his

¹³ Goodall, Frances. "The Status of the Social Worker in the Agency and the Community," Social Work Journal, vol. 35 (July, 1954) p.111

¹⁴ Ibid. p.112

life's work, and for the professional situation that would be of concern to them. While there are many similarities in the responses of the social workers and the business students, there are also many differences that serve to highlight the values of the social workers.

One of the social work values that is reflected by the questionnaire data, is a strong concern for the person and his integrity. We find, for example, that social workers to a greater extent than business students mention the personal factors that are involved in enjoying and adjusting to a job. The social workers are more concerned about such things as a person's interest and aptitudes, while the business students are more concerned with the nature of the job, in terms of such things as monetary gain and opportunity for advancement.

The social workers' greater concern for the welfare of the client is perhaps another indication of their more pronounced orientation toward persons. To a greater extent than the business students, the social workers are concerned about professional situations that center about the treatment given to the client. On the other hand, they are somewhat less concerned about those situations that center about the way the professional person himself is treated.

We also find that the social workers are more concerned about providing help for the clients, and about treating them courteously, than are the business students. These considerations, too, are an indication of social work values, and the concern about courteous or respectful treatment of the client is another way of talking about a concern for a person and his integrity.

CHAPTER III

THE IMAGE OF A SOCIAL WORKER

Introduction

Pictures often serve as expressive mediums for thoughts, feelings, and attitudes. For this reason, the authors decided to ask the sample groups to describe what social workers do. Their descriptions would constitute written pictures of social work, verbal images being obtained from the business students and self-images from the social workers. From these descriptions, we hoped to gather more information about attitudes towards social work, both quantitative and qualitative, explicit and implicit. We also felt that some of the social work values might emerge from the self-images of the social work group, and conversely, we wondered if these values would affect the way in which the social workers saw themselves.

Methodology

The Question

In order to obtain an image that would be valid for each respondent, we decided to include a free-response or "open-ended" question in our questionnaire. This would allow the respondent to bring out the ideas and attitudes that are important to him rather than those we might anticipate for him. Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook state that the "open-ended" question gives an "opportunity for spontaneous, unanticipated responses rather than confining the respondent to a choice among alternatives imposed by the question."¹

¹ Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook, *Research Methods in Social Relations*, p. 427.

With the probability of a tremendous variation within the two sample groups as to their ideas on social work, we could not anticipate them all. The "open-ended" question however, would allow every respondent to say what he wanted, and this would apply even to those who might know little or nothing of the field of social work. More important, this type of question would evoke more information as to how the respondent felt about social work. Not only would the respondent be at liberty to write his own ideas then, but in doing so, he would also express his beliefs and attitudes more fully.

The following questions were used in the questionnaire.

Each of the social workers was asked to:

Imagine that your college class is preparing an informal bulletin to go out before your reunion in June, and that they are asking you to describe what you do as a social worker. Imagine that you can use about 10 or 20 lines and write your job description below.

The business students were given the following question:

Taking social work as an example of the ten professions mentioned earlier, write what you think a social worker does. Use about 10 or 20 lines, and write your job description below.

Both groups were asked what a social worker does, but in different ways. For the social work group the requested response was on the basis of each respondent's experience as a social worker. For the business school group it was on the basis of his experience, knowledge, or imagination of what this other professional group does. Both groups were asked to do this in an imagined way. The different wordings were necessary due to the different occupations of the groups.

The social work group was asked explicitly to imagine a situation in order to help them in their task of writing about themselves. The situation of writing for an informal bulletin provided a structure for them. The "informal bulletin" was included to give the social workers freedom to express themselves fully and naturally, rather than in a formal way. The "college class" was also included to promote fullness in the description. It assumed a camaraderie that would help the respondents be informal and natural. It further assumed that college classmates would not know the field of social work as well as classmates of a graduate school of social work would, and therefore it would encourage a fuller description of each respondent's job. On the other hand, the college reunion orientation was intended to prevent any propaganda for recruitment, since it assumed that the classmates had already made their occupational choices.

The business school group was asked to write about social work "as an example" of ten occupations used in other parts of the questionnaire. This was designed to avoid any bias the students might have had had they known we were specifically concerned with social work. They were also asked to do this by a simple, business-like question, in line with their occupational orientation. Both aspects of the question were intended to allow the students the opportunity to write about social work from their own frame of reference, according to what the question meant to them. The business students were asked to write what they "think a social worker does." This was a request to imagine a situation in an implicit sense, since social work is not a field in which they were actively engaged. The group was asked what they "think" rather than what they "know" to allow all the students

to respond, whether they knew much about the field or not. This meant that their responses would range from fully imagined ideas about social work to ideas based on a great deal of knowledge and experience with it. In an attempt to check this, we included a question as to how much the students knew about social work, with five possible answers ranging from "very great" to "nothing."

The Sample

Of the 199 questionnaires mailed to the social work group, 86 were returned. Eleven of these were not filled out at all and 9 others were not filled out in this question, leaving a total of 66. Of the 9 respondents who did not answer this question, 2 were graduate students, one of whom explained that she had just been placed in her agency and did not feel qualified to describe her duties there yet. Another respondent stated that she was retired, and a fourth said that she could not answer this kind of question well so that anything she might write would not have any meaning. The remaining 5 were returned without comment but the face sheet information revealed that 2 were from directors, and one each was from an executive director, a research worker, and a caseworker. Possibly those persons who were in an administrative or research position did not feel that a question about what social workers do applied to them.

Of the 86 business students who were given the questionnaires, only 72 were completely filled out. Although others completed this portion of the questionnaire, they were eliminated due to other incompleting sections, in an attempt to reduce the business group to approximately the same size as the social work group, and to cut down on the number of questionnaires to be analyzed.

Limitations of the Methodology

The major limitation of this portion of the research project lies with the fact that a written question was used. Here the researcher can neither observe the respondent nor provide interpretation or encouragement to help draw him out, nor seek clarification if his responses are confusing. As a result, it is not always clear how a respondent interprets the question or whether two respondents mean the same thing by the same comments. Therefore the validity of the responses is open to question.

This limitation refers only to this question, however. In view of the total research project and the limited time in which to do it, the written questionnaire seemed well suited to the kinds of information requested, especially to the rankings. Moreover, it was hoped that it would be helpful even in this question. As the most impersonal medium of collecting data, we hoped that the written question would further encourage the sample groups to respond openly and freely.

Analysis of Data

The Social Worker as a Helper

One of the most frequent words used by all of the respondents to describe social workers was the word "help." Accordingly, all the forms of this word were noted and quantified. Table 1 shows the totals and the mean use for each respondent in both groups.

TABLE 1

USE OF ALL FORMS OF THE WORD "HELP" BY SOCIAL WORKERS AND BUSINESS STUDENTS

Group	Number of Respondents	Number of Times "Help" Appeared	Mean Use per Respondent
Social Workers	66	82	1.24
Business Students	72	106	1.47

As social work has often been called a "helping profession", it was expected that the members of that profession would use the word "help" more often than the business students. Table 1 shows that such was not the case in this study. Moreover, not only did the business students use the word more frequently as such, but also more frequently in relation to the number of lines they devoted to their descriptions. Table 2 shows the number of lines used by each group and the mean for each respondent in both groups. All lines one-half a page or longer were counted as one line.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF LINES USED BY SOCIAL WORKERS AND BUSINESS STUDENTS IN RESPONSES TO QUESTION

Group	Number of Respondents	Total Lines Used	Mean Number of Lines per Person
Social Workers	66	1046	15.85 or 16.0*
Business Students	72	786	10.92

* Eight social workers typed their responses. The mean number of lines was increased to 16.0 to compensate for the resulting reduced number of lines.

Since the social workers used 46 per cent more lines than the business students, it would be expected that they would use "help" 46 per cent more than the latter group, or a mean use of 1.92 as compared to the 1.47 of the business students. The fact that the mean use for the social workers was 1.24 as compared to the expected 1.92 requires some comment.

Helping is one of the primary aims of social work. It is mentioned throughout the literature, from the most basic and fundamental texts to the most sophisticated professional papers. This has been so since social work began. As such, then, the term "helping" has evolved as a clear cut value, a single expression which, for social workers, defines the very essence of their purpose. Therefore, in this study we expected that the social workers would use "help" more frequently than the non-social workers, particularly since social workers would have the optimum opportunity to know that helping is a value in social work, and they could be expected to adhere to this value as part of their identification with the profession. The fact that they did use "helping" indicates their knowledge and acceptance of the value. However, the fact that the business students also used "helping" indicates that while they were not involved in identifying themselves with the field, they recognized "helping" as either an aim or a value of social work. Their quite frequent use of "helping" suggests that non-social workers are becoming more aware of what social work does, at least to the extent that it is a helping profession.

Another reason the social workers did not use "helping" more often than the business students may have been that they assumed that their work is helpful and were more concerned with the kind of help they gave. Since helping is so basic to social work, they may have felt it unnecessary to use the word.

Since the social worker was seen as a helping person by both groups, it seemed of interest to explore the kind of help the groups attributed to this person. To do this, phrases used to describe the help were divided between three categories. One was called Physical-Practical to identify any activity the social worker had in helping people on a material basis. It included such things as giving money, food, clothing, or shelter, and finding a job, medical care, or housing. Referrals and recording were included if they related to the client. The following are examples of this type of help.

A caseworker . . . deals directly with families in providing financial aid.

A social service worker will advise patients who are in need of medical or other help. For instance, a blind person may be informed of what services the community has to offer in the way of instruction on how to walk with a cane in traffic, how to cook, how to get talking books, where to go to get someone to do housework, etc.

Concrete help may involve providing clothes, toys, recreation, housekeeping or nursing help at home, obtaining medical appliances.

These clients . . . may need help with social problems; like help in getting a job, need for change in (their) living situation.

Another category was termed Social-Emotional to denote any activity the social worker had in helping people with their feelings and anxieties towards any life situation. This included help towards

gaining understanding and insight into problems, and dealing with emotional difficulties. The following phrases are typical of those included in this category.

The social worker is concerned with the betterment of . . . social attitudes of the persons in their charge.

My knowledge of social work leads me to think of it as generally helping others, whether their troubles be monetary, physical, or mental.²

As a caseworker in a psychiatric setting, I see people who are seeking some relief from emotional difficulties that are preventing them or their loved ones from living a full life.

Sometimes the help comes through their being able to take a new look at their problems, feelings, and experiences in a non-judgmental setting, to gain new understanding and decide upon new, more appropriate behavior, or to outgrow and leave behind no longer appropriate feelings.

All other phrases were put into the third category, called Unqualified. These phrases either did not specify the type of help or were not clear in their specification. It was so difficult to make the category decisions, that many phrases were called Unqualified in order to make the other two categories clear. Below are examples of phrases in which the kind of help was called Unqualified.

A social worker helps those in need . . . They move around, especially during disasters, such as floods, blizzards or hurricanes.

A social worker in most cases works either for some stage of government or welfare agency, and whose job mainly is to investigate and counsel people in a variety of social problems, ranging from family spats to backgrounds of criminal behavior. Their job also is to classify one's economic troubles and try to prescribe a solution to these problems.

2

Only the "mental" was put in the Social-Emotional category in this example. The "monetary" and "physical" were put in the Physical-Practical category.

Our main interest is working with natural groups of youngsters and having them develop their interests and abilities, using the democratic method as a basis of group organization. On an individual basis, counselling and guidance is a very important part of the total program.

The social worker . . . listens, understands, supports, questions, clarifies, interprets, and plans with the client to achieve for him the most satisfying solution in the best circumstances possible.

Table 3 show the totals for each category.

TABLE 3

TYPES OF HELP A SOCIAL WORKER GIVES AS SEEN BY SOCIAL WORKERS AND BUSINESS STUDENTS

Group	Number of Respondents	Physical- Practical	Social- Emotional	Unqualified
Social Workers	66	62	79	558
Business Students	72	149	9	167

The totals above show that the business students saw the social worker as giving over two times the amount of material help that the social workers did. Even if the seven additional respondents in the business group are taken into consideration, the totals are significantly different. Moreover, many of the social work responses of this type referred to indirect services to clients such as referrals, recording, and securing money for agencies, as compared to the business student responses which were typified by the direct giving of money to clients, running activities, finding jobs, and arranging for medical care. One example of the social work group was written by the director

of an adoption agency whose duties included "budgeting, fund-raising, and selection and direction of staff." Another social worker also wrote of indirect help:

On admission of each patient who is assigned to my team, a psychiatric history is prepared by the social worker. I am responsible for clearing all weekend passes and for making arrangements for the discharge of each patient.

On the other hand, the non-social work group spoke predominately of direct help to people, as the following examples show.

A social worker provides for people who need money (collections, Red Cross, etc.). He also looks after the activities of the younger generation and puts on dances and shows for the crippled and disabled people.

There are many facets of social work. Some of these are adoption and placement, welfare investigation, therapy (physical) for those equipped (afflicted?) with some specific disease such as CP, etc. Controlled recreation and observation of children from slum or underdeveloped areas. Aid is supplied in clothing and feeding the needy.

In summary then, the business group not only saw the social worker as giving more Physical-Practical help than the social work group did, but also in a more direct, material way.

In contrast, the social workers demonstrated by their responses that they saw the social worker as helping with Social-Emotional problems over eight times as much as the business students did. Here, too, the discrepancy between the number of respondents of each group would not compensate for the tremendous difference.

A comparison of the totals in Table 3 shows that the business students felt that the social worker operates on a Physical-Practical level, almost to the exclusion of the Social-Emotional level. This suggests that while the non-social workers see the social worker as a

helper, they see her in a stereotyped way as a worker who gives only practical help. On the other hand, the social workers pictured themselves as operating more on the Social-Emotional level, although they also recognized the fact that they give Physical-Practical help. This perhaps suggests that the social work respondents value Social-Emotional help more than Physical-Practical help. In a study on the self-image of 144 psychiatric attendants in five North Carolina mental hospitals, Simpson and Simpson discovered a tendency of this low-status occupation to focus on some aspect of their job that was valued either by society or by the hospital subculture.³ The psychiatric attendants also minimized the less glamorous aspects of their work. This was seen as an attempt to increase the social prestige of the occupation. Since social work is also in a low-status position as a professional group, it is conceivable that they too might minimize the less glamorous material help and maximize the emotional help that they give to their clients to gain greater prestige.

The comparison of the totals in Table 3 gives rise to another interpretation. The total number of clearly defined phrases for each of the sample groups was fairly similar: The social workers had 141 and the business students had 158. Yet within these totals, the division between the two types of help for each group was decidedly different. The social workers had 62 Physical-Practical phrases and 79 Social-Emotional ones, in a ratio of 3 to 4. On the other hand, the business students had 149 Physical-Practical phrases while only 9

³ Simpson and Simpson, "The Psychiatric Attendant: Development of an Occupational Self Image in a Low Status Occupation," American Sociological Review, vol. 24 (June 1959), pp. 389-392.

were Social-Emotional, in a ratio of 16 to 1.

Assuming that both types of help are equally involved in current social work practice, the social workers were fairly unrealistic. The former group recognized both types of help, although they emphasized the emotional type. The business students, however, hardly recognized emotional help at all and considered the material help as tremendously important. Therefore, although the social workers may have been trying to upgrade themselves in prestige, the extremes of the business students' totals suggest that the students do not know much about current social work practice.

In an attempt to discover how much they do know about social work, the business group was asked to rate their knowledge of the field according to five categories. Table 4 gives the totals for each category. It shows that even by their own rating, the business students felt they knew only a moderate to slight amount about social work, which seems to support the above suggestion.

TABLE 4

BUSINESS STUDENTS' SELF RATING ON THEIR KNOWLEDGE OF SOCIAL WORK

Number of Students	Very Great	Considerable	Moderate	Slight	Nothing
72	0	10	33	27	2

The Social Worker As One Who Respects Her Clients

By examining the descriptions of social work presented in the questionnaire, we can make a number of inference about the degree to which the social worker is seen as one who shows respect or disrespect for her clients. An attempt has been made to do this by focusing attention upon the words and phrases used by the social workers and business students to describe the social worker's relationship with her clients.

To say that the social worker "works with" her clients, or "helps people to help themselves" implies a relationship in which the social worker is respectful of her clients. Both these phrases suggest that the clients participate as full members in the helping process, and that their self-determination is valued. The phrase "helping people to help themselves" was used four times by each group, and did not differentiate between the two groups. Perhaps the fact that this phrase has become a current slogan accounts for the fact that it did not show up any differences between the social workers and the business students. However, the phrase "works with" was used 23 times by the social workers and only 6 times by the business students. This may be an indication of the greater emphasis social workers place upon showing respect for clients.

Moreover, the general tenor of the responses from the two groups was quite different. The majority of the social workers showed respect towards clients in one way or another. One said that "the person who seeks help continues to use his inner strengths and to make the decisions." Another, in speaking of her client, said,

"together we try to work out more appropriate adjustments or solutions."

In contrast, many of the business students spoke of a one-way relationship in which the social worker does and gives all. One business student said social workers "attempt to find the basis of social and family problems and suggest a solution or extend material help when necessary." Another stated that social workers "interview people looking for help, visit them in their homes, provide any help, either financial or advice."

Some business students also implied disrespect on the part of the social worker towards her client. The following are examples of this implication.

Social workers make checks on families receiving welfare funds.

He would try to help a juvenile delinquent see the path of righteousness.

He also is involved in investigating and passing judgment on childless couples who are trying to adopt children.

He investigates homes to see if they are fit places to rear children.

There are at least three possible explanations for the attitudes of the sample groups. The business students' feeling that social workers have little or no respect for their clients may be due to their moderate to slight knowledge about social work. It may also be due to a tendency on their part towards a lingering stereotype in which the client is unable to help himself. Those business students who felt social workers have respect for their clients and those who felt social workers show disrespect, may have had or heard of personal experiences which lead to these attitudes. On the other hand, the social workers may have stressed respect for clients because of their

professional values. Saul Bernstein clearly points out that human worth is the supreme value in social work and that self-determination is an important adjunct to it.⁴ Since these values imply respect for the client, the social workers may have been responding in terms of these values because of their identification with the field.

The Social Worker As A Trained Member Of A Separate Profession

Another part of the image of the social worker, as seen by the sample groups, was whether or not she is either a trained person or a member of a separate profession. Twenty-two social workers mentioned the necessity of training or knowledge of skills, techniques, or theory, while only six business students specifically stated that training was needed and one stated that it was not. Also, more social workers spoke of the social worker as a professional person than the business students. In fact, fourteen business students described the social worker in terms of other occupations. Six of these spoke of the visiting nurse as a social worker and one even said, "The requirements for a social worker are: 1. Registered nurse, 2. Patient and kind." The fact that the visiting nurse was singled out to describe a social worker is noteworthy, considering that one out of every twelve business students confused these two professions.

Eight other business students saw members of several other occupations as social workers. For example, one business student stated that a social worker "may be a clerk, politician, or even a janitor working to help the social welfare of the community." Another

⁴ Saul Bernstein, "Self-Determination: King or Citizen in the Realm of Values," Social Work, vol. 5, (January, 1960), pp. 3-8.

said, "Any person working for the town or city may be considered as a social worker."

It is different to evaluate the responses of these fourteen business students. Although their responses suggest that they have little knowledge of the field of social work, they nevertheless rated themselves as having as much or more than the rest of the business students. Also, they might have interpreted social work in a broad sense in this question, as any work contributing to the welfare of society. For the total sample of business students, however, we can say that few of them either described the social worker as a member of a separate profession or felt that specialized training was necessary to become a social worker. This suggests that they do not think of a social worker in the modern sense as a member of a separate field who is becoming increasingly trained.

On the other hand, quite a few social workers stated that specialized training was necessary to be a member of the profession. Of the 66 in the sample, 22 or one third mentioned the need for training. Since 53 respondents already had graduate degrees and 3 others were currently getting them, it is reasonable to assume that training would be taken for granted. The fact that one third of the sample mentioned training suggests that a graduate degree is an important part of the image they hold of the social worker. To be sure, few of the social workers spoke of themselves explicitly as members of a separate profession. However, they would not be expected to speak of it since they were asked to give a description of their personal job rather than a description of either the qualifications

for their job or of the field in general. Therefore it is likely that the social workers, as members of the profession, would assume its separate identity rather than specify it.

Stereotypes in Social Work

Gordon Allport describes a stereotype as certain feelings and beliefs which are attributed to a group of people on an irrational basis.⁵ The image of the social worker as described by the sample groups gives rise to some discussion on this point.

To describe the client with whom the social worker deals, the business students used the words "poor", "unfortunate", "needy" and "underprivileged" an aggregate total of twenty-nine times. They also said that these clients were from slums and underdeveloped urban areas, were "down and out", unable to help themselves, and "destitute" and "impoverished." Below are some examples of such statements,

The primary job of the social worker is to provide for the needy many services that a higher class of people set for themselves.

Social Workers, I believe, are dedicated to the assistance of the unfortunate through many medias. They aid the poor, drunken, unfortunate, and misguided . . .

This suggests that the business group sees the social worker as helping the so-called "dregs" of the community, an old stereotyped view of the social worker's client.

In contrast, the social workers used the words "unfortunate", "underprivileged", and "needy" only once each. None of them spoke of "poor" people and very few even referred to them. When they did,

⁵ Gordon W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, p. 190

the social workers usually spoke of clients who need "financial help". On one hand, this suggests that the social worker's client is not necessarily poor and underprivileged any longer. Also, from the general tenor of the social workers' responses, there is good reason to believe that many of their clients go to them with problems that have nothing to do with class or income, even when income may be an additional problem. On the other hand, their comments about clients indicate that the social workers may tend to gloss over the realities of slum areas and the need for money. The fact that they rarely used such words as needy and unfortunate may also have been an attempt to combat the stereotype implied by these words. The reason might be that these words denote a lack of respect for the client which runs contrary to the values of the social work field.

The business students saw the function of the social worker as giving money, food, and clothing to clients. This also relates to the stereotype, and perhaps because of it, the social work group rarely mentioned this function although a great many social workers are involved in giving financial help at least. In fact one social worker made a special effort to show that her job does not include this function. At the bottom of her description, she wrote:

Note: My agency does not have funds for financial assistance, and we seldom have requests for environmental service, and so this job description is slanted accordingly.

The business students also felt that the social worker "investigates", using this word twenty times in comparison to the social workers who did not use it once. This word might again imply a lack of respect for clients which is anathema to the values of social work.

As a person, the business students saw the social worker in several lights. Many saw her as a dedicated, unselfish person who is underpaid and undervalued. Many others saw her as a snoopy investigator, such as one student who said, "The picture that comes to mind is a rather small, not too well dressed, sharp nosed person who asks double meaning questions." None of the social work group gave any such explicit picture of the social worker as a person, but they would not be expected to do this in writing about themselves. In the description by the business students then, there seems to be a tendency towards seeing the client, the social worker, and her function in a stereotyped manner.

Summary and Conclusions

The composite picture of the social worker as seen by the business students in this study seems to be along the line of a variety of stereotypes. She is an untrained person with little identity as a separate professional member of society. She is either undervalued and unselfish or is a snoopy investigator. She is generally helpful in a direct, material way. Her clients are the needy, unfortunates from the slum areas and are largely unable to help themselves. Finally, the social worker does not tend to respect them. In view of these stereotypes, we could conclude that the business students have little knowledge of modern social work, perhaps less than they recognized in their self rating of their knowledge of the field.

The image painted by the social workers is quite different. Here the social worker helps clients with their anxieties and feelings more than with their material needs. She serves and respects

anyone who seeks help, using some specialized techniques to do this. Lastly, she assumes her membership in a separate profession and feels that training is an important requirement for such membership.

In conclusion, therefore, we ought to say that the business students hold a stereotyped and somewhat uninformed view of the social work field, which is perhaps an indication of the image of the social worker that is held by the public at large. In contrast, the social workers' self image is one in which the more favorable and more highly valued elements of their work are emphasized. Possibly this serves the function of giving them a greater feeling of worth.

CHAPTER IV

A COMPARISON OF OCCUPATIONAL RANKINGS

Introduction

In the preceding chapter we examined and compared the profession of social work as it is seen by social workers and business students. We found that the social workers see themselves as dealing with the anxieties and feelings of their clients more than with their material needs. They see themselves as giving service and respect to anyone who seeks help and as using special techniques to do this. They assume that they have training and membership in a separate profession. The business students see the social worker as an untrained person, and they do not identify her as a member of a separate profession. The business students see the social worker as giving help in a direct material way, and feel she has little or no respect for her clients. The social worker is considered to be unselfish, undervalued, and a "snoopy investigator".

Social workers have been concerned with the stereotype which had developed about their profession because they feel it is a misrepresentation of their work, attitudes and values. It appears that this stereotype still exists, if the results of the previous chapter are representative of the attitudes of the community as a whole. Several of the opinions of the business students about social work values are contradictory to the values social workers consider intrinsic to their profession. The business students do not think social workers have respect for their clients or that they believe in the dignity and worth of the individual. Their image of "the snoopy investigator" is contrary to the social workers' belief in the client's right to

self-determination. Also, social workers believe that certain types of financial assistance are a right of every citizen and that financial assistance should not be a type of charity given by a kindly agency or government to those who can prove their indigency through investigations into every area of their lives.

Social workers see themselves as helping people in all walks of life to find a more satisfying life emotionally, intellectually and socially. The business students see social workers as working with the "dregs of society", the "underprivileged", the "needy" and the destitute."

In order to broaden our understanding of social work as it is seen by social workers and business students, we used four criteria which we felt could be applied to ten occupations, including social work. We hoped that the rankings of these occupations in respect to the criteria would show how social work compares with the other occupations, and what differences there might be between social work as ranked by the social workers and as it is ranked by the business students. The same or similar criteria have been used in other studies on occupational rankings.

Keller, Phelps, Shickman and Slade in their thesis on inter-professional relationships, found that social workers rated themselves second in a group of five occupations in terms of the respect the members of the occupations gave to their clients.¹

¹ Barbara Keller, Roger W. Phelps, Evelyn J. Shickman, and Carol Slade, "A Study of the Interprofessional Relations of Social Workers with Physicians, Psychiatrists, Psychologists, and Clergymen", p. 132

This is comparable with the results of Polansky's study on social workers, where it was found that they have a healthy self-respect with regard to their ability to help, so that he concluded that "if ability to help is a value" then social workers feel this is an important value in their profession.² Polansky found that social workers rated themselves second to doctors in their ability to help. The group of psychology students in his study placed them fourth, showing the discrepancy in the ways this social work value was seen by the two groups of respondents.³

Methodology

The social workers and the business students were asked to answer four questions which involved ranking ten occupations in order from one to ten for each question. This type of question gives the researcher a general idea of the rank order of the occupations according to the various criteria but it does not allow formally for groupings or ties in rank. Mean rankings were therefore used in order to clarify the exact position of each occupation in relation to the others.

There were eighty-six questionnaires returned by the social workers, and the number of answers varied from sixty-eight to seventy-three because some of the questionnaires were only partially completed. Three social workers preferred to group the occupations and these were rated as ties in rank order. One social worker added three occupations

² Norman Polansky, "Social Workers in Society; Results of a Sampling Study," Social Work Journal, vol. 34 (April, 1953), p. 78.

³ Ibid., p. 77.

which she felt should be included in the two questions on prestige.

Eighty-six business students answered the questionnaire. One of the students put in a tie, but this appears to be an error as there were two "fours" and no "nine", although all the other numbers were included. This answer was eliminated along with thirteen others because they were only partially completed and we wished to have roughly equal numbers of answers from the two groups of respondents.

The ten occupations were those of lawyer, minister, nurse, physician, policeman, psychiatrist, psychologist, school teacher, social worker and undertaker. The respondents were asked to rank them in terms of the general prestige they felt each occupation has in our society, the general prestige they felt they should have in our society, the consideration of the needs and feelings they show to those they serve.

It was suggested in the questionnaire that the authors of the study would welcome any comments which the respondents cared to make. The social workers answered their questionnaires at home and the business students answered theirs in class. Although there was plenty of time for them to answer, we wondered if having to answer in class, where they might have felt pressed for time, accounted for the fact that there were few comments made by the business students. The social workers made numerous remarks on their questionnaires. This may also be related to their greater interest in, and knowledge of, social work.

Ratings on Actual Prestige

Occupational prestige or status is an important factor in determining vocational choice, in establishing a self-image, and in

obtaining satisfaction from one's work. Several studies have been done to determine what the status of social work is in relation to other occupations and professions. Kadushin states that:

The question of the prestige of social work is a matter of importance to 1) the individual social worker, 2) the social work client, 3) the social work profession. Prestige is defined as the invidious value (attached) to a status or office independently of who occupies it. ¹

According to Kadushin, prestige is affected by occupation, influence potential with client and community, identification with a male or female role, the prestige of the clientele, the degree of independence granted to the individuals in the profession and the amount of training required.² Kadushin refers to Warner who says that occupation is the most important single determinant of class position in American society.³ Therefore, the prestige of the profession affects the individual social worker's concept of self, his relationships with representatives of other professions, and his feelings about his job.⁴

In regard to our question about the general prestige which the occupations have in our society, there were seventy-three replies from the social workers, and seventy-two from the business students.

¹ Alfred Kadushin, "Prestige of Social Work--Facts and Factors", Social Work, vol. 3 (April, 1958), p.37

² Ibid., pp. 40-42.

³ Ibid., p. 39.

⁴ Ibid., p. 37

As can be seen in Table 1, the social workers ranked themselves eighth, leaving the policeman and the undertaker in ninth and tenth places. The physician was first, then the minister, lawyer, psychiatrist, psychologist, school teacher, and nurse. The business students also ranked social work eighth.

TABLE 1
RANKINGS ON ACTUAL PRESTIGE

SOCIAL WORKERS		BUSINESS STUDENTS	
RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN
1. Physician	1.38	Physician	1.88
2. Minister	2.88	Minister	2.83
3. Lawyer	3.15	Lawyer	2.90
4. Psychiatrist	3.26	Psychiatrist	4.65
5. Psychologist	5.64	School Teacher	5.44
6. School Teacher	6.05	Psychologist	6.42
7. Nurse	6.87	Nurse	7.25
8. Social Worker	7.16	Social Worker	7.71
9. Policeman	9.12	Policeman	8.33
10. Undertaker	9.58	Undertaker	8.54

This ranking is comparable to that found by Keller et al.,⁵ and similar to that in Polansky's study, where physician, lawyer and teacher were among the five occupations ranked ahead of social work.⁶

⁵ Barbara Keller, et al., op. cit., p. 132

⁶ Norman Polansky, op. cit., p. 77.

Its low prestige ranking also points up the validity of the statement that there is a direct relationship between occupational status and the status of the clients served. But as the social workers see themselves as being of help to members of all classes, there must be other reasons why they rank themselves so low.

In a national survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center, ninety occupations were ranked according to their prestige in the community. Welfare worker for a city government ranked after physician, minister and psychologist. (Psychiatrist was not on the list.)⁷ This was a survey made with a sampling of the population of the country as a whole, and it appears that our results are also consistent with theirs. Other studies, quoted by Kadushin, have shown that social work ranks as one of the lowest professions and also ranks fairly low when compared with many other occupational groups.⁸

It would appear that the social workers and the business students have a similar view of the status of social work in the community. Therefore Rettig's assumption that people tend to rate the status of their occupation higher than will others who are not of the same or similar occupation, is not true here as far as the

⁷ Barbara Keller, et al., quoting the National Opinions on Occupations Survey, National Opinion Research Center, op.cit., p.133.

⁸ Alfred Kadushin, op. cit., p. 39-40.

⁹ Salomon Rettig, Frank N. Jacobson, and Benjamin Pasamanick, "Status Overestimation, Objective Status, and Job Satisfaction among Professions." American Sociological Review, vol. 34, p. 75. (February, 1953)

order of ranking is concerned. However, there is some evidence in favor of Rettig's hypothesis if we look at the mean rankings given to the social workers by the business students and the social workers, because the social workers' mean ranking is lower.

Social workers seem to have a more consistent idea of the prestige levels of the occupations because their mean rankings cover a wider range, that is, from 1.44 to 9.58, as compared to the students' rankings of from 1.88 to 8.54. For the latter group, the narrower range probably indicates that they are less consistent in ranking a particular occupation either high or low.

Ratings on Ideal Prestige

We asked our respondents to rank the ten occupations according to the general prestige they felt they should have in our society. We hoped this would give us some idea of the types of occupations which the respondents consider important. In earlier chapters we have discussed some of the opinions and values of social work as they are seen by social workers and business students. Now, in comparing the rankings, we hoped to find out how social work compared with the other nine occupations and therefore how important they consider the values associated with social work.

There were seventy-two replies from the social workers and seventy-two replies from the business students. As can be seen in Table 2, social workers ranked themselves fifth after the physician, minister, psychiatrist and school teacher. The students placed them sixth, also placing lawyers above social work. The mean ranking for social work was 4.82 by the social workers and 6.13 by the business

students, indicating that the social workers think that social work should have a higher prestige than the business students think it should have.

TABLE 2
RANKINGS ON IDEAL PRESTIGE

SOCIAL WORKERS		BUSINESS STUDENTS		
RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	
1.	Physician	2.28	Minister	2.13
2.	Minister	3.17 ^a	Physician	2.19
3.	Psychiatrist	3.17 ^b	School Teacher	4.21
4.	School Teacher	4.35	Lawyer	4.50
5.	Social Worker	4.75	Psychiatrist	5.67
6.	Lawyer	5.11	Social Worker	6.13
7.	Psychologist	6.17	Psychologist	6.31
8.	Nurse	7.21	Nurse	6.83
9.	Policeman	8.83	Policeman	7.38
10.	Undertaker	9.77	Undertaker	9.35
a)	3.166			
b)	3.173			

It is interesting to note that the social workers and the business students rank the lawyer and the psychiatrist very differently. Social workers rank the psychiatrist third whereas the business students rank him fifth. This would seem to be related to the social workers' more thorough knowledge and identification with this profession. Social workers ranked lawyers sixth and the business students ranked them fourth, indicating the comparatively higher prestige law has to people who are business-oriented. The social workers' ranking of the lawyer is closest to the business students' ranking of the psychiatrist,

indicating that these professions are seen at about the same prestige level. It is interesting to note that the mean ranking by the business students of both the minister and the physician is higher than the social workers' mean ranking of the physician, showing that the business students are more definite in their evaluation of these professions and think more highly of them.

If the results of the two questions on prestige are compared, it is seen that the social workers would like to raise their prestige by three ranks, to fifth place, whereas the business students would raise the rank of social work two ranks, to sixth place. This emphatic raise by the social workers shows that prestige is a value of social work. Rettig also showed that expected status always exceeded received status and that social workers and teachers always overestimated their status.¹⁰ Our results show that this does not necessarily apply to the social workers' ranking of their actual prestige but it does apply to their ranking of the ideal prestige.

Ratings on Respect

Social workers usually think of their profession as a "helping profession" which is concerned with the dignity and worth of the individual, his right to self-determination, and his particular needs and feelings. In order to determine how the social workers and the business students compared social work with the other occupations in regard to the respect given to the client, we asked them to rank them in terms of the consideration they gave to the needs and feelings of those they serve.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 76.

There were sixty-nine replies from the social workers and seventy-two replies from the business students. Table 3 shows us that the social workers place themselves first, followed by the psychiatrist, minister, physician, school teacher, psychologist, lawyer, undertaker and policeman. Keller, et al. found that the social workers ranked themselves a close second to the psychiatrist in regard to the respect the members of an occupation have for the client, and they also found that the social workers ranked the physician lower for this criterion than for the others such as "ability to help" and "general prestige".¹¹ This is consistent with our findings that the occupation of physician ranks fourth for the consideration for the needs and feelings of the client.

TABLE 3

RANKINGS ON CONSIDERATION FOR NEEDS AND FEELINGS

SOCIAL WORKERS		BUSINESS STUDENTS		
RANK	MEAN	RANK	MEAN	
1.	Social Worker	2.32	Minister	1.99
2.	Psychiatrist	2.83	Physician	2.90
3.	Minister	3.29	Nurse	4.53
4.	Physician	4.23	Social Worker	4.65
5.	Nurse	5.17	School Teacher	4.79
6.	School Teacher	5.51	Psychiatrist	5.68
7.	Psychologist	5.74	Psychologist	6.50
8.	Lawyer	7.87	Lawyer	7.33
9.	Undertaker	9.03	Policeman	7.92
10.	Policeman	9.12	Undertaker	8.65

¹¹ Barbara Keller, et al., op. cit., p. 135.

The business students ranked social work in fourth place after the minister, physician and nurse. The teacher, psychiatrist, psychologist, lawyer, policeman and undertaker ranked after social work indicating a relatively higher rating for the minister. This appears to indicate that the business students are more consistent in their ranking of the minister in first place than the social workers are of themselves. Therefore, in comparison, the business students feel that the minister has more consideration for the needs and feelings of his clients than the social workers feel they have for theirs. Social workers ranked the minister in this study third with a mean rank of 3.29. This is consistent with the results of Keller's study where the mean rank was 3.3.¹²

The business students and the social workers rank the psychologist seventh although the mean rank is considerably higher for this rating by the social workers (5.74 to 6.50). This low rank would seem to indicate that the psychologist is still seen as a technician concerned with clinical testing rather than as a therapist. The business students ranked social work fourth, a difference of three places from the rank given it by the social workers. The fact that the social worker and the psychiatrist are ranked comparatively low by the business students would seem to indicate that these occupations have not yet proven to the public their belief in

The worth of the individual, the inherent dignity of the human person, society's responsibility for the individual welfare, and the individual's responsibility for

¹² Barbara Keller, et al., op. cit., p. 131.

contributing to the common good.¹³

It appears that social workers, psychiatrists and psychologists have a long way to go in making known their ideals and values. Perhaps a fuller understanding of these would raise the general public's opinion of these occupations but one wonders if they would ever rank as high as the minister and the physician and nurse who will always be known by a greater majority of people. Also, the high value placed on physical health and religious faith would probably keep these occupations in the highest ranks.

One respondent said that she could not answer this question as so much depended on the individual practitioner. She said that

An occupation does not have consideration for the needs and feelings of those they serve. It is the individual who also happens to belong to a certain occupation who has the feelings. By training certain occupational groups might be more sensitive than others but the training does not always "take."

Several respondents voiced a reluctance or a refusal to generalize about the occupations, saying that it was unfair to do this when they only knew a few individuals in some of the occupations and none in others. One social work respondent was reluctant to answer because she wondered what we meant by "the consideration they show to those they serve." This indicates, perhaps, that certain occupations, like people, are often evaluated on those characteristics they show and not on the values which are so much more difficult to assess.

¹³ Werner W. Boehm, "The Nature of Social Work", Social Work Journal, vol. 2 (April, 1958), p. 11.

Ratings on Monetary Interest

In our culture, money plays an important role. The acquisition of it has become a symbol of success. Prestige and power usually go with it. Correspondingly, a low income suggests mediocrity and little prestige.

Our fourth criterion makes use of the importance most people attach to monetary gain. We asked the respondents to rank the ten occupations in terms of the proportion of people within them who are more interested in making money than in helping those they serve.

There were sixty-eight replies from the social workers and seventy-two from the business students. The two groups ranked the social worker ninth, and the minister tenth. As seen in Table 4, the other eight rankings were almost identical. The minister is thought to be the least interested in making money in relation to helping the client, and the social worker is next. The social workers think that the physician is more interested in making money than is the psychiatrist and the business students think that the psychiatrist is more interested in making money than is the physician. The social workers ranked the occupations in the following order (from the least interested in making money to the most interested): minister, social worker, school teacher, nurse, psychologist, policeman, psychiatrist, physician, undertaker and lawyer. The difference in the ranking of the psychiatrist are probably due to the social workers' familiarity with this profession.

There were fewer answers to this question than to the other three. On the first question 84.8 per cent of the 86 social workers replied, 83.7 per cent answered the second question, 80.2 per cent

answered the third, and 79.1 per cent answered the fourth. It appears that social workers are hesitant to generalize about monetary interest among the occupations, and one respondent said, "These questions are very difficult to evaluate as most of the professions listed are 'helping professions' and thus are not professions basically concerned with monetary returns." However, another respondent wrote about another aspect of the question and said that "no one group has a corner on altruism". In general, it appears that interest in monetary gain is not a dominant characteristic of social work either as it is seen by the social workers or by the business students, but perhaps the fact that fewer social workers answered this question indicates some doubt about the place money has or should have in their system of values.

TABLE 4
RANKINGS ON MONETARY INTEREST

SOCIAL WORKERS			BUSINESS STUDENTS		
RANK		MEAN	RANK		MEAN
1.	Lawyer	1.68	1.	Lawyer	
2.	Undertaker	2.29	2.	Undertaker	
3.	Physician	4.01	3.	Psychiatrist	
4.	Psychiatrist	4.63	4.	Physician	
5.	Policeman	4.85	5.	Policeman	
6.	Psychologist	5.60	6.	Psychologist	
7.	Nurse	7.18	7.	Nurse	
8.	School Teacher	7.25	8.	School Teacher	
9.	Social Worker	8.34	9.	Social Worker	
10.	Minister	9.10	10.	Minister	

The Business Students' Knowledge of the Occupations

In order to be able to make a clearer evaluation of the statistical results which we have obtained from the answers of the business students, we felt it would help to know how much they thought they knew about the different occupations. They were asked to indicate the degree of knowledge they had under the categories "very great", "considerable", "moderate", "slight", and "nothing". As seen in Table 5, when the occupations were listed in order, the mean rankings showed that the business students thought they knew a great deal more of the first six occupations than they knew of the last four, which included social work, psychiatry, psychology, and undertaking.

TABLE 5

BUSINESS STUDENTS' RELATIVE KNOWLEDGE OF TEN OCCUPATIONS ^a

OCCUPATION	RANK	MEAN
School Teacher	1	2.35
Policeman	2	2.57
Physician	3	2.75
Minister	4	2.79
Lawyer	5	2.82
Nurse	6	2.83
Social Worker	7	3.26
Psychiatrist	8.5	3.58
Psychologist	9.5	3.58
Undertaker	10	3.79

a) 72 respondents

We wondered if those students who thought they knew a lot about social work would rank it in any way which would be significantly different from the rankings by those who thought they knew the least about social work. The mean rankings of the business students for each of the criteria, with respect to social work, were computed. Then the rankings of the eleven respondents who marked "very great" and "considerable" were compared with the mean rankings of the twenty-eight respondents who marked "slight" or "nothing". There were thirty-three business students who marked "moderate" and these were excluded from our calculations in order to make a clearer comparison. As seen in Table 6, the results were inconclusive. No rankings would change at all, although the mean rankings were slightly different.

TABLE 6

MEAN RANKINGS RELATED TO THE BUSINESS STUDENTS' KNOWLEDGE OF
SOCIAL WORK

NUMBER OF STUDENTS	ACTUAL PRESTIGE	IDEAL PRESTIGE	CONSIDERATION OF NEEDS; FEELINGS	MONETARY INTEREST
11 Knew most	7.82	6.00	4.73	8.36
33 Moderate	7.76	5.91	4.55	8.06
28 Knew least	7.57	6.39	4.75	8.21
Average	7.71	6.13	4.65	8.17

Values and Self-Perceptions of Social Workers

We have attempted to broaden our understanding of the values and self-perceptions of social workers by comparing their occupation with the other occupations. We have also compared the image of the social worker as it is seen by sample groups of social workers and business students.

The prestige of an occupation affects the way the members of the occupation see themselves and the way in which other people see them. That prestige is a value of social work has been found from the analysis of the data of our first two criteria, but there appears to be some dissatisfaction among the respondents about being asked to rank the occupations at all. Four respondents said that they felt there should be no difference in prestige among the occupations and that the questionnaire sought to make the differences where none exist. One respondent added three occupations which she thought should be included above the ten listed. These were "large corporation president", "a successful political leader", and "educational leader". There were two suggestions that there should have been a more diverse selection of occupations in order to make clear-cut rankings possible. Three social workers said they did not like having to rank the occupations from one to ten and suggested groupings instead. For instance, one grouping, in answer to the question on actual prestige, was as follows:

- 1) Physician, minister, psychiatrist,
- 2) Lawyer
- 3) Nurse, psychologist, social worker, school teacher
- 4) Undertaker
- 5) Policeman.

There were several comments related to the respondents' general reluctance to generalize from a knowledge of a few individuals and sometimes from no knowledge at all. One social worker, who said that she would prefer to group the occupations, said that she would rank them in case we had an IBM machine (for tabulation purposes) but she felt that the question was too subjective.

It seems unrealistic to think that all the occupations would hopefully have equal prestige in our society, and we wondered why social workers feel so strongly about having to rank them. We feel that it is related to their reluctance to make generalizations and so, rather than do this, they prefer to be idealistic and make no differences at all. Clyde White found that social work ranked tenth on general prestige after four other professions and five other occupations, and so perhaps because social workers wish to be considered on a par with the other professions, by eliminating differences they feel they can attain this goal.

The question on the ranking of the occupations in terms of the consideration for the needs and feelings of the client again brought many comments about the dangers of making generalizations. Keller, et al. also found that social workers were unwilling to discriminate between the professions and they felt that in being asked to do this they were being asked to put aside their concern for the individual within the professional group.¹⁵ We may conclude that social workers feel strongly

¹⁴ Clyde R. White, "Social Workers in Society: Some Further Evidence", *Social Work Journal*, vol. 34, no. 4. (October 1953) p. 162.

¹⁵ Barbara Keller, et al., op. cit., p. 136

about their belief in the worth of the individual and that this attitude towards all people is intrinsic to their professional values.

Also, it appears that the social workers and the business students rank social work similarly in regard to the low value social workers put on money earned in comparison to the other aspects of the job. Perhaps this is due to the widespread knowledge of the low wages in social work in comparison to those in other professions. Many people, in and out of the profession, see social work as a calling, but there are also those who, like one of our respondents, say "no one group has a corner on altruism".

When various ideals and values of their profession are discussed, social workers rarely consider that their income is one of their main concerns. However, there is a fairly widespread interest among social workers in raising their salary standards. It seems that the establishment of a higher salary scale may be one way of attempting to establish an identity on a par with the other professions.

The values and self-perceptions of social workers continue to be quite different from those characteristics attributed to them by others outside the profession. The greatest difference lies in the way the two groups see the attitudes of the social workers towards their clients. As the business students do not agree that the individual, considerate, approach is a basic concept in the profession of social work, we wonder how we can dispel the stereotype which apparently is still connected with the profession, and which was described earlier in our chapter on the image of the social worker.

Concluding Remarks

The four criteria included in this chapter brought many comments from the social work respondents. They indicated their dislike of these questions by saying that they were "poorly worded", "not clearly phrased" or that they "did not understand it at all". One respondent said

Page four seems directed toward discovering prejudices. I try to evaluate people on an individual basis and not by profession. Some policeman have much more feeling for people while some social workers I know have little feeling for clients. I do not believe in the "average" social worker, minister, etc., concept.

These comments brought an added source of information about the professional values and self-perceptions of the social workers. Twenty-one social workers felt they had to make some remark related to the subjectivity, or arbitrary nature of such a questionnaire. Only one remarked that it was "a very well-prepared schedule".

From analysis of the data it appears that social workers see their present prestige ranking fairly realistically and that they would like to see their prestige rank higher than it is now. However, we feel that they are unrealistic in their wish to see all the occupations rank equally, and we wonder if this is their way of hiding differences so that they may be considered among the professions which command a higher degree of respect and prestige in the community.

There is a considerable difference in the occupational rankings given by the social workers and the business students in relation to the consideration given by each occupation to the needs and feelings of the client, and the business students rank the psychiatrically-oriented professions lower than the other occupations.

This is in opposition to the opinion of the social workers who feel that their primary interest is the client and his physical and emotional needs. As this is a subjective question and is closely related to personal experiences of the respondents with representatives of the various occupations, it seems reasonable that there would be a greater disparity in these results than there was in the results of the other questions. As social workers identify themselves with the professions of psychiatry and psychology, we would expect them to rank these two professions differently than they were ranked by the business students.

Neither the social workers nor the business students appear to feel that the social workers are more interested in making money than in helping those they serve. This seems to be an indication of the unselfish or altruistic aspects of social work where economic interests are secondary to serving or helping the client. Finally, one of the most outstanding values of social workers, which comes more from the comments they made rather than from the statistical data, is the emphasis they place on seeing the client as an individual and the fact that they do not like to be asked to make generalizations about people when they feel they have insufficient knowledge with which to support their statements. The social worker is convinced of the dignity and worth of the individual and holds this belief as one of the main values of her profession.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Some professional values of social workers emerged from the question regarding the considerations to be observed in choosing a career. Among the major considerations stressed by social workers were a person's interest in the job, his native ability, and his aptitude and personality. These ideas reflect a strong orientation toward the person rather than the task, in contrast to the more job-centered concern of the business students. We can therefore see that in their answers to this question we are getting a reflection of the values social workers place upon the person and such things as personal worth and personal fulfillment.

The images of the social worker evoked by the social work group and by the business student group show a marked divergence. The business students see the social worker either as an untrained person unselfishly helping the poor in a direct material way or as a snoop investigator with little respect for her low class clients. The social worker, on the other hand, sees herself as a trained professional person helping clients more with psychological than with material needs.

It appears that the business student group has an inaccurate picture of the present nature of social work and that their concept of the social worker is obsolescent. This is in contrast to the findings of a study by Myerson who states that "there is strong evidence to support the premise that the social work image we are attempting to

debunk is in fact an anachronism."¹

In order to gain some understanding of the knowledge of the occupations on which business students were basing their replies they were asked to indicate the degree of their knowledge. This question proved disappointing in the results it brought for there seemed little relation, if any, between the degree of knowledge claimed and the nature of the social work image depicted and the way in which social workers were ranked in relation to other professions. This would suggest that follow-up questions or an interview would have given more accurate data on what the business student meant by "knowledge of the social work profession."

It is also possible that the self-image of the social worker lacks accuracy, in the sense that it may be glossed over or based on selective perception. The study by Zander, Cohen and Stotland points out that the stereotype which the social worker holds of her colleagues compared with the stereotype which the psychiatrists hold of their own group is in the main more favorable, yet the social workers "view themselves as more "mercenary", "condescending", and "striving", than the psychiatrists view themselves.

In fact, in our study there seems to be some inconsistency, lack of clarity or ambivalence in the social worker's attitude toward money. On the one hand the social worker is considerably less concerned than the business student by the situation of the professional person

¹ Irma T. Myerson, "The Social Work Image or Self-Image", Social Work, vol. IV, no. 3. (July, 1959,) pp. 67-71.

² Alvin Zander, Arthur R. Cohen, Ezra Stotland, Role Relations in the Mental Health Professions, Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan.

who is "mainly interested in monetary gain", thus suggesting that she perhaps accepts money as a main motivation more readily than the business student. On the other hand, the social worker portrays her own work as mainly concerned with help of a social-emotional type even though many social workers are involved in giving financial help at least. She feels that her own interest in monetary gain is slight, exceeding only that of the minister. It is possible there is a suggestion here that social workers are reacting against one of the stereotypes held by the business students, that of the snoop investigator dispensing relief funds, but it is also possible that the social worker is to some extent ignoring or avoiding the problem of money, whether in relation to clients, herself, or in general.

As for the social workers' perception of themselves in relation to other professional groups, they see their prestige as very low, as low as that granted them by business students. Social workers feel, however, that they should have more prestige than they do and would raise themselves several ranks higher than the business students who would give them only slightly higher status. The question asking about "situations that would be of concern" showed the social worker giving greatest importance to helping the client. She is also concerned that she know the job well and that she treat the client with respect. Business students however rate three other professions ahead of social workers in having respect for the client.

In short, social workers think of themselves as showing more consideration to clients than anyone else and as being less interested in money than any group except ministers. Their perception of themselves

as social workers carries therefore their primary or basic values, their concern for the individual and respect for human worth.

There are many implications suggested by this study. It is evident that social workers and business students share more values than might have been predicted. The two groups also showed some similarities in the ranking question and in the question asking for the situations that would be of concern. This suggests that the divergence between the two groups may arise more from difference in knowledge than from deeply divided attitudes toward professional behavior or human values.

It is striking, however, to observe the distorted image of the social worker held by the business student. Not only is it inaccurate but it suggests an inadequate knowledge of some aspects of present-day society, with its frequent resulting dysfunction of individuals and groups. It appears that the business student group, and we may infer that it is true of other, non-social work groups as well, are not yet aware that "the helping professions assert that their work requires knowledge and skill not likely to be found in any ordinary citizen", and that "it also requires the application of scientific methods."³

Whatever the reasons for this situation, it seems important that social workers try to effect a better understanding of their work, for as this becomes clearer, the stereotype of the social worker should also change. Perhaps, as Myerson says, social work has not been adequately

³ Joseph W. Eaton, "A Scientific Basis for Helping", in *Issues in American Social Work*, Alfred J. Kahn (ed.) New York: Columbia University Press., 1959. pp. 270-292.

interpreted "because we've been unable to reduce what we say to a language that is common to most people", and that we must now direct our energy to "explaining what we do and why".⁴

⁴ Myerson, op. cit. p. 8

APPENDIX

TABLE 1

SOCIAL WORKERS' RANKINGS OF TEN OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS WITH RESPECT
TO SEVERAL CHARACTERISTICS ^a

Occupation	Mean Rankings (Scale of 10)			
	Actual Prestige	Ideal Prestige	Consideration of Needs, Feelings	Monetary Interest
Lawyer	3.15	5.11	7.97	1.68
Minister	2.88	3.17 ^b	3.29	9.10
Nurse	6.87	7.21	5.17	7.18
Physician	1.38	2.28	4.23	4.01
Policeman	9.12	8.83	9.12	4.85
Psychiatrist	3.26	3.17 ^c	2.83	4.63
Psychologist	5.64	6.17	5.74	5.60
School Teacher	6.05	4.35	5.51	7.25
Social Worker	7.16	4.75	2.32	8.34
Undertaker	9.45	9.77	9.03	2.29

a) number of the respondents varied from 68-73 with the mean
determined accordingly.

b) 3.166

c) 3.173

APPENDIX

TABLE 2

BUSINESS STUDENTS' RANKINGS OF TEN OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS WITH RESPECT
TO SEVERAL CHARACTERISTICS ^b

Occupation	Mean Rankings (Scale of 10)			
	Actual Prestige	Ideal Prestige	Consideration of Needs, Feelings	Monetary Interest
Lawyer	2.90	4.50	7.33	1.96
Minister	2.83	2.13	1.99	9.36
Nurse	7.25	6.83	4.53	7.01
Physician	1.88	2.19	2.90	4.21
Policeman	8.33	7.38	7.92	4.96
Psychiatrist	4.65	5.67	5.68	3.78
Psychologist	6.42	6.31	6.50	5.07
School Teacher	5.44	4.21	4.79	7.38
Social Worker	7.71	6.13	4.65	8.17
Undertaker	8.54	9.35	8.65	3.10

b) number of respondents was 72.

There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. The "right" answer for us is the one that best presents your own point of view. You may find some of the questions difficult to answer, but we cannot complete this study without your help and we therefore would like you to answer all the questions as best you can.

1. What do you think are the two most important things for a young man to consider when he is choosing his life's work?

- 1.

- 2.

2. The following seven items all describe situations that would be of concern to practically everybody. Please check the THREE items that you would be most troubled by.

_____ The professional person who is mainly interested in monetary gain.

_____ The professional person who is not properly valued by the community he serves.

_____ The professional person who treats his clients or patients discourteously.

_____ The professional person who does not know his job well.

_____ The professional person who is paid an inadequate salary.

_____ The professional person who is mainly interested in increasing his prestige.

_____ The professional person who is not concerned about helping his clients or patients.

3. Imagine that your college class is preparing an informal bulletin to go out before your reunion in June, and that they are asking you to describe what you do as a social worker. Imagine that you can use about 10 or 20 lines, and write your job description below.

In answering the following questions, please keep in mind the average person within the occupations listed below.

Please rank the following ten occupations in terms of the general prestige you feel they have in our society. Place a 1 beside the occupation you feel has the most prestige, a 2 beside the occupation with the next most prestige, and so on down to a 10 beside the occupation with the least prestige.

Lawyer
 Minister
 Nurse
 Physician
 Policeman

Psychiatrist
 Psychologist
 School Teacher
 Social Worker
 Undertaker

Now please rank the ten occupations in terms of the general prestige you feel they should have within our society. Place a 1 beside the occupation that you feel should have the most prestige, a 2 beside the occupation you feel should have the next most prestige, and so on.

Lawyer
 Minister
 Nurse
 Physician
 Policeman

Psychiatrist
 Psychologist
 School Teacher
 Social Worker
 Undertaker

Now please rank the ten occupations in terms of the consideration for the needs and feelings they show to those they serve. Place a 1 beside the occupation whose members show the most consideration for the needs and feelings of those they serve, and so on down to 10.

Lawyer
 Minister
 Nurse
 Physician
 Policeman

Psychiatrist
 Psychologist
 School Teacher
 Social Worker
 Undertaker

Now rank the ten occupations in terms of the proportion of people within them who are more interested in making money than in helping those that they serve. Place a 1 beside the occupation with the largest proportion of people who are more interested in making money than in helping those that they serve, and so on down to 10.

Lawyer
 Minister
 Nurse
 Physician
 Policeman

Psychiatrist
 Psychologist
 School Teacher
 Social Worker
 Undertaker

Thank you for your help in this study. If there are any further comments you would like to make about the questions in this study, please do so on the reverse side of this sheet.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY* A STUDY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD PROFESSIONSBackground

1. Sex Male _____
 Female _____
2. Year of birth _____
3. Present major position _____
 Type of organization _____
 Number of years at this job _____
 Vocational goal _____
4. Have you completed grade school? Yes ___ If yes, in what year? _____
 No _____
- Have you completed high school? Yes ___ If yes, in what year? _____
 No _____
- Have you completed college? Yes ___ If yes, in what year? _____
 No _____
- Other educational training _____
5. Marital status _____
 If ever married, number of children _____
6. Your father's major occupation _____
7. Your father's highest level of formal education _____

There are no right or wrong answers to the questions that follow. The "right" answer for us is the one that best presents your own point of view. You may find some of the questions difficult to answer, but we cannot complete this study without your help and we therefore would like you to answer all the questions as best you can.

* Questionnaire answered by business students.

In answering the following questions, please keep in mind the average person within the occupations listed below.

Please rank the following ten occupations in terms of the general prestige you feel they have in our society. Place a 1 beside the occupation you feel has the most prestige, a 2 beside the occupation with the next most prestige, and so on down to a 10 beside the occupation with the least prestige.

____ Lawyer
 ____ Minister
 ____ Nurse
 ____ Physician
 ____ Policeman

____ Psychiatrist
 ____ Psychologist
 ____ School Teacher
 ____ Social Worker
 ____ Undertaker

Now please rank the ten occupations in terms of the general prestige you feel they should have within our society. Place a 1 beside the occupation that you feel should have the most prestige, a 2 beside the occupation you feel should have the next most prestige, and so on.

____ Lawyer
 ____ Minister
 ____ Nurse
 ____ Physician
 ____ Policeman

____ Psychiatrist
 ____ Psychologist
 ____ School Teacher
 ____ Social Worker
 ____ Undertaker

Now please rank the ten occupations in terms of the consideration for the needs and feelings they show to those they serve. Place a 1 beside the occupation whose members show the most consideration for the needs and feelings of those they serve, and so on down to 10.

____ Lawyer
 ____ Minister
 ____ Nurse
 ____ Physician
 ____ Policeman

____ Psychiatrist
 ____ Psychologist
 ____ School Teacher
 ____ Social Worker
 ____ Undertaker

Now rank the ten occupations in terms of the proportion of people within them who are more interested in making money than in helping those they serve.

____ Lawyer
 ____ Minister
 ____ Nurse
 ____ Physician
 ____ Policeman

____ Psychiatrist
 ____ Psychologist
 ____ School Teacher
 ____ Social Worker
 ____ Undertaker

What would you say is the extent of your knowledge about each of the following professions? Rate each of them from 1 to 5 according to the following formula:

- 1 Very great
- 2 Considerable
- 3 Moderate
- 4 Slight
- 5 Nothing

Lawyer _____

Minister _____

Nurse _____

Physician _____

Policeman _____

Psychiatrist _____

Psychologist _____

School Teacher _____

Social Worker _____

Undertaker _____

What do you think are the two most important things for a young man to consider when he is choosing his life's work?

1.

2.

The following seven items all describe situations that would be of concern to practically everybody. Please check the THREE items that you would be most troubled by.

The professional person who is mainly interested in monetary gain.

The professional person who is not properly valued by the community he serves.

The professional person who treats his clients or patients discourteously.

The professional person who does not know his job well.

The professional person who is paid an inadequate salary.

The professional person who is mainly interested in increasing his prestige.

The professional person who is not concerned about helping his clients or patients.

Taking social work as an example of the ten professions mentioned earlier, write what you think a social worker does. Use about 10 or 20 lines, and write a job description of social work below.

Thank you for your help in this study. If there are any further comments you would like to make about the questions in this study, please do so on the reverse side of this sheet.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Brown, Esther L. Social Work as a Profession. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1942
- Caplow, Theodore. The Sociology of Work. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954
- Friedlander, Walter A. Introduction to Social Welfare. New York: Prentice Hall, 1955.
- Jahoda, Marie, Deutsch, Morton, and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations. 2 vols., New York: Dryden Press, 1951.
- Selltiz, Claire, Jahoda, Marie, Deutsch, Morton, and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations. Henry Holt and Co., 1951.
- Zander, Alvin, Cohen, Arthur B., Stotland, Ezra, Role Relations in the Mental Health Profession. Ann Arbor, Mich., University of Michigan, 1957.

Articles

- Axelrod, Sidney, Ginsberg, Sol, Ginsberg, Eli, and Herma, John. "The Problem of Occupational Choice", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, vol. 20 (April 1950), p.177
- Berelson, Bernard. "Content Analysis," in Handbook of Social Psychology, Gardner Lindzey (ed.). Cambridge; Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., vol. 1, pp. 448-518.
- Bernstein, Saul. "Self-Determination: King or Citizen in the Realm of Values," Social Work, vol. 4 (January, 1960), pp.3-8.
- Boehm, Werner. "The Role of Values in Social Work," Jewish Social Service Quarterly, vol. 26 (June 1950), p. 430.
- _____ "The Nature of Social Work", Social Work Journal. vol.3, No. 2 (April 1958), pp. 10-18.
- Counts, George S. "The Social Status of Occupations: A Problem in Vocational Guidance." School Review, Vol. 33, no. 1, (January 1925) pp. 16-27
- Coutu, Walter, "The Relative Prestige of Twenty Professions as Judged by Three Groups of Professional Students," Social Forces, Vol.14, no. 4. (May 1936), pp. 522-529.

- Flexner, Abraham, "Is Social Work a Profession?" Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, Vol. 42 (1915) pp. 576-590.
- Goodal, Frances, "The Status of the Social Worker in the Agency and the Community", Social Work Journal, Vol. 35 (July 1954). p. 111
- Greenwood, Ernest. "Attributes of a Profession", Social Work, Vol. 2 (July 1957), p. 52.
- Kadushin, Alfred. "Prestige of Social Work--Facts and Factors," Social Work, vol. 3., no. 2., (April 1958), pp. 37-43.
- Kay, Lillian Wald. "Social Norms as Determinants in the Interpretation of Personal Experiences", Journal of Social Psychology, vol.19. (May 1944), pp. 359-367.
- Kidneigh, John C. "People, Problems, and Plans", Social Work Journal, vol. 32, (April 1951), p.81.
- Menger, Clara, "The Social Status of Occupations for Women", Teachers' College Record, vol. 33, no.8. (May 1932), pp.696-704.
- Myerson, Erma T., "The Social Work Image or Self-Image", Social Work vol. 4, no. 3 (July 1959)
- North, Cecil C., and Hatt, Paul K. "Jobs and Occupations: a Popular Evaluation", Opinion News, vol. 9, no. 4 (Sept. 1, 1947) pp.3-13
- Polansky, Norman A. "The Professional Identity in Social Work", Issues in American Social Work, Alfred J. Kahn, (ed.), New York, Columbia University Press, 1959, pp. 293-318.
- Polansky, Norman, Bowen, William Gordon, Lucille and Nathan, Conrad. "Social Workers in Society: Results of a Sampling Study", Social Work Journal, vol. 34., no. 2., (April, 1953) pp.74-80.
- Regensburg, Jeanette, "Professional Attributes, Knowledge, and Skills in Practice: Educational Priorities," Social Work Journal, vol.34
- Rettig, Solomon, Jacobson, Frank N. and Pasamanick, Benjamin, "Status Over-estimation, Objective Status, and Job Satisfaction among Professions," American Sociological Review, vol. 34.(February 1953), pp.75-81.
- Simpson, Richard L. and Simpson, Ida H. "The Psychiatric Attendant: Development of an Occupational Self-Image in a Low Status Occupation", American Sociological Review, vol.24., no.3., (June, 1959), pp. 389-392.

Articles.....continued

- Stevens, Raymond B. "The Attitudes of College Women toward Women's Vocations" Journal of Applied Psychology, vol. 24, no. 5. (October, 1940), pp.615-627.
- Turner, Damon A. "The Licensing Effort--Seven Years Later", Social Work Journal, vol. 35., no. 2., (April 1954), pp.68-72.
- White, Clyde R. "Prestige of Social Work and the Social Worker," Social Work Journal, vol. 36., no. 1., (January 1955), pp. 21-23.
- _____ "Social Workers in Society: Some Further Evidence," Social Work Journal, vol. 34., no. 4., (October 1953), pp. 161-64.
- Williamson, Edmund. "Value Orientation in Counseling," Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 36 (April, 1958), p.524.

Pamphlets

- National Opinion Research Centre. National Opinion on Occupations, Denver, Colorado: University of Denver, 1947.
- Occupational Planning Committee, "Social Prestige Ranking of Occupations by High School Students: A Replication Study," Welfare Federation of Cleveland, 1956. (Mimeographed)

Unpublished Material

- Houston, Gay A. "Attitudes of College Students toward Social Work as a Career," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boston University School of Social Work, Boston, 1957.
- Keller, Barbara, Phelps, Roger W., Shickman, Evelyn J., Slade, Carol, "A Study of the Interprofessional Relations of Social Workers with Physicians, Psychiatrists, Psychologists, and Clergymen." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boston University School of Social Work, Boston, 1959).