

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

"An Exploration of Student Characteristics
of Bachelor of Social Work III and Master
of Social Work I Students in the
Academic Year 1970 - 1971"

This Report of a Group Research Project is
submitted in partial fulfillment of
requirements for the Degree of
Master of Social Work

1971 ✓

Committee of Students

Laura Carment
Sue Feldman
Ron Levin
Russ Reiter
Sandra Gardiner

April 1971

Winnipeg, Manitoba



Acknowledgements

The Committee of students who participated in this research project wish to express their thanks to Professor Leonard Spearman, research advisor and Miss Helen Mann for their assistance in the completion of this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	Page
I INTRODUCTION	1
The University of Manitoba	5
Rationale and Broad Areas of Concern	8
Statement of the Problem	14
II METHOD	15
Selection of Variables	15
Data Collection	23
Development of the Questionnaire	25
Measurement of the Variables	26
Variable #12 - Aptitude for Inter- personal Relationships	37
Administration of the Questionnaire	38
Treatment of the Data and Analytical Strategies	41
A. The Questionnaire	41
B. Paper and Pencil Test	43
III DATA ANALYSIS	46
Demographic Data	46
Family Background	48
Size of Home Community	51
Countries Lived in and Visited	51
Academic Background	53
Political Activism	57
Community Involvement	59
Work Experience	61
Career Plans	64
Why Respondents Choose Social Work as a Career	66
Perception of Social Problems	68
Potential Instrument for Social Change	72
Aptitude for Interpersonal Relationships	72

Chapter	Page
IV SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATION	80
BIBLIOGRAPHY	84
APPENDICES	
I Questionnaire	
II Correspondence	
III Tables	
IV Social Work Attitude Inventory	
V Formula for Skewness	
VI Formulae for Questionnaire Analysis	

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1 Age of Respondents	46
2 Number of Respondents who are the Eldest Child	47
3 Number of Married Respondents	48
4 Occupation of Respondent's father	49
5 Occupation of Chief Parental Wage-Earner	50
6 Population Centres where Respondent Lived Most of his Life	51
7 Number of Countries Visited	52
8 Number of Different Countries Lived In	52
9 Number of Universities Attended	53
10 Number of Different Faculties Enrolled In.	54
11 Number of Social Science Courses Taken	54
12 Source of Financial Support for Academic Year 1970-71	56
13 Number of Political Meetings Attended in Past Two Years	57
14 Voting in Types of Elections in Last two Years	58
15 Contact of Political Representative re- Social Issue	59
16 Involvement in a Social Issue or Problem	60
17 Cumulative Work Experience in a Social Agency	61
18 When Paid Social Work Experience was Obtained	62
19 Participation in Volunteer Social Work Activity	63

TABLE	PAGE
20 When Non-Social Work Work Experience was Obtained	64
21 Expected Future Long-Run Employer	65
22 Statements Expressing Reasons for Choosing Social Work as a Career	67
23 Importance of Social Problems as Perceived by Society	69
24 Importance of Social Problems as Perceived by Respondent	70
25 Areas in which Respondent would like to Become Competent	70
26 Frequency Distribution of Inventory Scores for M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III Groups of Social Work Students	73
27 Comparison of Mean Inventory Scores for Social Work Students in M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III	74
28 The Mean Inventory Score with Number of Social Work Students from M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III Groups Found at Each of Three Age Levels	75
29 Comparison of Inventory Scores of M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III Social Work Students in the 20-25 and 26-30 Age Groupings	75
30 Comparison of Mean Inventory Scores of the Total Sample Population Between the 20-25 and 26-30 Age Groups	76
31 The Mean Inventory Score with Number of Social Work Students from M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III Groups by Sex	77
32 Comparison of Mean Inventory Scores of the M.S.W. I Male and Female Sample and Sex and the B.S.W. III Male and Female Sample and Sex	77
33 Comparison of Mean Inventory Scores of (1) Male B.S.W. III and M.S.W.I student popula- tions and (2) Female B.S.W. III and M.S.W.I Student Populations	78

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This first chapter describes the establishment of undergraduate social work education at the University of Manitoba School of Social Work; our rationale for this project; the broad areas of concern which can be looked at in terms of the rationale; and finally the area of concern to which our research project is directed.

At a conference held on May 29, 1966 convened by the Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada (A.U.C.C.) manpower needs in the field of social welfare were discussed. This conference was supported by the Canadian Association of Social Workers (C.A.S.W.) and the National Committee of the Canadian Schools of Social Work.

The major areas of concern discussed at the conference were summarized in a MASW working paper as follows:

1. The need for an increase in Social Work practitioners in the Social services is great and continually more pressing. Coupled with this need for more practitioners, the expansions planned in various kinds of social services makes it increasingly more difficult to provide services that will measure up to desirable standards. It is felt that effective delivery of these social services calls for a variety of functions and tasks that require different levels of education and training.

By moving the first stage of education for Social Workers down into an undergraduate program, it may be assumed that the manpower shortage and the expansions planned in services will begin to be met by graduating students from a first professional degree program of undergraduate Social Worker education.

2. The obvious differentiation of functions and tasks needed to take place in the organization of the social services delivery system will not only require the distribution of these functions and tasks among different professionals and other social service practitioners, but also among social work practitioners with differing practice competences. However, the professional should be as concerned with safeguarding professional quality of social work competence as with the need for an increasing number of social workers.

At present, the Master of Social Work degree from an accredited School of Social Work program is considered to qualify a person as a "professional" social worker. This is the "minimal" qualifying degree for membership in the CASW.

By stating that the Master of Social Work degree is the "minimal" requirement for membership in the profession, it, ipso facto, assumes gradations of levels of education and competence with professional Social Work practice beyond minimal. It appears, therefore, desirable to recognize graduated levels of competence within the realm of professional social

work practise and to accept coordinate levels of professional education other than graduate which will prepare for a certain level of professional competence, albeit a minimal.

It would seem that undergraduate education can be professional if it meets the requirements of being a "liberal" education while at the same time providing for the acquisition of specialized professional knowledge, skills and discipline on a level determined by the profession. An undergraduate degree in social work (BSW) would thus be considered professional and would enable one to begin professional practise at this level.

3. In order for professional education to be appropriately "graduate" it needs to build on undergraduate programs of professional education, and the educative process for professional social workers might then be continuous and made up of undergraduate, graduate and post graduate stages.

The undergraduate program could be considered to provide a better integrated foundation of knowledge and skill for graduate programs. Graduate programs might then offer professional specialized education.

Undergraduate programs might improve the opportunity for making better choices of areas of specialization at the graduate level. The establishment of the undergraduate program would also enhance the academic and professional status

of the graduate program.

4. Many professions seem to be in a very competitive position with one another to attract sufficient members from limited personnel resources. The Social Work profession is in a rather difficult position to increase its recruits if it continues to insist upon graduate education for a first professional degree.

Positions and salaries offered in relation to the length of time required to obtain the first professional degree are not commensurate with those in other professions.

Also, Social Work, in placing a high importance on its value system and development of professional attitudes which take a fairly long period to develop, should not delay the process of socialization into the profession to the graduate level of education.¹

From these major concerns arose an impetus for change in the pattern of social work education, toward a continuum based on the establishment of the first professional degree at the undergraduate level. This development has been approved and supported by the Canadian Universities and the CASW, in cooperation with the Canadian Universities for Education in the Social Services (MASW Social Worker, Vol. 4, No. 1, Pat Wooley).

¹Manitoba Association of Social Workers, Work Paper on Undergraduate Education for Social Work, pp. 4-9.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

The University of Manitoba School of Social Work shared the general concern of this A.U.C.C. conference in 1966 relating to the manpower shortage in the social welfare field. However, as mentioned, a further concern surrounded the need for providing an educational continuum based on the first professional degree at the undergraduate level.

Thus a proposal was developed in 1967 for the establishment of undergraduate social work education. This proposal was approved by the Senate of the University in the spring of 1968. The first students were admitted in the fall of 1968. Simultaneously, the two year Master Social Work program established in 1952 is being phased out, with the last class admitted in 1970-71.

An explanation of what is being attempted at the Bachelor of Social Work level and how this is being achieved becomes relevant here.

The new Bachelor of Social Work program is a "four year undergraduate program leading to a first professional degree in social work (B.S.W.). This program, among the first to be developed in Canada, combines the objectives of liberal and professional education. It is organized in such a way as to provide the student with a sound background in the social sciences and humanities in the first two years and a carefully

structured program of professional study and supervised practise in the third and fourth years. The undergraduate program is basic and generic."²

The areas of professional content in the new Bachelor of Social Work program will parallel closely that offered in the present Master of Social Work curriculum.³ Field instruction will commence in the second term of third year, with a substantial concentration of time spent in field work in fourth year. The Bachelor of Social Work program has also been intended as a prerequisite for the new specialized graduate program. In 1972-73 the school will admit the first class of graduates in the new one year Master of Social Work program.

Further elaboration on the structure of the new Bachelor of Social Work program will be documented later in this chapter, when a look at the present Master of Social Work and Bachelor of Social Work programs is attempted.

As previously mentioned, the University of Manitoba shared general concern over the social welfare manpower shortage,*

²The University of Manitoba Calendar, School of Social Work. p. 2104.

³Manitoba Social Worker, "New B.S.W. Program at U. of M.", P. Wooley, Manitoba Association of Social Workers, Vol. 4, No. 1, p. 1.

*At the present time (1971), the manpower shortage may no longer be at this critical point, and may in fact be reaching a saturation point. The number of graduates from both welfare technology courses and universities is on the increase. However, the introduction of a Bachelor of Social Work program in Canada was, in large fact, based upon the manpower shortage that did exist.

but was also concerned about establishing a new educational continuum based on a first professional degree at the undergraduate level. Their concern was accompanied by several related factors:

- the feeling that the present Master of Social Work program did not provide the opportunity for "graduate" education in the usual sense of the word

- the idea that an undergraduate program would free the school to develop a more advanced graduate social work program

- it was felt that with changing times, students want, and are able to make a vocational choice earlier

- a new undergraduate curriculum was seen to begin to cope with the problem of persons having a wide range of backgrounds (especially undergraduate courses) entering professional schools by setting out required arts courses that must be taken in the course of their undergraduate education.

While there was no clear consensus among the Faculty of the School of Social Work, there was a tendency in the many discussions held around the new educational continuum to expect that the "old" M.S.W. graduate and the "new" B.S.W. graduate would have a comparable beginning level of practise competence. It was obvious, also, that during these discussions, it could not be ascertained whether or not this expectation was in fact true, until graduates of both programs would be available.

Lending support to this expectation is the fact that the Bachelor of Social Work program is presently set up to involve only one year less of total study than the Master of Social Work program, with no reduction in the number of years of professional education.

In addition, the Bachelor of Social Work students, because of the proposed organization of their course content, will all have a similar liberal arts background and a similar professional education content according to the School of Social Work's administrators. This common knowledge base should allow instructors to teach both more competently and more economically than before.

Therefore, the students in the Bachelor of Social Work program are presumed to be able to have all of the academic and field content that the Master of Social Work graduate has been given in this past. (With one exception, the research component, which is not felt to be significant in terms of a beginning level of practice competence.)

RATIONALE AND BROAD AREAS OF CONCERN

This research project has been concerned about the expectation regarding the Bachelor of Social Work and Master of Social Work graduates having comparable beginning levels of practice competence. The intent of this research is to begin to answer the general question: Are, in fact, the Bachelor of

Social Work and the two year Master of Social Work graduates comparable?

The following are offered as reasons for questioning this proposed comparability:

1. Many Master of Social Work students holding a Bachelor of Arts degree have had the opportunity to work as untrained social workers or may have worked in other areas before beginning their Social Work education. Having worked between their graduate and undergraduate education probably means that most Master of Social Work students are older than Bachelor of Social Work students. Work experience and maturity (a possible result of work experience and age) as well as age, might make the educational process of relating theory to practise much easier for a Master of Social Work than a Bachelor of Social Work student who has usually not worked and may be generally younger and less mature. If their age, maturity and work experience are significantly different, it may have a very real effect on their beginning level of practise competence.

2. If the School of Social Work is assuming comparable output in terms of a beginning level of practice competence for the Master of Social Work and Bachelor of Social Work students the question may be raised - are these two groups of students therefore expected to perform comparably while in the process of taking their Social Work education?

It is generally presumed that graduate studies (the

two year Master Social Work program) have higher expectations on students than undergraduate programs, (BSW program). Because of this, Faculty of the School of Social Work, especially those who have been teaching for some time, may see the Master of Social Work students more as peers than they might Bachelor of Social Work students. The performance and/or expectations of performance may not be the same in the two programs. If they do not perform and/or are not expected to perform similarly while in school, can we expect their output upon graduation to be comparable?

3. Although thought to be similar, the structure of the Master of Social Work and Bachelor of Social Work programs seem to be quite different.

A. Field placement:

BSW III - 1 day a week second term only, for
observation.

BSW IV - 3 days per week first term
2 days per week second term.

MSW I - $1\frac{1}{2}$ days per week first term, mainly
observation

2 days a week second term

MSW II - 2 days per week both terms.

B. Some professional courses are taught in the undergraduate program in first year (social welfare) and second year (HB and SE) before the beginning of the students professional

education. This is not true in the Masters program.

C. Third year Human Behaviour and Social Environment and third year practice methods in the Bachelor of Social Work program are not taught other than during the observation period concurrently with field work. In both years of the Masters program field, practice, and Human Behaviour and Social Environment are taught concurrently.

D. In addition, the practice courses in the Bachelor of Social Work program are all taught from a generalist base. In the two year Master of Social Work program, casework, group-work, and community development are taught as specialties.

E. There is no research component other than general statistics in the Bachelor of Social Work program as there is in the Master of Social Work program.

The above areas regarding structural set-up of the two programs, concern field instruction, professional courses and the research component. It may be questioned here that if different school experiences are to be given to each group (especially if the school's expectations of performance is different) can beginning levels of practise competence be assumed to be comparable? Bachelor of Social Work students receive substantially less time per week in the field than do Master of Social Worker students (and concentrate on 'observation' for one complete term). Assuming also that many Master of Social Work students have worked before but that

few Bachelor of Social Work students have, the Bachelor of Social students work level of beginning practise may be quite different from that of a Master of Social Work graduate.

In the Bachelor of Social Work program the set-up for H.B. and S.E. for practise methods is that it is not taught concurrently with field practise. This might mean inability on the part of the student in the Bachelor of Social Work program to be able to integrate field work practise with the theory taught in school. This in turn, might affect his method of working with clients.

The research component in the Master of Social Work program might make one more aware of, and able to use, research oriented studies and projects in order to help a graduate in his Social Work practise. The Bachelor of Social Work student is unable to have this at his disposal because the research component does not exist in his program. This lack may have a substantial effect on his beginning level of practise competence.

The above discussion of potential differences in the two educational programs, may be grouped into four distinct parts for analytical purposes:

1. Student Input into the program. For example, age, work experience, and maturity may represent areas of student input into the program which could influence the graduates' beginning contribution to the field of practise.

2. Student Output - Student output is here defined as those characteristics which the student possesses upon his graduation from either the Bachelor of Social Work program or the Master of Social Work program. This area cannot at this time be tested empirically since students of the new Bachelor of Social Work program will not graduate until May of 1972. However, it is important that student output in both the Bachelor of Social Work and Master of Social Work programs is empirically examined at some time.

3. Actual academic structure and content - As suggested, there are differences in structure, in what is being taught and how it is being presented to the students in both the Master of Social Work and Bachelor of Social Work programs. These areas of difference may have an important effect on the students' beginning level of practise competence since the educational process is based on the school's academic content.

4. Professors teaching in each program - At present, the same professors do not teach both the Bachelor of Social Work and Master of Social Work courses. Their method of teaching, educational content, and approach towards the students may well have an effect on the student who eventually leaves the school. In addition, actual Faculty expectations in the two programs might be quite different.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

On the basis of the above rationale, this research project addresses itself to the area of student input. To be more specific, we will examine student input in terms of the question; are there differences in student input between Master of Social Work and Bachelor of Social Work programs? It may also be interesting to note any general differences in students which might exist between the two student populations. These differences might be useful for further and future planning by the Faculty of the University of Manitoba School of Social Work for students enrolled in the Social Work educational programs.

We emphasize that this is only one of the areas to which questioning should be directed and suggest, that in fact, depending upon results of this work, close examination of the other three areas needs to be done.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

SELECTION OF VARIABLES

This research project attempts to answer the question: are there differences in student input into the Master of Social Work and Bachelor of Social Work programs?

For the purposes of this study Bachelor of Social Work students are those students enrolled in third year of the Bachelor of Social Work program at the University of Manitoba School of Social Work as of September, 1970. Master of Social Work students are those enrolled in the first year of the two year Master of Social Work program at the University of Manitoba School of Social Work as of September, 1970. The school year in which this study is being conducted, Sept. '70 - May '71, presents a unique opportunity to look at these two student populations together since there will be no further classes of students admitted to the two year Masters program. The program will be phased out in May of 1972 when the last class graduates.

For the purposes of this study student input is generally defined as some of those characteristics which students bring to their professional social work education. Some of the areas of student input examined were chosen primarily out of

interest and because of the unique opportunity which exists to discover areas of difference in the two student populations; other areas of student input were chosen because of their potentially significant relationship to students' beginning level of practice competence.

The following characteristics of students were chosen for examination:

I Demographic Variables -

In this category the specific variables examined were: age, sex, sibling pattern, marital status and number of children. By 'sibling pattern' is meant the position of the student in relation to his siblings in the nuclear family.

II Family Background -

Ethnic origin, occupation, education and income of students' parents were the variables selected for examination in this cluster.

H. Horwitz and E. Smith in The Language of Social Research⁴ suggest that these variables are generally used to measure socio-economic class. The measure of socio-economic class may be important to the social work profession, since Arnulf F. Pins in his book Who Chooses Social Work, When and Why? has postulated that students from families with a socio-

⁴Hortense Horwitz, Elias Smith, "The Interchangeability of Socio-Economic Indices", The Language of Social Research, ed. Paul F. Lazarsfield and Morris Rosenberg, The Free Press: Illinois 1955, p. 73-77.

economic status higher than that of social work would perhaps not choose a career in social work.⁵ He bases this premise on the fact that in the United States the status of social work is relatively low and the average income expectation, though much increased in recent years, is still less than many other fields.

In view of this literature, it may be interesting to look at the socio-economic status of the parents of both groups of students who have chosen Social Work as a career.

III Home Community -

This variable was defined in terms of the size of the town or city in which the student has lived most of his life and the number of different communities lived in.

IV Countries Lived in and Visited -

The intent of this cluster was to determine the number of different countries lived in and the number of different countries visited by the two groups of students.

Differences between the two groups of students in terms of the characteristics examined in variables III and IV may be of general interest.

V Academic Background -

The variables selected to measure academic background

⁵ Arnulf F. Pins, Who Chooses Social Work, When and Why? Council on Social Work Education, New York, p. 41.

were: the number of universities attended; the number of faculties enrolled in; the number of social science and selected humanities courses taken at the University level.

The number of social science courses taken by the student is considered an essential part of his knowledge base by Schools of Social Work.⁶ This knowledge base may affect the student's capacity to maximize the learning opportunities offered by professional schools which may, in turn, affect beginning level of practice competence.

VI Political Activism and Community Involvement -

The intent of the cluster concerning political activism was to measure the degree of political activity of the two groups of students. The variables selected as indicators of political activity were: activity in school student council; attendance at political meetings over the past two years; voting and campaigning in university, municipal, provincial or federal elections; identification with or membership in a political party or political organization.

The degree of community involvement has been measured by involvement with church; attendance at a public inquiry, commission, or hearing; attendance at a conference, workshop or institute related to a social issue or social problem; writing a letter to a newspaper or magazine editor about a

⁶University of Manitoba Admissions Criteria.

social issue or social problem of concern; writing or otherwise contacting political representatives about a social issue or social problem.

It may be assumed that political activism and degree of community involvement indicate commitment to social change and yield knowledge of political processes by which to affect such change. Since social work as a profession has long been associated with a commitment to social action and social change in the direction of growth, it may be postulated that students who indicate a high degree of political activism and community involvement will possibly have a higher beginning level of competence in these areas.

VII Work Experience -

Areas of work experience selected for examination were paid and volunteer social work experience and any other work experience gained by the students before beginning their professional education. These variables were examined in terms of amount of experience gained and the time in the student's academic career during which it was gained.

Having worked in the social work field, or in any field, before beginning social work education may give students different perspectives on the academic material being learned. The educational process of relating theory to practice may be easier for someone who has worked in a practical setting beforehand.

Those students beginning their professional careers with no prior work experience in any field will most probably handle their first jobs differently than students who have previous experience, especially in the social work field. Thus both social work and other work experience may have an effect on beginning practise competence in the field of social work.

VIII Career Plans -

The intent of this cluster of variables was to examine short and long range employment expectations in the field of social work of the two groups of students.

The variables selected for examination were the expected employers upon graduation and in the long-run, the specific activities comprising the anticipated long-run career, and the field of practice planned for the first job.

Differences in the short- and long-range career plans of the two groups of students may be of general interest.

IX Why Choose Social Work -

This variable was used to determine possible differences between the two groups of in terms of their reasons for choosing to enter the profession of social work.

Career choice is probably related to earlier aspirations. For example, if a person's primary reason for choosing social work as a career was financial, he might seek a first job primarily out of concern with financial rewards rather than with

any other consideration in mind. Thus one's reason for choosing a career, may be significantly related to what job he might want to do, and thus his willingness and ability to carry out that job.

X Ranking Social Problems -

This area gave a list of thirteen commonly recognized Canadian social problems. Five of these were to be ranked in order of their importance (a) as perceived by society, (b) as perceived by self, (c) as areas in which you would like to become competent.

It may be interesting to note whether differences will exist between the two groups of students in terms of their patterns of ranking these social problems.

XI Instrument for Social Change -

This variable was used to discover whether or not students saw themselves as being potential instruments for social change. Differences in answers between the two groups of students may be of general interest.

XII Aptitude for Interpersonal Relations -

The intent of this last variable was to measure aptitude for interpersonal relationships.

In Social Work the aptitude for interpersonal relationships means..."the ability to form a professional helping re-

lationship which is warm, outgoing, and consciously controlled."⁷
The professional relationship is..."a sustained response to the needs of others, ability to give and to withhold, to assume responsibility and to delegate it, and to use authority without personal need to be authoritative."⁸

The beginning professional's ability to form a professional helping relationship is usually thought of as the result of professional social work education enhancing his aptitude for interpersonal relationships that he initially brought with him to a school of social work. The ability to form a professional helping relationship is an integral part of the new professional's beginning contribution to the field. Differences in the aptitude for interpersonal relationships which students bring to a school of social work may indicate the probability of differing levels of beginning competence in the field. Thus we intend to test if the Bachelor of Social Work and Master of Social Work groups differ in social work attitudes.

The Social Work attitude inventory developed by Anne W. Oren and John C. Kidneigh was employed to measure the aptitude for interpersonal relationships of the Bachelor of Social Work III

⁷Oren, Anne Winslow, "The Construction of an Instrument for the Measurement of Social Worker Attitudes Associated with Aptitude for Interpersonal Relations", Doctoral Dissertation, 1957, p. 5.

⁸Towle, Charlotte, The Learner in Education for the Professions, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1954. p. 178.

and Master of Social Work I student population samples. This instrument contains the premise that integral components of the professional helping relationship are the attitudes and feelings that can be the ... "basis of a disciplined skill." Viewing attitudes as determinants of behaviour it is postulated that "...attitudes of social workers toward people and their social situations are in a large part an index of aptitude for interpersonal relationships."⁹ The author further contends that "...some approximation of aptitude for interpersonal relationships in social work might be inferred from significant attitudes which are known and measured."¹⁰

DATA COLLECTION

Since the nature of the information that we wished to elicit regarding the first eleven input variables was available to the two groups of potential respondents, self-reporting data collection techniques seemed appropriate. The two approaches considered, therefore, were the interview and the questionnaire. As the study population represented an interested and literate group the use of a written questionnaire appeared justifiable and this technique was finally chosen.

⁹de Schweinitz, Karl, "Education for Social Security", The Educational Record, Vol. 25, No. 2, April 1944, pp. 142-153.

¹⁰Oren, Anne Winslow, "The Construction of an Instrument for the Measurement of Social Worker Attitudes Associated with Aptitude for Interpersonal Relationships." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1957, p. 8.

There is evidence on the comparative use of questionnaires and interviews to support this choice. Goode and Hatt¹¹ have indicated that questionnaires can be fairly effective if a select group is the object of study. Maas and Polansky¹², in an article on the collection of data in research, state, "The questionnaire...is best used when those asked to complete the questionnaires are motivated to help get answers to the questions raised...Professional groups, therefore, constitute ideal populations for questionnaire distribution."

It was further assumed that if students received assurance of confidentiality and if the questionnaire had open-ended questions or provided for the possible insertion of individual responses the use of a questionnaire could provide almost as much information as could be assembled from an interview. At the same time it would make possible the collection of data from a large group of students and ensure a higher degree of uniformity from one measurement situation to another than was likely through personal interviews.

The use of the questionnaire technique with social work students was supported by studies conducted by Alfred Kadushin¹³

¹¹Goode, William J., and Hatt, Paul K., Methods in Social Research, McGraw Hill Book Company, New York, 1952. p. 174.

¹²Maas, Henry S., and Rolansky, Norman A., "Collecting Original Data", Social Work Research, edited by Norman A. Polansky, University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1960. p. 150.

¹³Kadushin, Alfred, Research Project - Social Work Occupational Choice.

and Arnulf Pins.¹⁴ In a report to the Council on Social Work Education, Dr. Kadushin wrote, "Our own pilot study using the questionnaire seemed convincing that social work students were ready to share with us information that was available to them to share."

DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire used represents the final revision of several earlier drafts. The development of the original questionnaire and its revisions were influenced by the views of experts, the approaches and results of other studies, and a pretest. Studies of social work students and the social welfare field were reviewed, as were studies of students in other fields of professional education, while no studies with similar purposes to this one could be found, several proved of great value in the development of the study instrument. Most helpful were questionnaires developed by Arnulf M. Pins¹⁵ for a study of career choices in social work and Seymour Warkov for a study entitled "Subsidies for Graduate Study: Stipend Support in Thirty-Seven Fields of Study, 1962-63."

The last draft of the questionnaire was pretested with ten second-year Masters students at the University of Manitoba

¹⁴Pins, Arnulf, Who Chooses Social Work, When and Why? Council on Social Work Education, New York. p. 56.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 60.

School of Social Work. Comments and suggestions on the questionnaire were encouraged and received from the students who participated. These mainly centered around the rewording of some of the questions in order to clarify what was meant and giving examples, where possible, for this clarification. The final instrument contained forty-eight items designed to examine the twelve input variables selected for study.* These items are described below. Both open and closed questions were used in the questionnaire. In general, close-ended questions were designed wherever possible since uniformity of responses along specific dimensions was essential in order to measure differences between the two groups of students. The time factor in processing answers was another consideration suggesting the choice of this type of question. Open-ended questions were used in those instances where it seemed probable that the question would not be misunderstood and that individualized answers would provide interesting and original data.

MEASUREMENT OF THE VARIABLES

This section further describes each variable chosen for the questionnaire by showing how each was measured:

I Demographic Variables

The variables of age and sex were measured by means

*See Appendix I

of open-ended questions. Sibling pattern was determined by a three-part fixed alternative question in which the respondent was asked to indicate whether he is the only child, or youngest or oldest child in relation to his brothers and sisters. Marital status was determined by a closed question as well, with the five alternatives of 'single', 'married', 'divorced', 'separated', or 'widowed' offered as choices. The number of children of the respondent was measured in terms of five categories ranging from 'none' to 'more than three'.

II Family Background

Questions 9 - 14 measured the cluster of variables selected to identify differences in the family backgrounds of the two groups of students. The ethnic origin of the respondent was determined by means of an open-ended question in which he was asked to identify the ethnic origin of his father. Four examples were given to ensure that the intent of the question was clear.

The respondent was asked to identify his religious identification by checking one of five alternatives: Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Other or None.

Questions 11 and 12 asked the respondent to state the occupation of his father and of the chief parental wage earner in his family. It was stipulated that the reply indicate the occupation engaged in "for the longest period of time" where the father or chief parental wage earner had more than one

occupation.

The respondent was asked to indicate the total family income of his parents in a close-ended question in which there were ten alternatives ranging from "under \$2,000" to "above \$15,000". This classification was adapted from that used by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in University Student Expenditure and Income in Canada, 1956-57.

The educational level attained by each of the respondent's parents was also determined by means of a close-ended question. There were nine alternatives provided, ranging from "grades I - IV" to "Did graduate work", with a tenth category provided for "do not know" responses.

III Home Community

Question 15 examined this variable in terms of the number of different cities lived in by the respondent and the number of different towns lived in. Five response alternatives were provided in each case, range from "none" to "more than three".

Question 16 examined the size of the respondent's home community in terms of population. Home community was defined as the center lived in "most of your life". Seven response alternatives were provided, ranging from "on a farm" to "over 25,000", with a "none of the above" category provided as well.

IV. Countries Lived in and Visited

Questions 17 and 18 examined this variable. In question

17 the respondent was asked to indicate the number of different countries visited since the age of twelve. Eight response alternatives were provided, ranging from "none" to "more than twelve". Question 18 asked for the number of different countries lived in for more than three consecutive months since the age of twelve. Canada was not to be counted. Six alternatives were provided ranging from "none" to "more than 7".

V Academic Background

Question 19 asked the respondent to indicate the number of different faculties in which he has been enrolled during his student career. Affiliated colleges of the same university were not to be counted as separate. Four response alternatives were provided ranging from "one" to "four or more".

The respondent was asked to indicate the number of different faculties in which he had been enrolled in question 20. Two examples were given for purposes of clarity. Four response alternatives were provided, ranging from "one" to "four or more".

Question 21 asked the respondent to indicate the number of social science and humanities courses taken at the university level. Social science courses were defined as sociology, psychology, economics, anthropology, history, and political science. Humanities courses selected for measurement were philosophy and english. Space was provided for the respondent

to state the number of full courses and the number of half courses taken in each discipline.

Level of education attained by the respondent was measured in question 22. Category (a) asked the respondent to indicate whether he held a bachelor's degree and if so, to indicate his major. Category (b) asked the respondent to indicate whether he held a bachelor's degree which included a pre-professional social work sequence. Category (c) asked the respondent to indicate whether he had any graduate social work education and category (d) asked him to indicate whether he had any graduate education other than social work. This cluster of questions was developed by Anne W. Oren for use with her "Social Work Attitude Inventory".

Question 23 was designed to identify the respondent's major source of financial support for the 1970-71 academic year. The respondent was required to rank his sources of support in order of greatest proportion received from each. Eight response alternatives were provided.

VI Political Activism and Community Involvement

Questions 24 to 30 measured the degree of political activism of the respondent. In question 24 he was asked to indicate his activity in student council while attending elementary and high school. Four response alternatives were provided in which the respondent was requested to classify him-

self as a "participant", "observer", "organizer" or "not active at all".

In question 25 the respondent was asked to indicate the number of political meetings attended over the past two years. Seven response alternatives were provided, ranging from "none" to "more than five". In question 26 the respondent was asked to indicate by means of checking a yes or no answer, whether he has ever voted in a university, municipal, provincial, and federal election. A "never voted" category was provided. Question 27 asked the student to indicate whether he had ever actively campaigned for the election of a candidate to political office. The same four election categories were provided as in question 26, and a "never actively campaigned" category was provided.

The respondent was asked to describe himself in terms of political affiliation in question 28. Six response categories were provided: Conservative, Liberal, New Democrat, Social Creditist, Communist, and an "other" category in which the respondent could specify an affiliation not included. In question 29 the respondent was asked to indicate, by means of checking a yes or no answer, whether he was presently a member of a political party. In question 30 he was asked to indicate whether he was a member of a political organization other than a political party. This was an open-ended question with

the respondent asked to specify the organization. Two examples were given to ensure clarity.

Questions 31 to 37 measured the respondent's degree of community involvement. In question 31 the respondent was asked to indicate degree of involvement in church activities by checking one of three responses: a) not involved, b) attend meetings or services, c) involved as an organizer. Question 32 measured the number of times during the past year the respondent had attended a public inquiry, commission, or hearing while in question 33 he was asked to indicate the number of times during the past year he had attended a conference, workshop or institute related to social issues or social problems. Question 34 asked the respondent to indicate the number of times he has written letters to a newspaper or magazine editor about a social issue or social problem of concern to him and question 35 asked him to indicate the number of times he has written or otherwise contacted his political representative about a social issue or social problem of concern to him. Five response alternatives, ranging from "never" to "more than three" were provided in each of questions 32 to 37.

In question 36 the respondent was asked whether he had ever participated in a demonstration by checking one of four responses: a) as an observer, b) as a participant, c) as an organizer, d) never participated.

Question 37 measured the respondent's degree of involvement in a social issue or social problem. The terms social issue and social problem were defined by two examples, pollution and population control. Four levels of involvement were defined in the response alternatives and the respondent asked to describe himself in terms of one of these: a) attend meetings related to a social issue or social problem as an observer, b) actively participate as a member of a group concerned with a social issue or social problem, c) not involved with an organized group but active as an individual concerned with a social issue or social problem, d) not involved in any way. In part (c) the respondent was requested to specify the social issue(s) and problems concerned with by means of a written response.

VII Work Experience

Questions 38 to 41 measured the prior work experience of the respondent. Social work experience was examined in questions 38a, 39, 40. Other paid work experience was examined in question 41.

In question 38a the respondent was asked to indicate the extent of his cumulative paid social work experience in a social agency. Five response alternatives were given, ranging from "none" to "more than six years". Question 38b asked the respondent to indicate at which times in his academic career

paid social work experience was gained. The eight response alternatives ranged from "during high school" to "after third year university".

Question 39 asked the respondent to indicate by means of a yes or no response whether he had ever been a volunteer worker in a social agency. Question 40 asked him to list his voluntary social work experience other than that gained in a social agency. Three examples were given for purposes of clarity.

Question 41a asked the respondent to indicate the cumulative length of all paid experience other than social work. The same five response alternatives were provided as for question 38a. In question 41b the respondent was asked to indicate at which times in his academic career paid work experience other than social work was gained. The response alternatives provided were the same as those provided in question 38b.

VIII Career Plans

Questions 42 to 46 looked at the short and long range career plans of the respondent. These questions were adopted from those used by Seymour Warkov in Subsidies for Graduate Study: Stipend Support in Thirty-Seven Fields of Study, 1962-63.

Question 42 asked the respondent to identify his expected employer upon graduation. Six response alternatives were provided: a) Federal Government Agency, b) Provincial or

Municipal Agency, c) Private Agency, d) College or University, e) Private Practice, f) do not expect employment. Examples were given in part (c) to clarify the meaning of "private agency". Question 43 asked the respondent to identify his expected long-run future employer. The same six response alternatives were provided as for question 42.

Question 44 asked the respondent to indicate the specific job activities anticipated as the major part of his long-run career work. Four response alternatives were provided: a) teaching, b) research, c) administration or supervisory position, d) direct service to clients. In question 45 the respondent was asked to indicate in which field of practice he intended to take his first job. The fields of practice offered as response alternatives were: a) Corrections, b) Financial Assistance, c) Counselling and Family Service, d) Child Welfare, e) Health, f) Social Planning, g) Group Services, h) Community Development, i) Child Guidance, j) Teaching, k) Private Practice, and l) Research. An "other" response alternative was also provided, and the respondent asked to specify if he chose this response.

IX Why Choose Social Work

In question 46 the respondent was asked to describe his reasons for choosing social work as a career. The ten response alternatives provided included nine statements about social work and an "other" category which allowed the respond-

ent to make his own statement. He was asked to indicate by means of ranking, the five statements which came closest to expressing the major reasons for his career choice of social work. This question was adapted from one used by Arnulf Pins in his study, Who Chooses Social Work, When and Why?¹⁶

X Ranking Social Problems

Question 47 listed thirteen commonly recognized Canadian social problems: Alcoholism and Drug Abuse; Pollution; Illegitimacy; Poverty; Crime and Juvenile Delinquency; Population Control and Family Planning; Old Age; Discrimination against Minority Groups; Mental Illness; Child neglect; Family breakdown; Transient youth; other (specify). The last was an open-ended category in which the respondent could enter any other social problem he wished. He was asked to rank five of the above social problems in order of their importance: as perceived by society; as perceived by himself; as areas in which he would like to become competent.

XI Instrument for Social Change

Question 48 asked the respondent to indicate, by means of checking a yes or no response, whether he perceived himself as being a potential instrument for social change. This question was developed by Anne W. Oren for use with her "Social Work Attitude Inventory".

¹⁶
Ibid., p. 168.

VARIABLE #12 - APTITUDE FOR INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

This section deals with the twelfth variable chosen that of aptitude for interpersonal relations. In this section discussion of what test was used and why will follow.

The Social Work Attitude Inventory is a paper and pencil test comprised of 59 statements representing various attitudes. The subject must indicate his degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement. Each item has an assigned numerical value for scoring purposes. An individual's cumulative score represents those items answered favorably and can be statistically compared to the upper group mean (87.86 - connoting a relatively high aptitude for interpersonal relationships) or the lower group mean (68.75 - connoting relatively less aptitude for interpersonal relationships). The higher the cumulative score the greater will be one's aptitude for interpersonal relationships as measured by this instrument.¹⁷

The authors claim validity for the Social Work attitude Inventory on several counts. They contend that the validity of the instrument is supported by "...logical evidence of the relationship of item content to the theoretical framework of Social Work principles and values." Externally, validity was supported by the administration of the inventory to ten

¹⁷Oren, A. W., "The Construction of an Instrument for the measurement of Social Worker Attitudes Associated with Aptitude for Interpersonal Relationships", (Doctoral Dissertation, 1957, p. 5, Unpublished, University of Minnesota).

faculty members from a School of Social Work. The results showed faculty agreement with the appropriate high score range group response on 57 of the 59 items. Further confidence in the validity of the instrument was obtained through the empirical process of test construction. Utilizing the technique of tetrachoric correlation coefficient "...items were discarded which did not distinguish between social workers with superior aptitude for interpersonal relationships and social workers with relatively poor interpersonal relationship aptitude."¹⁸

The reliability of the Social Work attitude inventory was determined by the split-half method and the Spearman - Brown prophecy formula which yielded a result of $r = .93$. The test-retest method was also employed using three large, differing groups of students yielding reliability coefficients for these three groups of .87, .90, and .89.¹⁹

ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE, PAPER AND PENCIL TEST, AND POPULATION OF THE STUDY

Since the use of the questionnaire method allows testing of large numbers, it was decided to administer the questionnaire and the paper and pencil test to the total popula-

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 61.

¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 67-68, 103.

tion of Bachelor of Social Work III and Master of Social Work I students. According to enrollment figures at the University of Manitoba School of Social Work as of the fall of 1970, there were 93 Bachelor of Social Work III students registered and 63 Master of Social Work I students registered.

Through arrangements made with the instructor of a class where the total Master of Social Work I population was expected to attend the questionnaires and paper and pencil tests were personally distributed in this class by a member of the research team on November 23, 1970. Similar arrangements were made with the instructor of a Bachelor of Social Work class, and the questionnaire and paper and pencil tests were personally distributed to this group on the same date, November 23, 1970.

The front sheet of the questionnaire* was in the form of a letter to the respondent, explaining the purpose of the research project and inviting his participation. The letter also assured the respondent of confidentiality and contained brief instructions on completing the questionnaire and paper and pencil test. These instructions were reiterated verbally by the attending member of the research team at the time of distribution. Opportunities for questions from any of the respondents were made available at this time also.

*See Appendix I

In the case of the Master of Social Work students used in this project, classroom time was not allowed for the completion of the questionnaire and paper and pencil test while in the case of the Bachelor of Social Work students it was. This was the decision of the instructor.

The first return of the questionnaires and paper and pencil test from the Master of Social Work I class yielded a sample of 34 questionnaires. The Bachelor of Social Work group yielded a sample of 64. The difference in number of questionnaires and paper and pencil tests returned could have been due to many factors such as the fact that class time was allowed for the Bachelor of Social Work students to complete the questionnaire, and the member of the research team actually waited to collect them, whereas the Master of Social Work students were allowed to keep them and turn them in on their own. The fact that the actual population of the Bachelor of Social Work III students is larger than that of the Master of Social Work I class meant that there would be fewer responses from the Master of Social Work students; as well, students could have been absent from class for a variety of reasons in both the Bachelor and Master of Social Work classes.

It was felt that the sample size of the Bachelor of Social Work students (which was 64), was representative of this class, but that in order to be representative of the

Master of Social Work class and in order to compare with the size of the Bachelor of Social Work sample, the Master of Social Work sample size should be increased.

To this end, a letter from our research advisor was sent to all field instructors* who had Master of Social Work IV students in their field unit that had not participated in our project. This was determined by checking the names of those who returned questionnaires against a list of the total Master of Social Work I population. This approach yielded a further return of ten questionnaires and paper and pencil tests from Master of Social Work I students, making a total sample size for the Master of Social Work I class of 44. This was deemed appropriate and thus the final sample size used for this study was: Bachelor of Social Work III = 64, Master of Social Work I = 44.

TREATMENT OF THE DATA AND ANALYTICAL STRATEGIES

A. The Questionnaire:

A preliminary review of the total number of questionnaires indicated that some questions were left out and some were incomplete, however, no questionnaires needed to be completely excluded on the basis of incompleteness, or unclear responses.

*See Appendix II

Incorrect or unclear answers were edited whenever possible. For example, in the item regarding parental income, some respondents answered with the actual salary range rather than marking a category; this was placed in the appropriate category. If individual questions were unanswered or if an answer was unclear and the correct answer was not readily apparent, the item was marked as unavailable or incomplete and that data was not considered.

Several questions included write-in-responses under the category "other" or written comments of some kind. These responses were reviewed by the researchers and put into categories if any trend in responses could be identified. Write-in responses which coincided with one of the alternatives listed in the questionnaire were recorded in the appropriate category. If responses of students provided more choices than requested only the requested number of responses were counted and the others were disregarded.

Following a preliminary review of all questionnaires, the responses for each question were tabulated. Other areas where different procedures were used are documented as follows: Ethnic origin was classified according to Western European (British, Irish, French, Scottish) and Eastern European (Polish, German, Hungarian). Since some students indicated Canadian as their ethnic origin, this was coded as North American.

There was less than 25% response to questions 22a, b, c, and d. These parts of question 22 were not considered in any way.

The two population groups were examined to ascertain if there were any statistically significant differences between them in terms of the variables employed.

Most of the results were in the form of ordinal or nominal data. Consequently, the chi square statistic was employed.

This study provides a broad overview of differences between the two sample groups. It is hoped that this will pave the way for future research into the implications of these differences.

B. Paper and Pencil Test:

Social Work attitude Inventory scores were obtained from the Master of Social Work I and Bachelor of Social Work III student population samples. The inventories were carefully checked and categorized yielding the following results:

	MSW I	BSW III
- inventories returned	44	64
- inventories returned unanswered	1	1
- inventories with 2 or more no-response items	1	10

Questionnaires with two or more no-response items were dropped from the sample leaving a net total of 42 MSW I

and 53 BSW III inventories available for analysis.

Cumulative scores for each inventory were calculated using the scoring guide accompanying the instrument. The range and frequency distribution of the scores for both BSW III and MSW I groups was determined. As a measure of frequency distribution, the scores for BSW III and MSW I were examined for skewness. The mean and median of the two groups were tabulated and the Z test employed to compare the two groups for their difference or sameness.

The aptitude for interpersonal relationships, as measured by the Social Work attitude Inventory, of the student population groups was also analyzed in terms of age and sex to determine what, if any, influence on this variable was exerted by these demographic categories.

Comparisons were made between the means of the sample groupings illustrated below:

<u>Sex:</u>	<u>Sample Groupings</u>
	BSW Male - MSW Male
	BSW Female - MSW Female
	BSW Male - BSW Female
	MSW Male - MSW Female
<u>Age:</u>	
20-25	BSW III - MSW I
26-30	BSW III - MSW I
(20-25) - (26-30)	Total sample population

The analysis of the above data involved the use of the z and t tests of significance involving sample differences between means. These tests were employed to determine the degree of difference or sameness between the student population sample groups of the aptitude for interpersonal relationships.

The z test was employed with sample populations where each group had 30 or more inventories available for analysis. The t test was used to determine the existence of significant differences between means with sample populations where each group had less than 30 inventories for comparison.

CHAPTER III
DATA ANALYSIS

A. Demographic Data

The demographic variable addressed in this study included age, sex, sibling pattern, marital status, and number of children of the respondents.

a) age - It was found that there was a significant difference at the .01 level between the Master of Social Work and Bachelor of Social Work sample groups in terms of age. The data obtained was as follows:

Table 1 -

<u>Age of Respondents</u>	<u>M.S.W.</u>	<u>B.S.W.</u>	
18-22	17	40	
23-27	19	14	df = 2 x ² = 6.95 P < .01
28-45	6	6	

It should be noted that the mean age of the M.S.W. sample was 24.81, while the mean age of the B.S.W. sample was 22.32 years.

This difference in age may have relevance with regard to differences in the amount of life experience between these two groups. This implication will be explored more fully further on in this analysis.

b) sex - There was no significant difference in terms of the variable of sex between the two sample groups. Sixty-four percent of the M.S.W. sample was female and fifty-nine percent of the B.S.W. sample was female.

c) sibling pattern - The possibilities explored were:

- i) if the respondent had brothers or sisters,
- ii) if the respondent was the oldest child,
- iii) if the respondent was the youngest child.

It was found that there was a slight difference between the two sample groups with the B.S.W. group having more respondents who were the oldest child. The other two possibilities showed no significant differences.

Table 2 - Number of respondents who are the eldest child

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
yes	13	27	$\chi^2 = 2.51$
			df = 1
no	30	32	$P < .20$

It is difficult to draw implications from these results, because of the low level of significance of the one statistically significant finding.

d) marital status - There was a statistically significant difference at the .05 level between the two sample groups, with more of the M.S.W. sample being married.

Table 3 - Number of Married Respondents

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
married	25	48	P < .05 $\chi^2 = 3.9350$ df = 1
single	19	16	

e) number of children - It was found that there was no significant difference between the two samples in terms of the number of children respondents have. We see this result as being not inconsistent with the finding that more M.S.W. students are married, as many of the M.S.W. respondents are recently married.

B. Family Background

A second cluster of variables are those related to family background. These include i) ethnic origin of father, ii) religious identification of respondent, iii) occupation of father, iv) occupation of chief parental wage-earner, v) total family income of parents, vi) level of education of parents.

The data indicated no significant difference between the two samples in terms of ethnic origin of father or religious identification of the respondents. The majority of respondents in both sample groups were western European in terms of father's ethnic origin, and Protestant in terms of religious identification.

a) occupation of father - To ascertain the occupation of

respondent's father, the schema used by Pins in his study Who Chooses Social Work, When and Why? was employed.* It was found that there were significant differences between the two sample groups at the .05 level.

Table 4 - Occupation of Respondent's father

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
professional	12.5%	6.6%	
proprietor manager official	32.5%	31.7%	
clerical sales or other	0	16.2%	$\chi^2 = 11.40$ df = 5 P < .05
farmer or farm manager	27.5%	11.7%	
skilled or semi-skilled	25.0%	28.3%	
skilled	2.5%	5.0%	

The greatest differences which occurred between the two samples involved the occupational categories of "clerical and/or sales or other", and "farm or farm manager", with more B.S.W. respondents reporting their father's occupation as falling within the "clerical-sales" category, while more of the M.S.W. group reported their father's occupation as falling with the "farmer-farm manager" category (See Table 4).

*See Appendix I

b) occupation of chief parental wage-earner -

Table 5 - Occupation of Chief Parental Wage-Earner

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
professional	13.8%	9.8%	
proprietor manager official	30.8%	27.8%	$\chi^2 = 8.23$
clerical sales	0%	16.3%	df = 5
farmer farm manager	22.2%	13.1%	P < .20
skilled or semi-skilled	30.5%	26.2%	
unskilled	2.7%	6.7%	

We do not see this as being inconsistent with the finding about father's occupation even though different findings were indicated since it is possible that in some instances the chief parental wage earner may not have been the father.

c) parents' level of education - The variables regarding the level of education of parents of the respondents were not statistically significant. It was found that for both M.S.W. and B.S.W. Sample groups, the education of the respondents father ranged between grades 8 - 10, while the mother between grades 11 and 12. Thus, we may note that in general the two sample groups are quite similar in regards to this cluster of variables.

C. Size of Home Community

The next cluster of variables we explored related to the size of the respondents home community. It was found that there was no significant difference between the two sample groups as to the number of different cities and towns lived in.

There was, however, a significant difference at the .01 level as to the size of the population of the center in which the respondent spent most of his life.

Table 6 - Population centres where respondent lived most of his life.

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
under 1 thousand	20.9%	8.33%	
1-10 thousand	13.9%	10%	
10-25 thousand	9.3%	1.60%	$x^2 = 8.37$
over 25 thousand	48.8%	70%	df = 4
on a farm	6.9%	10.0%	P < .10

Thus it is evident that 58% of the M.S.W. sample had spent most of their lives in population centers over 25 thousand, whereas this was the case for 72% of the B.S.W. sample group.

D. Countries Lived in and Visited

The variables regarding the number of different countries that the respondents had lived in or visited did not

prove to be statistically significant. If world travel can be seen as an additional contributor to life experience, then these results appear to be inconsistent with the implication mentioned earlier as to the M.S.W. sample group having had more life experience. We might explain this apparent inconsistency in terms of a current trend for students to begin world travel at an earlier age. This tentative explanation, however, would have to be explored further.

Table 7 - Number of countries visited

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
1	20	34	
2	8	5	
3-5	5	3	
5 or more	4	5	$df = 4$
none	8	15	$\chi^2 = 4.47$
total	45	62	not statistically significant

Data is presented in terms of the number of responses given for each possible alternative.

Table 8 - Number of different countries lived in

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
1	8	12	
2 or more	4	6	$df = 2$
none	30	43	$\chi^2 = .01$
total	42	61	not statistically significant

Data is presented in terms of the number of responses given for each possible alternative.

F. Academic Background

The next cluster of variables relates to the respondent's academic background, specifically examined in terms of a) number of universities attended, b) number of different faculties enrolled in, c) number of social science courses taken at the university level and d) degrees held. An additional related variable investigated was that of the respondent's source of financial support for the academic year 1970-71.

a) number of universities attended -

Table 9 - Number of Universities attended

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
one	38.1%	77.7%	P < .001 df = 2 x ² = 16.77
two	52.2%	20.9%	
three or more	9%	1.6%	

As may be seen above, there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups in terms of the number of universities attended. Sixty-one percent of the M.S.W. sample had attended more than one university, whereas this was the case for only 22.6% of the B.S.W. sample. This could be explained by the fact that the M.S.W. sample group is generally older, and thus has had time for more varied experiences, including attending more universities.

b) number of different faculties enrolled in -

Table 10 - Number of Different Faculties Enrolled in

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
	14.2%	46.8%	
	61.2%	51.5%	df = 2
			P < .001
	24.5%	1.5%	$\chi^2 = 22.13$

Eighty-six percent of the M.S.W. sample has been enrolled in more than one faculty whereas 53% of the B.S.W. sample reported this outcome.

c) number of social science courses taken at the university level -

Table 11 - Number of Social Science Courses Taken

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
Social Science	68%	64%	
Humanities	31%	17%	df = 2
			$\chi^2 = 94.03$
Para-social sciences	34%	19%	P < .001

For purposes of clarification, the courses to be examined were divided into three clusters; these were termed i) the "social sciences" (sociology, psychology, and anthropology, ii) the "humanities" (history, philosophy, and English), and finally the iii) "para-social sciences" (economics and political science).

The data indicated a significant difference between the two groups at the .001 level. The main difference was in the area of the "humanities" and "para-social sciences" as may be seen in the table above. There was found to be no real difference in terms of the proportion of social science courses taken between the two groups. It should be noted that almost none of the M.S.W. sample group had taken any para-social sciences courses, while 19% of the B.S.W. sample group had taken some. At least one para-social science course is a requisite in the B.S.W. program.

These results suggest that although the "social sciences" make up the largest proportion of courses taken for both groups, there is an interesting and possibly significant divergence as to the additional courses taken. These findings may have ramifications for educational planning, and deserve further investigation.

d) degrees held - As could be expected, all of the M.S.W. respondents hold a bachelor's degree since this is a prerequisite for the present M.S.W. program. Only 23% of the B.S.W. respondents hold this degree.

e) source of financial support for academic year 1970-71 -

Table 12 - Source of Financial Support for Academic Year 1970-71

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
husband or wife	11	13	
parent	15	33	
savings	28	46	
borrowed funds	7	18	
social work job	5	9	$\chi^2 = 23.32$
non social work job	4	26	$P < .01$
scholarship	3	11	$df = 7$
bursary	25	16	

A statistically significant difference was found for this variable at the .01 level. Specifically, in both sample groups, personal savings played a large part in terms of financial support. Two disparate areas between the two groups were those of i) support by parents and ii) non-social work jobs. The B.S.W. group indicated more financial support coming from both of these areas.

Looking at this cluster as a whole, the M.S.W. sample group had been to more universities and had been enrolled in more faculties. This again might be construed as contributing to a broader range of life experience, which is in keeping with previously mentioned implications. With respect to

the social science courses taken by each of the sample group, we wish to underline the fact that further research is warranted in this area, as critical implications for educational planning may well result.

F. Political Activism

The next cluster of variables were intended to examine differences in political activism between the two sample groups. The variables specifically were a) activity in student council, b) number of political meetings attended in the last two years, c) voting activity in various types of elections, d) campaigning for election of candidates of various kinds, e) political affiliation, formal or informal and f) political membership other than in a formally recognized political party (i.e. Conservative or Liberal).

The results showed no significant difference between the sample groups in the area of student council activity, political campaigning, and political affiliation with either a formally or informally recognized political group.

a) Table 13 - Number of political meetings attended in Past Two Years

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
1	14.2%	19.3%	$\chi^2 = 8.14$ df = 4 P < .10
2	9.5%	9.6%	
3-5	0%	11.2%	
more than 5	7.1%	12.5%	
none	69.2%	46.7%	

One method of construing the above data regarding the number of political meetings attended in the past two years may be that the B.S.W. group is more politically active according to this index. However, it should be noted that a few individuals in both sample groups are particularly active.

b) voting in various types of elections -

Table 14 - Voting in Types of Elections in Last Two Years

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
university	36%	50%	
municipal	14.6%	14.8%	
provincial	28.4%	18.1%	$\chi^2 = 6.10$
federal	20%	15.7%	$P < .20$
never voted	.91%	1.82%	$df = 4$

It should be noted that a greater percentage of B.S.W.'s voted in university elections, while a greater percentage of M.S.W.'s noted in provincial and federal elections. It is important to bear in mind, however, that the mean age for the B.S.W. sample is 22.32 years, thus many of them were not old enough to have voted in the last federal election or provincial election in Manitoba.

The fact that a greater percentage of B.S.W.'s voted in university elections than M.S.W.'s who for most part have been in university longer, and thus have had more opportunity to vote in these elections, might tend to lend support to the

implication that the B.S.W. sample group is somewhat more politically active.

G. Community Involvement

This cluster of questions involved variables intended to examine differences between the two groups in terms of community involvement. Specifically, these variables included a) involvement with the church in one's community, b) attendance of public inquiries, commissions or hearings, c) attendance of workshops, conferences or institutes related to social issues, d) whether the respondent had written a letter to a newspaper or magazine regarding a social issue, e) whether the respondent had contacted his political representative about a social issue, f) respondent's degree of participation in a demonstration, and finally, g) a personal involvement or concern for a social issue.

a) contact of political representative re social issue -

Table 15 - Contact of Political Representative re - Social Issue

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
once	16%	22%	$\chi^2 = 8.01$ df = 2 P < .02
two or more	2%	18%	
never	82%	60%	

Regarding contacting a political representative about a social issue, the data indicated a statistically significant difference at the .02 level. The main difference between the two sample groups was relating to contacting their political representative two or more times. A higher proportion of B.S.W.'s had done so as may be seen above.

b) involvement in a social issue or problem -

Table 16 - Involvement in a Social Issue or Problem

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
not involved	60%	47.6%	
attend meetings	17.5%	10.7%	
actively participate in group	10%	10.7%	$\chi^2 = 5.04$ $P < .20$ $df = 3$
active as an individual	13%	31%	

The major significant difference between the two groups was in terms of their being active as individuals concerned with a social issue.

The other variable in this cluster did not indicate statistically significant differences between the two groups. There is a trend that should be noted that seems to imply greater community involvement on the part of the B.S.W. sample group. Further exploration is needed in order to expand on this possible trend.

H. Work Experience

The next cluster of variables relate to work experience, both in and outside of the field of social work. For clarity of analysis, we have divided the variables into two sections, I - Social work work experience, paid or volunteer, and II - Non-social Work, paid only.

I Social work, work experience, paid or volunteer.

The variables in this section include a) are cumulative work experience in a social agency, b) when this experience was obtained, c) volunteer work in a social agency and finally, d) type of volunteer work done.

a) cumulative work experience in a social agency -

Table 17 - Cumulative Work Experience in a Social Agency

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
none	36%	70.3%	
less than 1 yr.	6.6%	18.7%	
1-3 years	47%	6.0%	$\chi^2 = 24.49$
3-6 years	88%	4.6%	$P < .0005$
more than 6 yrs.	2.2%	0%	$df = 4$

From these results it is evident that a far greater percentage of the B.S.W. group had had no paid social work experience. These results may have implications regarding the respondent's social work education process, and practice

upon graduation. Prior social work experience might serve to make more meaningful the academic and practical material dealt with in the social work training sequence. On the other hand, this experience might serve as an impediment to learning and practice in the form advocated by the School of Social Work. Further research will be required to look into these implications.

b) when paid social work experience was obtained -

Table 18 - When paid Social Work Experience was Obtained

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
during high school	1	2	
before University	1	4	
during 1st year Un.	2	1	
after 1st year Un.	3	2	
during 2nd year Un.	5	0	$\chi^2 = 22.67$
after 2nd year Un.	3	11	df = 7
during 3rd year Un.	6	2	P < .01
after 3rd year Un.	25	6	
total	46	28	

As indicated in the diagram, the majority of the M.S.W. sample group had the majority of their paid social work experience after their third year in University, while the B.S.W.'s obtained theirs after second year University. There was no greatly significant difference between the two groups until the category of "after third year University". However, since

the largest proportion of B.S.W.'s have not yet completed a third year of University, no implications can be drawn at this time. It should be noted that after second year University a larger proportion of B.S.W.'s reported having had paid social work experience than did M.S.W.'s.

c) volunteer social work experience - There was no significant difference between the two groups in terms of their having done volunteer work in a social work agency. There was a significant difference, however, between the two sample groups, at a .05 level in terms of other volunteer social work experience, i.e. Big Brother program, with the B.S.W. sample group as having greater participation in this area.

Table 19 - Participation in Volunteer Social Work Activity

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
participation in volunteer social work activity	61.7%	81.8%	$\chi^2 = 3.92$ $P < .05$
not participated	38.3%	18.2%	$df = 1$

II Paid non-social work, work experience.

The variables in this cluster explored differences between the two sample groups in terms of the amount of paid non-social work, work experience, and when this experience was obtained.

a) cumulative length of paid non-social work work experience - There was no statistically significant difference between the

two sample groups in terms of this variable.

b) when non-social work paid work experience was obtained -

Table 20 - When non-social work work experience was obtained

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
during high school	25	38	
before University	28	39	
during 1st year Un.	11	26	
after 1st year Un.	29	39	
during 2nd year Un.	11	22	$\chi^2 = 26.95$
after 2nd year Un.	31	43	$P < .001$
during 3rd year Un.	9	21	$df = 7$
after 3rd year Un.	31	8	
total	175	236	

The largest difference between the two sample groups was due to the M.S.W. sample group having had paid work experience after third year University. This opportunity was not available, for reasons indicated earlier to the B.S.W. sample. Otherwise there was little significant difference between the two sample groups as to when this experience was obtained.

I. Career Plans

This cluster of variables dealt with career plans of the two sample groups. The items explored included: a) ex-

pected employment after graduation, b) expected long-run employer, c) specific jobs anticipated for long-run career work and d) expected field of practice for first job.

Of these items, only one proved to be statistically significant, that being the respondent's expected future long-run employer (other results may be seen in Appendix).

Table 21 - Expected future long-run employer

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
federal government	9%	29%	
provincial government	33%	30%	$\chi^2 = 9.18$ df = 5 P < .01
private agency	53%	30%	
college	0%	0%	
private practice	4.4%	7.6%	
don't expect employment	0%	1.9%	

The majority of the M.S.W. group indicated their expected future long-run employer to be a private agency, whereas the B.S.W. sample group divided their responses almost equally between the federal government, provincial government and private agency.

Regarding the respondents' job expectations after graduation, the majority of both B.S.W. and M.S.W. sample groups expressed an intention to work for either the provincial or municipal governments, or private agencies.

The majority of both sample groups indicated the area

of direct service to be their choice as the major part of their long-run career work.

This cluster of items does not suggest any consistent pattern and thus it is difficult to draw implications at this time.

J. Why Respondents Choose Social Work as a Career

The respondents were asked to choose in rank order from a series of statements those that came closest to expressing the reasons why each chose social work as a career.

The procedure adopted in order to standardize the responses for the purpose of comparison between the two sample groups for different sample sizes, was to divide the raw data score for each possible alternative by the highest possible ranking multiplied by the sample size for each cell, i.e. $\frac{\text{raw score}}{(n) 5}$.

In this way the scores were ranked on an infinite scale from 0 to 1, thus enabling the experimenters to compare the data for the two groups. Using this procedure, 1.00 would indicate that particular choice had been ranked highest by all the responses.

No statistically significant difference was found between the two sample groups. It should be noted that both the M.S.W. and B.S.W. sample groups rated the same three statements in the same orders as being those which they per-

ceived as most closely expressing their reasons for choosing social work as a career. Specifically, these statements were (in order of importance from most to least), i) I enjoy working with people, ii) social work makes an important contribution to individuals and society and iii) some other reason. Some of these were that social work contributes to social action, that a lot of people need help, and that social work is relevant and meaningful to the world today.

Table 22 - Statements expressing reasons for choosing Social Work as a Career

M.S.W. Sample Group

1. I enjoy working with people.
2. Social work makes an important contribution to individuals and society.
3. Some other reason eg. social work is relevant and meaningful to the world today.
4. Social work is an interesting and exciting profession.
5. Social work will give me social status and prestige.

B.S.W. Sample Group

1. I enjoy working with people.
2. Social work makes an important contribution to individuals and society.
3. Some other reason.
4. Social work will give me social status and prestige.
5. Social work is an interesting and exciting profession.

In addition, the two sample groups ranked the same two statements as their fourth and fifth choices, however, the order was reversed. Specifically the statements and order as indicated by the B.S.W. group were i) Social Work will give one social status and prestige, ii) Social Work is an interesting and exciting profession. The M.S.W. sample group cited the same two statements, only in reversed order.

These results would lead us to suggest that both sample groups had similar motivations for choosing social work as a career.

K. Perception of Social Problems

This cluster of questions related to perception of social problems. Respondents were asked to rank a number of given social problems in order of their importance a) as perceived by society, b) as perceived by themselves and c) as areas in which they would like to become competent. The same standardizing procedure for raw data was employed as that for the question regarding respondent's reasons for choosing social work as a career.

a) importance of social problems as perceived by society -

Table 23 - Importance of Social Problems as Perceived by Society

M.S.W.	B.S.W.
1. poverty	1. old age
2. alcoholism and drug abuse	2. pollution
3. old age	3. crime and juvenile delinquency
4. crime and juvenile delinquency	4. poverty
5. pollution	5. alcoholism and drug abuse

The above lists indicated the choices of each of the two sample groups in rank order from most to least.

It is interesting to note that out of a possible fourteen social problems given as choices, both sample groups chose the same five social problems, though in different orders. This finding may be attributed to the popularization of certain social problems through the public media, (recent newspaper and T.V. coverage of Commission on Poverty, numerous newspaper articles and T.V. shows on drugs, old age, etc.).

b) importance of social problems as perceived by respondent -

Table 24 - Importance of Social Problems as Perceived by Respondent

M.S.W.	B.S.W.
1. poverty	1. poverty
2. pollution	2. some other social problem
3. old age	3. population control and family planning
4. population control and family planning	4. pollution
5. illegitimacy	5. crime and juvenile delinquency

The lists above indicated the responses for each of the two sample groups in rank order of importance at $P < .001$, using the chi square statistic.

It may be seen that both sample groups ranked pollution, poverty and population control and family planning among the first five choices.

c) areas in which the respondent would like to become competent -

Table 25 - Areas in which Respondent would like to Become Competent

M.S.W.	B.S.W.
1. poverty	1. population control and family planning
2. family breakdown	2. child neglect
3. child neglect	3. old age
4. crime and juvenile delinquency	4. housing
5. alcoholism and drug abuse	5. poverty

Rank order of social problems of the two sample groups in terms of area in which they would like to become competent - $P < .10$.

Poverty and child neglect were the only two social problems cited by both groups as ranking within the five most important.

Although there is an inconsistency between these responses and those of responses in regard to social problems seen as being most important to the respondent, it must be remembered that these two questions address themselves to different considerations. A respondent may wish to become competent in an area which he may or may not perceive as being extremely important within the hierarchy of his and society's perceived ranking of social problems.

Responses as to areas in which the respondents would like to become competent may be relevant in terms of employment, and also for future educational program context planning.

As an overview, it should be noted with respect to the two sample groups, that there is a meaningful parallel in terms of the respondents' perceptions of the importance of various social problems as he sees them as perceived by society, and as he himself perceives them. Generally the thinking of the two sample groups around these issues is similar.

The question arises as to whether the School of Social Work is training students to work in the areas in which they would like to become competent. Our data indicates that responses as to areas in which students would like to become competent do not correspond to those they indicated as being most important to society and to the respondents themselves. Further exploration is needed to examine this inconsistency.

L. Potential Instrument for Social Change

The last item of the questionnaire dealt with whether the respondent saw himself as a potential instrument for social change. There was no statistically significant difference between the two groups. Ninety-three percent of the M.S.W.'s and 94.6% of the B.S.W. sample group indicated that they saw themselves as being potential instruments for social change. One implication of this finding may be that both groups are optimistic about their ability to bring about social change.

M. Aptitude for Interpersonal Relationships

The Social Work attitude Inventory scores for the student sample population are an indicator of this aptitude for interpersonal relationships. A high score indicates a relatively greater aptitude for interpersonal relationships than does a lower score.

Table 25 presents the frequency distribution of inventory scores for M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III groups of social work students.

Table 26 - Frequency Distribution of Inventory Scores for M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III groups of Social Work Students

Range of Scores	Frequency	
	MSW I	BSW III
30 - 39 - 99	0	3
40 - 49 - 99	2	4
50 - 59 - 99	7	7
60 - 69 - 99	9	12
70 - 79 - 99	9	16
80 - 89 - 99	10	4
90 - 99 - 99	5	7
total	42	53

As a measure of frequency distribution, the scores for M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III social work students were examined for skewness. The result for both groups was within the range of normality, or the limits of plus or minus three.*

A comparison of mean inventory scores for social work students in M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III is shown in Table 27.

*See Appendix V.

Table 27 - Comparison of Mean Inventory Scores for Social Work Students in M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III

Statistic	M.S.W. I	B.S.W. III
N	42	53
Range	41.48-94.11	37.72-99.11
M	72.83	69.26
S.D.	14.30	15.79
Im	2.23	2.19
Mdm	72.53	70.41
	Idm.	3.13
	Z	1.14

Formulas used to calculate the above statistic can be found in Appendix IV.

The Z score of 1.14 indicates that the difference between the mean scores is not statistically significant.

The age and sex factors will now be considered in relation to mean inventory scores and the number of social work students in each category. This demographic data was requested from each of the social work students in the sample by direct personal data questions on the questionnaire. This information was accepted at face value with no attempt at further verification.

Table 28 presents the mean inventory score with the number of social work students from M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III groups found at each of three age levels.

Table 28 - The Mean Inventory Score with Number of Social Work students from M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III groups found at each of three age levels

Age	MSW I		BSW III	
	N	M	N	M
20-25	28	74.04	37	67.45
26-30	8	67.49	7	75.29
31 plus	4	76.17	3	71.45
total	40		47	

Table 29 shows a comparison of mean inventory scores of M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III social work students in the 20-25 and 26-30 age groupings.

Table 29 - Comparison of Inventory Scores of M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III Social Work students in the 20-25 and 26-30 age groupings

Statistic	20-25 years		26-30 years	
	M.S.W. I	B.S.W. III	M.S.W. I	B.S.W. III
N	28	37	8	7
M	74.04	67.45	67.49	75.29
T	3.25 * *		.27	

P < .05 *
P < .01 **

The + score of 3.25 indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III groups in the 20-25 years of age category is significant at the .01 level. One implication to be drawn from this is that the M.S.W. I sample group has a greater capacity for interpersonal

relationship in the 20-25 year age group than the B.S.W. III sample group.

Table 30 shows a comparison of mean inventory scores of the total M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III student sample population between those in the 20-25 age group and those in the 26-30 age group.

Table 30 - Comparison of mean inventory scores of the total sample population between the 20-25 and 26-30 age groups.

Statistic	20-25 yrs.	26-30 yrs.
N	65	15
M	70.29	71.13
T	20.56 **	

** P < .01

The t score of 20.56 indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the 20-25 age group and the 26-30 age group is statistically significant at the .01 level. This finding would tend to indicate that the 26-30 year age group has a greater capacity for interpersonal relationships than the younger 20-25 year age group in our sample. On the basis of our data, it would appear that age does influence the capacity for interpersonal relationships. In the face of very limited data, it may be incautious to further speculate on these differences, however, it is possible that older social work students have benefitted from greater life experiences.

Table 31 presents the mean inventory score and number of social work students from M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III groups, according to sex.

Table 31 - The Mean Inventory Score with Number of Social Work students from M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III groups by sex

Sex	MSW I		BSW III	
	N	X	N	X
Male	16	74.69	22	68.82
Female	25	70.98	30	66.98
Total	41		52	

It is interesting to note that M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III males comprise 39% and 42% of their respective sample populations.

Table 32 shows a comparison of mean inventory scores of both M.S.W. I Male and Female social work students and sex and B.S.W. III Male and Female social worker students and sex.

Table 32 - Comparison of Mean Inventory Scores of the M.S.W. I Male and Female Sample and Sex and the B.S.W. III Male and Female sample and sex

Statistic	MSW I		BSW III	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
N	16	25	22	30
M	74.69	70.98	68.82	66.98
T	7.17 **		4.05 **	
P < .01 **				

The t Score of 7.17 indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the M.S.W. I male and female sample group is statistically significant at the .01 level. This finding implies that males in the M.S.W. I sample group have a greater capacity for interpersonal relationships than do females in the M.S.W. I sample group. The data comparing the B.S.W. III sample population in terms of sex also indicates a greater capacity of male B.S.W. III students than female B.S.W. III students for interpersonal relationships. This finding was also statistically significant at the .01 level. However, it is beyond the scope of the present study to examine the interrelationships among sex factors, age, and other variables which may have influenced the data. This finding indicates the necessity for further research into this area.

Table 33 shows a comparison of mean inventory scores: 1) of male M.S.W. I and male B.S.W. III student populations; 2) and of female M.S.W. I and female B.S.W. III student populations.

Table 33 - Comparison of Mean Inventory Scores of (1) Male B.S.W. III and M.S.W. I student populations and (2) Female B.S.W. III and M.S.W. I student populations

Statistic	Male		Female	
	MSW I	BSW III	MSW I	BSW III
N	16	22	25	30
M	74.69	68.82	70.98	66.98
T	2.92 **		1.79 *	

P < .01 **

The + score of 2.92 indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the MSW I male and BSW III male sample groups is statistically significant at the .01 level. The + score of 1.79 indicates that the difference between the mean scores of the M.S.W. I female and BSW III female sample groups is statistically significant at the 0.10 level. This data suggests a general trend in which M.S.W. I students have a greater capacity for interpersonal relationships than do B.S.W. III students.

On the basis of our data, it appears that the factors of age and sex may play a significant role when associated with the aptitude for interpersonal relationships as expressed in the inventory scores of the M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III social work student contrast groups.

CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATION

The broad objective of this research project was to look for differences in student input between the Master of Social Work I and Bachelor of Social Work III student sample groups at the University of Manitoba School of Social Work for the academic year 1970-71.

A statistically significant difference was found between the two groups in terms of age. The mean age of the Bachelor of Social Work sample group was 22.23 years while for Master of Social Work students, the mean age was 24.81 years. As could be expected due to this age difference, statistically significant differences were also found with regard to the variables of marital status, number of faculties enrolled in, and number of universities attended, with the Master of Social Work sample group scoring higher on these items.

We feel that experience with regard to these variables may be seen as contributing to one's life experience. Further research and an examination of existing related research is needed in order to fully explore this supposition.

The results of our application of Ann Oren's "Social Work Attitude Inventory" test indicated that there was a statistically significant level of difference within both

samples according to an age differential. It was found that when the groups were divided into age categories of 20-25 and 26-30, the respondents in the 26-30 age category had a higher statistically significant degree of aptitude for interpersonal relationships. There was a large difference between the Master of Social Work and Bachelor of Social Work sample groups within the 20-25 year old category, and this decreased significantly within the 26-30 year old category. It would appear that the greater educational experience of the Master of Social Work respondents in the 20-25 year old category contributes to a substantial difference between the two sample groups in terms of their capacity for interpersonal relationships. In the 26-30 year old category, there was almost no difference in terms of aptitude for interpersonal relationships between the Master of Social Work and Bachelor of Social Work respondents. This would suggest that as the respondents get older, their educational background becomes a less critical consideration in their aptitude for interpersonal relationships. This is a very interesting find, which we feel warrants further research.

Thus, we may note that the important variable is that of age, and the concurrent maturation process. This has significant implications for educational planning, which will be dealt with shortly.

On the basis of our questionnaire data, it was noted

that there was a high correspondence between the two groups as to why they perceived social problems of importance to society and to themselves. However, both the Master of Social Work and Bachelor of Social Work sample groups indicated the areas in which they would like to become competent as different from those perceived as important to society and to themselves. In addition, each sample group chose different areas in which they would like to become competent. Another factor to be noted is that there were differences between the two sample groups in terms of long-run job expectations. These factors might tend to suggest implications for educational planning. One implication may be that student input is necessary in the educational planning process.

Student contribution to education planning committees should be sought on a continuing basis. In order for this input to be meaningful, the degree of student participation should be more than mere tokenism. In addition, there is a need to provide a greater variety of courses so that course content supports individual social work career area aspirations.

Student aspiration might be ascertained prior to finalization of course content and course alternative decisions. These aspirations should play a significant role in the type of courses offered, and the material included in them.

Another implication for educational planning which relates to the factors of age, life experience and maturation is that the educational process might be geared to developing these factors, since age, and accompanying maturation and life experience seem to correlate with an aptitude for interpersonal relations. Specifically some of these educational process modifications might include a prolonged educational process including such things as a supervised practicum training or supervised summer experience, or internships, block placements, etc.

Another general trend found was that the Bachelor of Social Work sample group was more active in the areas of political and community involvement. In addition, the Bachelor of Social Work sample group was more active in terms of volunteer social work experience. We might suggest that the Bachelor of Social Work sample group is more active than the Master of Social Work group.

Thus it would seem that the most desirable outcome would be to combine the activism or involvement of the Bachelor of Social Work group with a maturation process.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Gockel, Galen L. "Social Work as a Career Choice." Manpower in Social Welfare: Research Perspectives. Edited by Edward E. Schwartz. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1966.

Goode, William J., and Hatt, Paul K. Methods in Social Research. 4th ed. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1965.

Institute on Research Approaches to Manpower Problems in the Social Welfare Services. Manpower In Social Welfare: Research Perspectives. Edited by Edward E. Schwartz. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1966.

Kahn, Alfred. "The Design of Research." Social Work Research. Edited by Norman A. Polansky. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Levine, Morton. "Trends in Professional Employment." Manpower In Social Welfare: Research Perspectives. Edited by Edward E. Schwartz. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1966.

Maas, Henry S., and Polansky, Norman A. "Collecting Original Data." Social Work Research. Edited by Norman A. Polansky. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Miller, Roger. "Statistical Analysis of Data." Social Work Research. Edited by Norman A. Polansky. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Orzack, Louis H. "Social Change: Implications for Welfare Manpower." Manpower in Social Welfare: Research Perspectives. Edited by Edward E. Schwartz. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1966.

Pins, Arnulf. "Education: Its Contribution to the Manpower Equation." Manpower in Social Welfare: Research Perspectives. Edited by Edward E. Schwartz. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1966.

- Polansky, Norman., ed. Social Work Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Porter, John. The Vertical Mosaic. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.
- Selltiz, Claire; Jahoda, Marie; Deutsch, Morton; and Cook, Stuart. Research Methods in Social Relations. Revised Edition. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1959.
- Towle, Charlotte. The Learner in Education For the Professions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Warkov, Seymour. "Social Work Students and Other Graduate Students: A Comparison." Manpower in Social Welfare: Research Perspectives. Edited by Edward E. Schwartz. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1966.
- Weiss, Robert S. Statistics in Social Research: An Introduction. New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1968.
- Witte, Ernest. "Education for Social Work." Social Work Year Book 1960. Edited by Russell H. Kurtz. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1960.

B. PERIODICALS

- Greenwood, Ernest. "Attributes of a Profession." Social Work, Vol. II, No. 3 (July, 1957), 45-55.
- Hayes, Dorothy D., and Varley, Barbara K. "Impact of Social Work Education on Students' Values." Social Work, (July, 1965), 40-46.
- Kadushin, Alfred. "Determinants of Career Choice and Their Implications for Social Work." Social Work Education, Vol. VI, No. 2 (April, 1958), 17-22.
- _____. "Prestige of Social Work-Facts and Factors." Social Work, Vol. III, No. 2 (April, 1958), 37-43.

_____. "Two Problems of the Graduate Programs: Level and Content." Journal of Education for Social Work, Vol. 1 (Spring, 1965).

Katz, Myer. "The Profession Looks Ahead at Practice and Manpower." The Social Worker, Vol. 35, No. 3 (Sept. 1967), 211-217.

Kidneigh, John C., and Lundberg, Horace W. "Are Social Work Students Different?" Social Work, (July, 1958), 57-61.

Lundberg, Horace W. "Some Distinctive Characteristics of Students Entering Graduate Social Work Education." Social Service Review, Vol. XXXII, No. 3 (Sept. 1958), 306.

Schweinitz, de, Karl. "Education for Social Security." The Educational Record, Vol. XXV, (April, 1954).

Stubbins, Henry. "The Profession's Expectations of Undergraduate Education." The Social Worker, Vol. 35, No. 2 (May, 1967), 64-70.

_____. "The Undergraduate Social Worker and the Manpower Crisis." The Social Worker, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Nov., 1966), 256-259.

Woolley, Patricia. "New B.S.W. Program at U. of M." Manitoba Social Worker, Vol. 4, No. 1 (April, 1970), 1 and 8.

C. STUDIES AND PAPERS

Berengarten, Sidney. Admissions Prediction and Student Performance in Social Work Education. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1964.

Canadian Association of Social Workers. The Canadian Association of Social Workers and the Welfare Worker. Ottawa: C.A.S.W., 1964.

- Council on Social Work Education. The Admissions Process in Schools of Social Work. Second National Workshop on Admissions, St. Louis, Missouri, 1962.
- _____. Continuities in Undergraduate Education in Social Welfare. New York: C.S.W.E., 1969.
- _____. Observations on Admissions to Graduate Social Work Education. New York: C.S.W.E., 1967.
- _____. Statistics on Social Work Education Nov. 1st, 1968 and Academic Year 1967-68. Edited by Frank M. Loewenberg. New York: C.S.W.E., 1968.
- Daly, Dorothy Bird. "The Future Baccalaureate Degree Social Worker." Implications for Social Work Education. Continuities in Undergraduate Education in Social Welfare. New York: C.S.W.E., 1969.
- Kendall, Katherine A. "Undergraduate Preparation for the Social Services." Continuities in Undergraduate Education in Social Welfare. New York: C.S.W.E., 1969.
- Lyndon, Benjamin H. "The Creation of Relevance: Social Welfare Education in Continuity." Continuities in Undergraduate Education in Social Welfare. New York: C.S.W.E., 1969.
- Pins, Arnulf. M. An Overview of Undergraduate Education in Social Welfare. New York: C.S.W.E., 1968.
- _____. Financial Aid to Social Work Students. New York: C.S.W.E., 1965.
- _____. Who Chooses Social Work, When and Why? New York: C.S.W.E., 1963.
- Robertson, Mary Ella. "Admissions Issues and the Social Worker of the Future." Observations on Admissions to Graduate Social Work Education. New York: C.S.W.E., 1967.
- Solander, Sanford. "Selection of Today's Students for Tomorrow's Practice." Observations on Admissions to Graduate Social Work Education. New York: C.S.W.E., 1967.

Tebor, Irving B., and Pickford, Patricia B. Social Work:
A Helping Profession in Social Welfare: A Syllabus.
New York: C.S.W.E., 1966.

Witte, Ernest. "Implications and Next Steps for Under-
graduate Education." Continuities in Undergraduate
Education in Social Welfare. New York: C.S.W.E., 1969.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Canadian Association of Social Workers. "The Critical Short-
age in the Manpower Field." Statement presented to the
National Council of Welfare, Oct. 18, 1965. (Mimeographed)

_____. "Draft Report of the
National Committee on Education on the Interests and
Responsibilities of the Professional Association Toward
Social Work Education and Technical or Vocational Edu-
cation in Social Welfare." Ottawa, 1965. (Mimeographed)

_____. "Undergraduate Education
and Training of Personnel for the Social Services."
Ottawa, 1966. (Mimeographed)

Govenlock, Shaun, and Woolley, Patricia. "Criteria for Recog-
nizing Programs of University Education for Social Work."
Report to the President's Committee, C.A.S.W., January,
1968. (Mimeographed)

Lindenfield, Rita, and Levine, Leonard. "A Statement on
Competence (Graduate Level)." Report to the President's
Committee, C.A.S.W., January, 1968. (Mimeographed)

Manitoba Association of Social Workers, Committee on Education,
Professional Training and Competence. "Work Paper on
Undergraduate Education in Social Work." Submitted to
the Annual Conference, M.A.S.W., June 16, 1967.
(Mimeographed)

Morrow, Harry M., and MacDonald, R. D. "A Statement on Competence of Persons with a First (Undergraduate) Degree in Social Work." Report to the President's Committee, C.A.S.W., January, 1968. (Mimeographed)

Oren, Anne Winslow. "The Construction of an Instrument for the Measurement of Social Worker Attitudes Associated with Aptitude for Interpersonal Relationships." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1957.

School of Social Work, University of Manitoba. "Proposal to the University Senate, 1966." Winnipeg, Manitoba, 1966. (Mimeographed)

Smith, Douglas E. "Existing and Possible Programs of Undergraduate Education for Social Welfare." University of Alberta, 1966. (Mimeographed)

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

November, 1970.

To: B.S.W. III and M.S.W. I Students
in the School of Social Work,
University of Manitoba.

We are requesting your participation in our M.S.W. II thesis project through completion of the attached questionnaire and attitude inventory. The purpose of our research is to explore characteristics of the student population of the School of Social Work, University of Manitoba. All data gathered from the questionnaire and attitude inventory will be held in strictest confidence.

Please read the questions carefully and answer all to the best of your ability.

We appreciate your anticipated cooperation as this material is crucial to the success of our thesis.

Please place your completed questionnaire and attitude inventory in the box marked "Thesis Questionnaires" in the general office, Room 521 Tier Bldg., before 5:00 o'clock p.m. today.

Laura Carment
Sue Feldman
Sandra Gardiner
Ron Levine
Russ Reiter

PART I

1. Indicate present program: BSW III _____ MSW I _____
2. Name in full _____
3. Present address _____
4. Age (as of last birthday) _____
5. Sex (check one) _____
6. a) Do you have any brothers or sisters: Yes _____ No _____
(If you have no brothers or sisters, disregard question b and c).
- b) Are you the oldest child: Yes _____ No _____
- c) Are you the youngest child: Yes _____ No _____
7. Marital status, as of present: (check one)
Single _____ Married _____ Separated _____ Divorced _____ Widowed _____
8. Do you have any children: (check one)
None _____ One _____ Two _____ Three _____ More than three _____
9. Indicate your father's ethnic origin (for example; German, Dutch, English, French) _____
10. Religious identification: (check one) Catholic _____
Protestant _____ Jewish _____ Other _____ None _____
11. Occupation of your father (if more than one occupation, give occupation engaged in for longest period of time):

12. Occupation of chief parental wage-earner - may be same as #11 (if more than one occupation, give occupation engaged in for longest period of time, i.e. farmer, clerk, dentist)

13. Approximate total family income of parents (check one):
 - a. under \$2,000 _____
 - b. from \$2,000 - \$2,999 _____
 - c. from \$3,000 - \$3,999 _____
 - d. from \$4,000 - \$4,999 _____
 - e. from \$5,000 - \$5,999 _____
 - f. from \$6,000 - \$6,999 _____
 - g. from \$7,000 - \$7,999 _____
 - h. from \$8,000 - \$9,999 _____
 - i. from \$10,000 - \$14,999 _____
 - j. from \$15,000 and over _____

14. Highest level of education received by parents (check one for each parent):

	Father	Mother
1. Grades I - IV	_____	_____
2. Grades V - VII	_____	_____
3. Grades VIII - X	_____	_____
4. Grades XI - XII	_____	_____
5. One year or part of one year university	_____	_____
6. Two years University	_____	_____
7. Three years University	_____	_____
8. Graduated from University	_____	_____
9. Did graduate work	_____	_____
10. Don't know	_____	_____

15. How many different cities and towns have you lived in: (towns: under 25,000 people; cities: over 25,000 people)

Towns: One ___ Two ___ Three ___ More than three ___ None ___

Cities: One ___ Two ___ Three ___ More than three ___ None ___

16. Did you live most of your life in centers where the population was (check one):

- | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|----------------------|-------|
| a. under 1,000 | _____ | e. over 25,000 | _____ |
| b. 1,000 - 4,000 | _____ | f. on a farm | _____ |
| c. 4,000 - 10,000 | _____ | g. none of the above | _____ |
| d. 10,000 - 25,000 | _____ | | |

17. Please indicate the number of different countries you have visited since the age of 12 (check one): (other than Canada)

1 ___ 2 ___ 3-5 ___ 5-7 ___ 7-9 ___ 9-12 ___ more than 12 ___
none ___

18. Please indicate the number of countries you have lived in for more than 3 consecutive months, since the age of 12 (other than Canada) (check one):

1 ___ 2 ___ 3-5 ___ 5-7 ___ more than 7 ___ none ___

19. Please indicate the number of universities you have attended (do not count as separate affiliated colleges of the same university):

One ___ Two ___ Three ___ Four or more ___

20. How many different faculties have you been enrolled in as a student (i.e. Arts, Education, etc.):

One ___ Two ___ Three ___ Four or more ___

21. Indicate the number of social science courses taken at the University level and if full or half courses:

Full Course Half Course

Sociology	_____	_____
Psychology	_____	_____
Economics	_____	_____
Anthropology	_____	_____
History	_____	_____
Political Science	_____	_____
Philosophy	_____	_____
English	_____	_____

22. Education (check either a or b plus c and d):

- a. Bachelor's degree _____ Major _____
- b. Bachelor's degree with pre-professional social work sequence (i.e. undergraduate major in Social Welfare)
- c. Graduate social work education Yes ___ NO ___
- d. Graduate education other than social work: Yes ___ NO ___

23. Rank in order of greatest proportion all source(s) of your financial support for the current (1970-71) academic year:

- a. earning of husband or wife
- b. support from parents or relatives _____
- c. personal savings _____
- d. borrowed funds (i.e. students loans) _____
- e. part-time job in social work _____
- f. part-time job out of social work _____
- g. scholarship or other scholastic award _____
- h. department or educational leave _____

24. Were you active in school student council (i.e. grades 1-12):

- a. as a participant _____
- b. as an observer _____
- c. as an organizer _____
- d. not active at all _____

25. Indicate the number of political meetings you have attended over the past two years:

One ___ Two ___ Three ___ Four ___ Five ___ More than five ___
None ___

26. Have you ever voted in a:

	Yes	No
a. university election	_____	_____
b. municipal election	_____	_____
c. provincial election	_____	_____
d. federal election	_____	_____
e. never voted in any of the above	_____	_____

27. Have you ever actively campaigned for the election of a candidate to political office:

	Yes	No
a. in a University election	_____	_____
b. in a municipal election	_____	_____
c. in a provincial election	_____	_____
d. in a federal election	_____	_____
e. never actively campaigned in any of the above	_____	_____

28. Generally, do you consider yourself as:

a. a Conservative	_____
b. a Liberal	_____
c. a New Democrat	_____
d. a Social Creditist	_____
e. a Communist	_____
f. other (specify)	_____

29. Are you presently a member of a political party: Yes ___ NO ___

30. Are you presently a member of a political organization, other than a political party: (i.e. Maoists, FLQ.)
PLEASE SPECIFY:

31. Are you involved with any church in your community:

a. attend meetings or services	_____
b. involved as an organizer	_____
c. not involved at all	_____

32. During the past year have you attended a public inquiry, commission or hearing:

Once ___ Twice ___ Three times ___ More than three ___
Never attended _____

33. During the past year have you attended a conference, workshop, or institute related to social issues or social problems:

Once ___ Twice ___ Three times ___ More than three ___
Never attended _____

34. Have you ever written a letter to a newspaper or magazine editor about a social issue or social problem of concern to you:
 Once _____ Twice _____ Three times _____ More than three _____
 Never _____
35. Have you ever written or otherwise contacted your political representative about a social issue or social problem of concern to you:
 Once _____ Twice _____ Three times _____ More than three _____
 Never _____
36. Have you ever participated in a demonstration:
- a. as an observer _____
 - b. as a participant _____
 - c. as an organizer _____
 - d. never participated _____
37. Are you presently involved in a social issue or social problem such as population control, pollution, etc:
- a. attend meetings related to a social issue or social problem as an observer _____
 - b. actively participate as a member of a group concerned with a social issue or social problem _____
 - c. not involved with an organized, identified group, but active as an individual concerned with a social issue or social problem (please specify) _____
 - d. not involved in any way _____
- 38 a. Please indicate all cumulative paid social work experience in a social agency:
 None _____ Less than one year _____ One to three years _____
 Three to six years _____ More than six years _____
- 38 b. If you have had paid social work experience indicate if (indicate more than one, if applicable)
- a. during high school _____
 - b. before entering University _____
 - c. during first year University _____
 - d. after first year University _____
 - e. during second year University _____
 - f. after second year University _____
 - g. during third year University _____
 - h. after third year University _____
39. Have you been a volunteer worker in a social agency:
 Yes _____ No _____

40. List any other volunteer Social Work experience (example, Big Brother, driving elderly people): _____

41. Please indicate cumulative length of all other paid work experience:

A. None ___ Less than one year ___ One to three years ___
Three to six years ___ More than six years ___

B. If you have had paid work experience indicate if (indicate more than one, if applicable):

- a. during high school _____
- b. before entering University _____
- c. during first year University _____
- d. after first year University _____
- e. during second year University _____
- f. after second year University _____
- g. during third year University _____
- h. after third year University _____

42. Where do you expect to work upon graduation (check one):

- a. federal government agency _____
- b. provincial or municipal agency _____
- c. private agency (for example; hospital, Children's Aid Societies, Family Bureaus, Church) _____
- d. College or university _____
- e. private practice _____
- f. do not expect employment _____

43. Who do you expect your long-run future employer to be (check one): (answer may or may not be same as #42)

- a. federal government agency _____
- b. provincial/municipal agency _____
- c. private agency (for example; hospital, Children's Aid Societies, Family Bureaus, Church) _____
- d. College or university _____
- e. private practice _____
- f. do not expect employment _____

44. Which specific job activities do you anticipate will be the major part of your long-run career work (check one):

- a. teaching _____
- b. research _____
- c. administration or supervisory position _____
- d. direct service to clients _____

45. Indicate in which field of practice you intend to take your first job (you may check more than one):

- a. Corrections _____
- b. Financial assistance _____
- c. Counselling & family service _____
- d. Child Welfare (neglect, foster placement, adoption, day care) _____
- e. Health _____
- f. Social Planning _____
- g. Group Services (recreation, social action, specific action, welfare, treatment) _____
- h. Community development _____
- i. Child Guidance _____
- j. Teaching _____
- k. Private practice _____
- l. Research _____
- m. Other (please specify) _____

46. Rank five of the following statements that come closest to expressing the major reasons why you chose social work as a career:

- _____ 1. Social work is an interesting and exciting profession.
- _____ 2. Social work will give me social status and prestige.
- _____ 3. I think I can succeed in this kind of work.
- _____ 4. Social work makes an important contribution to individuals and society.
- _____ 5. Salaries and working conditions are good in social work.
- _____ 6. I enjoy working with people.
- _____ 7. I was offered a job in social work.
- _____ 8. Social work can help me become a better person, parent and marriage partner.
- _____ 9. Job opportunities and job security are good in social work.
- _____ 10. Other (specify) _____

47. Social Problems: Canada

- a. Alcoholism and Drug Abuse
- b. Pollution
- c. Illegitimacy
- d. Poverty
- e. Crime and Juvenile Delinquency
- f. Population control and Family Planning
- g. Old Age
- h. Discrimination against Minority groups
- i. Mental illness
- j. Housing

47.

- k. Child Neglect
- l. Family Breakdown
- m. Transient Youth
- n. Other (specify) _____

Rank five of the above social problems in order of their importance:

- 1. as perceived by society: 1. () 2. () 3. () 4. () 5. ()
- 2. as perceived by yourself: 1. () 2. () 3. () 4. () 5. ()
- 3. as areas in which you would like to become competent: 1. () 2. () 3. () 4. () 5. ()

48. Do you perceive yourself as being a potential instrument for change: Yes ___ No ___

SOCIAL WORK ATTITUDE INVENTORY

by

Anne W. Oren

and

John C. Kidneigh

University of Minnesota--School of Social Work

Directions: Please Read Carefully

This inventory contains sixty statements. Separately there is an answer sheet upon which your opinions about each statement are to be recorded. Your personal opinion about each of these sixty statements is sought. Read each statement carefully and decide how YOU feel about it. Then mark your answer by placing a check mark () after the appropriate letter space on the separate answer sheet. Think in terms of situations as you know them rather than other specific instances. There is no time limit, but work as quickly as you can. PLEASE ANSWER EVERY ITEM. You should be able to complete the form in approximately one hour or less. Note the example below, also note that at the top of each page the letter code is restated for your convenience.

Example:

If you agree strongly,
check after A

A B C : D E F

If you agree pretty much,
check after B

A B C : D E F

If you agree a little,
check after C

A B C : D E F

If you disagree a little,
check after D

A B C : D E F

If you disagree pretty much,
check after E

A B C : D E F

If you disagree strongly,
check after F

A B C : D E F

A--Agree strongly
B--Agree pretty much
C--Agree a little

D--Disagree a little
E--Disagree pretty much
F--Disagree strongly

1. People generally do not appreciate something they get for nothing.
2. A good way to deal with enuresis is to keep the child off liquids for several hours before bedtime.
3. Very few women make good executives.
4. Agency policies should always be observed, even though they seem unfair in some situations.
5. The best home is one where there is no friction.
6. A person should be able to forget about a job at the end of the day.
7. A lazy man does not deserve to have his family supported by public relief.
8. A slovenly housekeeper is failing in her responsibilities as a mother.
9. The most enjoyable tasks are those which are clearly outlined and detailed.
10. Juvenile delinquents are not apt to repeat offenses if they know for sure they will be punished.
11. If people feel comfortable about taking relief, they will never want to be self-supporting.
12. Clients usually want to consider the social worker as a friend.
13. Easy-going parents do not usually win their children's respect.
14. There is little harm in disregarding a regulation if the client will be benefited.
15. Low-income families have little in common with those who are more privileged.
16. Most people would benefit from closer supervision of their personal affairs.
17. It is exciting to fight for one's convictions.
18. Teen-age fads are often silly and meaningless.
19. There is too much leniency these days in attitudes toward right and wrong.
20. The first thing a child should learn is to obey.

A--Agree strongly
B--Agree pretty much
C--Agree a little

D--Disagree a little
E--Disagree pretty much
F--Disagree strongly

21. It is difficult to learn from a supervisor who is not willing to give specific answers.
22. Most social workers are so busy that they cannot be expected to know much about social problems with which they are not directly concerned.
23. Childhood is the happiest time of one's life.
24. People tend to be difficult to deal with as they get older.
25. It is very annoying to have one's work schedule upset.
26. Alcoholics are usually repulsive.
27. Children are allowed too much freedom these days.
28. A good motivating device is the critical comparison of a person's accomplishments with those of his friends.
29. A social worker should continually urge his client to do better.
30. A lot of people think that the world owes them a living.
31. It is sometimes necessary for the group to be punished when the identity of the wrong-doer cannot be determined.
32. An aggressive, argumentative child often needs to be isolated from his group.
33. Children need a good deal of direction in selecting their friends.
34. Social workers should be more concerned with saving the taxpayers' money.
35. There is something revolting about a homosexual.
36. Foreigners should be especially grateful for the opportunities afforded them in this country.
37. Many of the 'emergency' requests made by clients are actually not very important.
38. Children should be taught to respect their elders.
39. If a man's family goes hungry for a while, the man will be more apt to want to work.
40. At the end of the day, it is a relief to get away from the people one works with.

A--Agree strongly
B--Agree pretty much
C--Agree a little

D--Disagree a little
E--Disagree pretty much
F--Disagree strongly

41. There is simply no use in trying to get along with some people.
42. If a person does not look out for himself, no one else will.
43. A person often has to get mad in order to push others into action.
44. Life is so complicated that the efforts of one person often do not count for much.
45. Academic courses are often irrelevant to real life situations.
46. Adolescents should be taught to fear the possible effects of petting.
47. Give a child something to keep busy with, and he will be all right.
48. Handicapped people often expect extra considerations.
49. It is impossible to consider individual differences in a group of thirty or forty people.
50. Some people are simply not worthy of respect.
51. The welfare of others is more important than one's own self-interest.
52. Children nowadays seem lacking in manners.
53. People who are always complaining about feeling ill often times have nothing wrong with them.
54. Young people are usually pretty resourceful in planning their own lives.
55. Day-dreaming is a wasteful activity.
56. Criticism can sometimes make a person feel like giving up.
57. There is something very unnatural about a parent who does not love his own child.
58. Most people like having decisions made for them.
59. Too much praise is apt to spoil a person.
60. The answers given to all the above questions have been answered to the best of my ability, truly stating what I believe.

APPENDIX II

TO: All First Year Field Staff

FROM: Len Spearman

DATE: December 11, 1970

As some of you likely know, I am involved with a research project comparing the M.S.W. and B.S.W. programs. The final outcome should be a helpful evaluation of our new B.S.W.

Recently this study has developed new dimensions and may result in both a thorough examination of characteristics of social workers plus some basic research designed to test Canadian social work norms.

Some of the initial questionnaires were handed out in a class. However, many students were absent and some failed to return forms. Since it is most important that our sample is adequate, we have decided to ask field instructors to assist in administering. No work on your part will be required but about one hour of field time for students will be. A second year student will be contacting you in the near future to explore test administration.

Also, I should point out that we are asking for names to be put on the test. There is no interest in individual scores, but it is necessary for names to be listed to be able to relate other data. No student on the research project will have access to confidential student information.

LS:rt

APPENDIX III

QUESTIONNAIRE RAW SCORES

	<u>Question 4</u>		
18-22	17	40	
23-27	19	14	df = 2
28-45	6	6	$\chi^2 = 6.95$
			P < .01
total	42	60	

	<u>Question 5</u>		
male	16	26	
female	28	38	df = 1
			$\chi^2 = .199$
total	44	64	not statistically significant

	<u>Question 6 a</u>		
	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
yes	41	52	
no	3	7	df = 1
			$\chi^2 = .3394$
total	44	59	not statistically significant

	<u>Question 6 b</u>		
	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
yes	13	27	
no	30	32	df = 1
			$\chi^2 = 2.51$
total	43	59	P < .20

Question 6 c

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
yes	13	19	df = 1 x ² = .21 not statistically significant
no	30	36	
total	43	55	

Question 7

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
single	25	48	df = 1 x ² = 3.9350 P < .05
married	19	16	
total	44	64	

Question 8

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
none	37	53	df = 2 x ² = 2.26 not statistically significant
one	5	4	
two or more	1	5	
totals	43	62	

Question 9

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
Eastern Europe	10	9	df = 3 not statistically significant
Western Europe	28	42	
North American	5	7	
Far Eastern	1	2	
Totals	43	58	

Question 10

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
Catholic	10	19
Protestant	21	32
Jewish	3	8
Others	1	3
None	6	6
Total	41	68

df = 4
 $\chi^2 = 1.77$
not statistically
significant

Question 11

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
professional	5	4
proprietor manager official	13	19
clerical, sales, other	0	10
farmer or farm manager	11	7
skilled or semi-skilled	10	17
skilled	1	3
total	40	60

$\chi^2 = 11.40$
 $P < .05$
df = 5

Question 12

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
professional	5	6	
managerial proprietor official	11	17	
clerical sales	0	10	$\chi^2 = 8.23$ $df = 5$ $P < .20$
farm or farm manager	8	8	
skilled or semi-skilled	11	16	
unskilled	1	4	
total	35	49	

Question 13

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
under 2000	0	1	
2 - 2900	2	3	
3 - 3900	4	4	
4 - 4900	1	5	$df = 9$ $\chi^2 = 12.49$ $P < .20$
5 - 5900	6	4	
6 - 6900	6	3	
7 - 7900	5	7	
8 - 8900	3	9	
10 - 14,999	6	9	
over 14,999	5	8	
total	16	34	

Question 14 a

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
1-4	3	8	
5-7	4	6	
8-10	17	17	
11-12	10	16	
1 yr. or part	0	5	$x^2 = 10.68$
2-3 yrs. Un.	0	2	df = 8
graduated Un.	7	4	P < .10
did grad. work	1	2	
don't know	2	3	
total	44	63	

Question 14 b

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
1-4	2	6	
5-7	5	5	
8 - 10	11	13	
11-12	15	24	
1 year or part	2	1	df = 7
2-3 yrs. Un.	2	6	$x^2 = 5.81$
grad. from Un.	3	4	not statistically significant
did grad. work	0	2	
don't know	3	1	
total	31	42	

Question 15 a

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
one	17	13	
two	3	10	
three	2	5	$df = 4$
more than 3	5	5	$\chi^2 = 5.06$
none	3	10	not statistically significant
total	34	43	

Question 15 b

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
one	20	31	
two	12	13	
three	7	6	$df = 4$
more than 3	3	5	$\chi^2 = 1.28$
none	2	3	not statistically significant
total	44	58	

Question 16

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
under 1000	20.9%	8.33%	
1-10,000	13.9%	10.60%	$\chi^2 = 8.37$
10-25,000	9.3%	1.66%	$df = 4$
over 25,000	48.8%	70.0%	$P < .10$
on a farm	6.9%	10%	

Question 17

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
one	20	34
two	8	5
three to five	5	3
500 more	4	5
none	8	15
total	45	62

$\chi^2 = 4.47$
 $df = 4$
not statistically
significant

Question 18

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
one	8	12
2 or more	4	6
none	30	43
total	42	61

$df = 2$
 $\chi^2 = .01$
not statistically
significant

Question 19

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
one	17	48
two	23	13
three or more	4	1
total	44	62

$\chi^2 = 16.77$
 $df = 2$
 $P < .001$

Question 20

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
one	7	30
two	30	33
three or more	12	1
total	49	64

$\chi^2 = 22.13$
 $df = 2$
 $P < .001$

Question 21

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
Social Sciences(68%)	324	429	
Humanities	(31%) 162	(19%) 112	$x^2 = 94.01$
Para-Social sciences	(-34%) 17	(19%) 130	df = 2
total	503	671	P < .001

Question 22 a

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
Bachelor degree	43	15
sociology	15	5
psychology	13	1
history	2	1
anthropology	2	0
other	4	0

Question 22 c

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
yes	15	1	16
no	10	9	19
total	25	10	

$x^2 = 6.99$
df = 1
P < .01

Question 22 d

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
	6	1	$x^2 = 1.05$ df = 1 not significant
	19	10	
total	25	11	

Question 23

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
husband	11	13	$x^2 = 22.3$ df = 7 P < .01
parents	15	33	
savings	28	46	
borrowed	7	18	
social work job	5	9	
non social work job	4	26	
scholarship	3	11	
bursary	25	16	
total	172	271	

Question 24

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
participant	18	21	$x^2 = .84$ df = 3 not significant
observer	6	10	
organizer	8	14	
non active	14	23	
total	46	68	

Question 25

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
one	6	12
two	4	6
three-five	0	7
more than five	3	8
none	29	29

$\chi^2 = 8.14$
 $df = 4$
 $P < .10$

Question 26

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
University	39	61
Municipal	16	18
Provincial	31	22
Federal	22	19
Never	1	1
total	109	121

$\chi^2 = 6.10$
 $df = 4$
 $P < .20$

Question 27

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
University	7	8
Municipal	0	4
Provincial	3	9
Federal	3	6
Never	34	47
Total	47	74

$df = 4$
 $\chi^2 = 4.70$
not significant

Question 28

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
Conservative	3	7	
Liberal	16	22	
N.D.P.	20	17	
Social Credit	0	0	$x^2 = 3.76$
Communist	0	0	df = 5
Other	3	10	not significant
Total	42	56	

Question 29

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
yes	1	5	
no	42	55	$x^2 = 1.63$
total	43	60	df = 1

not significant

Question 30

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
yes	1	1	
no	39	52	$x^2 = .40$
total	40	53	df = 1

not significant

Question 31

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
meetings or services	20	31	
organizer	6	10	$x^2 = .49$
not involved	23	28	df = 2
total	49	69	not significant

Question 32

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
once	9	10
twice	5	6
3 times or more	0	2
never	30	47
total	44	65

$x^2 = 1.95$
df = 3
not significant

Question 33

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
once	16	21
twice	9	12
three times	3	4
more than 3 times	6	10
never	10	18
total	41	68

$x^2 = 1.07$
df = 4
not significant

Question 34

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
once	4	6
twice	1	2
3 times or more	1	2
never	39	55
total	45	65

$x^2 = .15$
df = 3
not significant

Question 35

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
once	7	14
2 times or more	1	12
never	36	39
total	44	65

$x^2 = 8.01$
 $df = 2$
 $P < .02$

Question 36

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
observer	9	15
participant	6	10
organizer	0	4
never	31	41
total	46	70

$x^2 = 3.07$
 $df = 3$
not significant

Question 37

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
not involved	24	31
meetings	7	7
active	4	7
active as individual	5	20
total	40	65

$x^2 = 5.04$
 $df = 3$
 $P < .20$

Question 38 b

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
during high school	1	2
before University	1	4
	2	1
	3	2
	5	0
	3	11
	6	2
	25	6
total	46	28

$x^2 = 22.67$
df = 7
P < .01

Question 38 a

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
none	16	45
less than 1	3	12
1 - 3	21	4
3 - 6	4	3
more than 6	1	0
total	45	64

$x^2 = 29.49$
df = 4
P < .0005

Question 39

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
yes	14	20
no	28	43
total	42	63

$x^2 = .03$
df = 1
not significant

Question 40

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
yes	21	36
no	13	8
total	34	44

$x^2 = 3.92$
df = 1
P < .05

Question 41 a

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
none	3	8
less than 1	12	11
1 - 3	14	23
3 - 6	11	9
more than 6	5	10
total	45	61

$x^2 = 4.07$
df = 4
not significant

Question 41 b

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
during high school	25	38
before University	28	39
during 1st year Un.	11	26
after 1st year Un.	29	39
during 2nd year Un.	11	22
after 2nd year Un.	31	43
during 3rd year Un.	9	21
after 3rd year Un.	31	8
total	175	236

$x^2 = 26.95$
df = 7
P < .001

Question 42

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
federal government	2	7
provincial or municipal government	20	17
private agency	20	21
college or University	0	0
private practice	0	3
don't expect employment	0	2
total	42	50

$x^2 = 6.02$
df = 5
not significant

Question 43

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
federal government	4	15
provincial government	15	16
private agency	24	16
college	0	0
private practice	29	4
don't expect employment	0	1
total	45	52

$x^2 = 9.18$
df = 5
P < .01

Question 44

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.
teaching	2	3
research	2	4
administration or supervision	12	10
direct service	29	40
total	45	57

$x^2 = 2.04$
df = 3
not statistically significant

Question 45

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.	
a	7	14	
b	7	6	
c	16	10	
d	17	25	
e	6	2	
f	4	10	df = 12
g	8	12	$\chi^2 = 14.12$
h	7	10	not statistically
i	5	13	significant
j	1	3	
k	1	0	
l	1	2	
m	2	2	
total	82	109	

Question 46

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.			
1	103	4	144	5	
2	15	5	9	4	
3	108	7	146	6	
4	83	2	109	2	$\chi^2 = 37.68$
5	64	9	60	7	df = 10
6	80	1	86	1	not significant
7	13	6	21	8	
8	51	8	95	9	
9	48	10	49	10	
10	23	3	5	3	
other	3		5		

Question 47 a

	M.S.W.	B.S.W.			
a	69	2	132	5	
b	82	5	99	2	
c	29	9	30	7	
d	67	1	135	4	
e	78	4	118	3	
f	33		47	10	
g	6	3	32	1	df = 13
h	35		45		$\chi^2 = 38.46$
i	21	6	41		$P < .001$
j	69	7	93	9	
k	32	8	46	6	
l	36	10	44		
m	68		49	8	
n	0		0		
total	625		911		

Circled numbers indicated the rank order in which alternatives were chosen.

Question 47 b

	M.S.W.		B.S.W.	
a	54	8	79	10
b	72	2	134	4
c	3	5	13	14
d	75	1	98	1
e	85	10	85	3
f	59	4	67	3
g	28	3	54	9
h	31	9	94	7
i	62	9	75	11
j	55	7	50	12
k	44	11	74	8
l	92	6	91	6
m	10	12	35	13
n	5	12	5	12

$\chi^2 = 47.16$
 $df = 13$
 $P < .001$

Question 47 c

	M.S.W.		B.S.W.	
a	52	5	70	10
b	35	6	58	
c	41		49	9
d	55	1	91	5
e	63	4	90	7
f	49	7	56	1
g	42	10	29	3
h	30	9	64	8
i	49	8	50	
j	20		24	4
k	51	3	90	2
l	77	2	100	6
m	37		57	
n	5		5	
total	606		833	

$\chi^2 = 20.77$
 $df = 13$
 $P < .10$

Circled numbers indicate ranking of items

Question 48

	M.S.W.		B.S.W.	
yes	41		56	
	(93.2%)		(94.6%)	
no	3		3	
	(6.8%)		(5.4%)	
total	44		59	

$df = 1$
 $\chi^2 = .14$
not statistically significant

APPENDIX IV

Social Work Attitude Inventory

Raw Scores	BSW	N = 53
37.72		70.41
37.81		70.43
37.96		70.58
		71.45
45.31		72.54
46.26		73.03
46.61		73.61
47.62		73.67
50.12		74.49
52.72		75.28
53.92		75.64
55.92		76.48
56.56		76.92
56.78		77.33
58.69		77.97
		78.71
60.37		
62.58		81.70
65.42		82.44
66.24		85.11
66.33		89.03
66.52		91.02
66.99		93.27
67.04		93.99
67.28		94.27
67.84		96.18
68.09		98.75
68.87		99.11

Social Work Attitude Inventory

Raw Scores	MSW	N = 42
41.48		71.02
48.07		71.77
		72.53
51.80		73.97
52.41		74.67
55.30		75.06
55.89		77.46
57.43		79.32
57.61		79.94
59.89		82.28
		83.47
60.70		84.54
61.01		84.77
61.21		85.00
61.29		87.74
63.82		87.99
66.92		88.52
67.20		89.26
67.27		89.99
68.38		90.47
		91.05
		92.17
		94.05
		94.11

Formulae

$$\text{Mean} = \bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

$$\text{Median} = \frac{N + 1}{2}$$

(Monroe 990) Standard Deviation = $\frac{\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{n}}{n-1}$
 (0)

Guilford Estimated Standard Error = $\sigma_m = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N-1}}$
 p.145

Guilford Standard Error of Difference = $\sigma_{dm} = \sqrt{\sigma_{M1}^2 + \sigma_{M2}^2}$ $\begin{matrix} M_1 = \text{BSW} \\ M_2 = \text{MSW} \end{matrix}$
 p.174 Between Means

Guilford Z Score = $\bar{Z} = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sigma_{dm}}$ (where $\begin{matrix} M_1 = \bar{X} \text{ BSW} \\ M_2 = \bar{X} \text{ MSW} \end{matrix}$)
 p.175

(Difference is significant if \bar{Z} is greater than 1.96)

APPENDIX V

FORMULA FOR SKEWNESS

Examination of the M.S.W. I and B.S.W. III student populations for skewness. Assuming that the two groups could have been drawn from a normally distributed universe, skewness was calculated by use of the formula:

$$Sk = \frac{3 (M - M_{dm})}{\text{Standard Deviation.}}$$

The value of skewness for the M.S.W. I group was .0628, a positive value suggesting an excess of scores smaller than the mean. Skewness for the B.S.W. III group was minus .2184, a negative value indicating a tendency toward an excess of scores larger than the mean. The result for both groups is within the range of normality, or the limits of plus or minus 3.

APPENDIX VI

FORMULAE FOR QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

$$X^2 = \frac{(AD - BC)^2 N}{(A+B) (B+D) (A+C) (C+D)}$$

$$X^2 = \frac{(o-e)^2}{e}$$

Corrections were made for small sample sizes by adapting the above formulae i.e. using "n-1".