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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Theoretical Formulation

The occupational choice which a student makes either prior to entering or, as is usually the case, while in college is one of the most crucial decisions which he will face in his entire life. This is not to say, of course, that career choice, once made, is unchangeable. The field of possible alternatives does, however, become more limited with each step in the process. The choice of a college major, for example, reduces the number of occupations open to the student after college. To a large degree, then, the student must view his college major as a beginning decision regarding his life work and generally does so with some occupational goal in sight.

Aside from certain characteristics of the job as perceived by the student and the impersonal and relatively immutable characteristics of the individual himself, the single most important variable which will determine the student's course of action relative to career choice is that of his system of values. The dictionary defines the term "value," on a sociological level, as "the things of social life (ideals, customs, institutions, etc.) toward which the
people of the group have an affective regard." On the individual level, values may be thought of as "formulations of preferred behavior" which suggests that an individual's values with reference to a particular subject will produce a "strain toward consistent choice of certain types of behavior whenever alternatives are offered."

To proceed further with this concept, a value orientation may be defined as a set of values surrounding some aspect of the individual's life space which will determine how he will perceive that aspect and what course of action he will take with reference to it. One of these aspects is the individual's occupation. Thus, with reference to choice of a career, based on what information he has been able to acquire about the various occupations within his potential, as he perceives it, the student will choose that occupation and therefore that field of study which he believes will satisfy the largest number of his values—which conforms to his occupational value orientation.

From this statement, assuming (1) that a student's perception of his chosen occupation is reasonably accurate so that it does conform to his value orientation and (2) that the occupational goals of students in any one curriculum are similar with regard to their requisite value orientations, it can be deduced that students within a given curriculum will


have approximately the same occupational value orientation as all other students in that curriculum. By the same token, the student in a given curriculum should be more similar in his occupational value orientation to other students in that curriculum than to students in other curricula.

Specifically, those students who have chosen social work as an occupational goal and who, therefore, are in the social work and social welfare curricula should have similar occupational value orientations, and this value orientation should be different in some respects from those of students in other curricula who have occupational goals with characteristics quite different from social work, such as business, art or engineering. Similarly, there should be some differences in the occupational value orientation of undergraduate social welfare majors as compared to social work graduate students on the basis that the latter are required to make a greater investment to associate themselves with social work and should, therefore, have a greater commitment to the occupational values characteristic of the social work practitioner.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to ascertain how certain selected areas of the occupational value system of a college student are related to his choice of a career. Specifically, the study was undertaken to determine the extent to which a given set of values is characteristic of
students who have chosen a career in a social work oriented field and whether conformity to this set of values would differentiate them from students less committed to social work. Based on previous research findings, such a set of values was hypothesized, termed the "social work value orientation complex." Thus, the study sought to compare students who are strongly oriented to a career in social work, such as those in a graduate social work program, with students less strongly oriented, such as undergraduates majoring in social welfare, and to compare both with students not oriented to social work and having little likelihood of becoming oriented to it; for example, undergraduates in such nonwelfare curricula as business, art and engineering.

Problem

The large gap between the demand for and the supply of trained social workers continues to increase with each passing year. In public welfare alone, it has been estimated that more than 14,000 graduate social workers will be needed by the year 1970 to meet the demands of the expanding clientele adequately. This tremendous number "is fantastically beyond the entire output of all graduate schools of social work in the United States, even if public

---

1 The complex is defined as including a high faith in people, a social work job orientation, a low success orientation, and a high compliance preference. See the "Method and Procedure" section for further definition of these values.
Despite the seemingly hopeless prospect presented by this demand, it is the responsibility of the profession and particularly of the schools of social work to make every effort possible to increase the output of trained personnel while maintaining the present quality of the graduates. In order to accomplish this goal, there is a need, first, to increase the total number of graduate schools of social work in the U.S. and, second, to enlarge the capacity of each individual graduate program so as to accommodate an increased number of students. Such an expansion will, of course, produce a greater number of openings for new students in the graduate curricula. This very fact, however, creates at least two serious obstacles to the ultimate goal of increased output of qualified personnel.

First, in the realm of public relations, there is a need for the schools to upgrade recruitment techniques so that those students who are potentially good social workers and who might have an interest in social work oriented careers can be made aware of the desirability of a social work career for them. In the past and even today . . . these programs seldom, if at all, have been based on empirical evidence as to the values, the intellectual abilities, and other significant characteristics of potential candidates. One must question, therefore whether the full efficacy of recruitment programs can be realized with the existing modus operandi. Inevitably,
the specific recruitment objectives for any profession require a knowledge of the process by which individuals select an occupation.1

Thus, any effort to improve graduate school recruiting methods through a stronger emphasis on an empirical knowledge base will require some understanding of the significant characteristics of those students already successfully recruited into the graduate programs.

Second, with regard to the admission of new social work recruits, there remains the problem of determining not only which of the candidates are capable of becoming adequate social work practitioners, but also which will and which will not find satisfaction in the profession. The admission decision is often based solely on such highly subjective data as the interviewer's personal impressions of the applicant; there is very little concrete information in the form of test results to allow the admissions officer to assess accurately the probability of the prospective student's satisfaction with his choice. Based on the implicit assumption that a graduate student who has remained in the social work curriculum for a period of five months may be defined as satisfied with his occupational choice, then the question is: Are there identifiable characteristics in the student's system of values which can be associated with the fact that he has selected a career in social work

---

and which, therefore, being absent in another student, would allow the prediction that he would not make such a selection?

In looking at the value system of the student in the social work curriculum, another assumption must also be made. It must be supposed that there have been no appreciable changes in his value system—those aspects of it which caused him to make his career choice—as a result of his exposure to the graduate curriculum. This expectation is only partly borne out in research. Varley, in her study of the socialization process in social work education found only slight differences between students just entering social work education and those approaching graduation, with respect to certain selected aspects of their value systems. She did find, however, that analysis of the data, equating the students on certain baseline characteristics, revealed a significant change in attitudes and that small accumulated differences in the individual value scales resulted in a significant difference between the two groups of students.¹

In considering the validity of the above assumption in the light of these findings, two things must be kept in mind. First, the values in question in the present study are, for the most part, not the same as those examined by Varley. Thus, the changes which she found may not apply equally to the social work value orientation complex. Secondly, and more important, even if it is assumed that the

the same degree of change can be expected over the two year program, the time period involved in the present study sample is considerably shorter, so that by comparison the value changes may be less than those found by Varley. The answer to the question of the effect of socialization on the values considered in the present study must await future research.

The important point is to recognize the possibility of this factor producing spurious differences between the graduate and undergraduate students.

In order to explore the foregoing questions and assumptions, the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. Working: There is a significant difference between undergraduate nonwelfare majors, undergraduate social welfare majors, and first-year graduate social work students in their conformity to the social work value orientation complex.

2. Null: There is no significant difference between undergraduate nonwelfare majors, undergraduate social welfare majors, and first-year graduate social work students in their conformity to the social work value orientation complex.

3. Statistical: There is a probability value of .05 or less, as determined by the $\chi^2$ test for the significance of the difference, that the difference between undergraduate nonwelfare majors, undergraduate social welfare majors, and first-year graduate students in social work in their conformity to the social work value orientation complex could occur by chance alone.

Rejection of the null hypothesis would suggest at least two conclusions. First, it would seem to indicate that there is a cluster of values as defined by the social work value orientation complex. Second, it would suggest that this value complex does differentiate social work oriented students from those in other curricula and that it is,
therefore, in some way associated with choice of social work as an occupational goal. The second conclusion would raise, of course, a question as to the extent of this difference. In other words, if the social work students are different from other students with respect to those aspects of their occupational value orientations dealt with in this study, there may be differences in other aspects of their occupational values as well and in their attitudes and values toward other aspects of their life-space and possibly in other characteristics not covered by the scope of the present study.

If the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, it could indicate several things. It may mean that the social work value orientation complex does not exist as hypothesized. Since, by definition, the complex consists of several components, the invalidity of only one factor could cause the entire complex to fail to differentiate the student groups. It is also possible that the failure to reject the null hypothesis indicates that the direction of conformity to the value complex is different from that expected, even to the extent that the complex is negatively oriented to the profession of social work. As with most studies of this kind, it may be that the research tool, the questionnaire, is not a valid instrument for assessing the hypothesized value orientation complex and that the failure to reject the null hypothesis is an indication of the tool's weakness rather than of the nonexistence of the complex. Finally, it
is possible that the sampling and/or testing techniques distorted the results or that the study sample was of insufficient size to represent accurately the range of responses of the total population.

In addition to testing the above hypotheses, the study attempted to answer the following basic questions:

1. What previous research has been done that would tend to confirm the expectation that there would be a difference in the value orientations of students preparing to enter social work as compared to students in other fields of study?

2. What were the descriptive characteristics of the study sample as defined by the first eight questions in the questionnaire? Did these questions differentiate the sample when trichotomized by fields of study?

3. To what extent did the weighted items in the questionnaire significantly differentiate the trichotomized study sample when cross tabulated?

The following methods and procedures were employed in attempting to answer these questions.

Method and Procedure

The population for the study was composed of 198 students attending Fresno State College, Fresno, California, during spring semester, 1967. The study sample was selected from students listed in the 1966-67 Fresno State College Directory by means of a stratified sampling technique. The names of all students who were, according to the Directory listings, senior undergraduates majoring in either business, art, engineering, or social welfare, and those of all first-year graduate students in social work were placed on separate
lists according to field of study. Systematic sampling was then carried out in each subgroup to select subjects for the study. The sample arrived at consisted of twenty-five students each in business, art and engineering, sixty-one students in social welfare, and sixty-two graduate students in social work.

The data were collected by means of a mailed questionnaire. A cover letter accompanied the questionnaire explaining the nature and purpose of the study and the reason for selecting the recipient to be part of the research. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was enclosed to facilitate return of the questionnaire. Although the questionnaire was so constructed that the student was not required to identify himself by name, each one was coded to indicate to which subsample the student was to be categorized.

The questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first section, questions 1 through 8, provided identifying data regarding the respondents. Questions 7 and 8 in this section were used jointly, according to the "Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position" technique, to determine the subject's social class origin. The second section was derived from the questionnaire used in the "Cornell Study  

1See appendix A for questionnaire.  
2See appendix B for copy of correspondence.  
of Student Values.\textsuperscript{1} This section contained those items for which there was a predicted response, and which, therefore, were weighted to provide a score indicating the subject's conformity to the social work value orientation complex. The section was subdivided into four parts representing the four value scales of the complex and defined as follows:

**Faith in People.** "... the individual's degree of confidence in the trustworthiness, honesty, goodness, generosity, and brotherliness of the mass of men."\textsuperscript{2}

**Job Orientation.** A high degree of interest in working with people rather than things, and in being helpful to others, a moderate interest in being creative and original and in using one's special abilities and aptitudes, and a low interest in attaining status, in earning a lot of money and in having a stable and secure future.

**Success Orientation.** The degree of importance which the individual places upon getting ahead in life, in elevating himself in the status hierarchy. As defined in the questionnaire, it also includes the justification of unscrupulous and manipulative tactics, when necessary, to achieve that end.

**Compliance Preference.** The desire to maintain interpersonal relationships on a submissive or acquiescent level as characteristic of the person who is "... particularly concerned with approval, acceptance, warmth, and support. He 'likes everyone,' is anxious to please them, is willing to be dominated but is reluctant to dominate others."\textsuperscript{3}

The Faith in People scale consisted of questions 9, 11, 13, 15, and 18; the Success Orientation scale included questions 10, 12, 14, 17, and 21; the Compliance Preference scale consisted of questions 16, 19, and 20; question 22


\textsuperscript{3}Ibid., 42.
indicated the subject's Job Orientation.

In scoring the results obtained from the second section of the questionnaire, each possible answer in a multiple choice question was so weighted that the lowest number, a one, was given to those answers predicted to be least in accordance with the social work value orientation complex, and the highest number to those most in accordance. Thus, the lowest score possible on this section, twenty, would indicate complete nonconformity with the values in the complex and the highest score, one hundred, would indicate complete conformity.

The unit of analysis was the student's conformity to the complex of social work occupational values as determined by his response to the weighted section of the questionnaire and dichotomized as high or low. A student was considered to have low conformity if his score on the questionnaire was below the mean score for the total sample, and high conformity if his score was equal to or above the mean. After the data were collected, there were distributed in 2 X 2, 2 X 3, and 2 X N frequency tables. The data were subjected, where appropriate, to the chi square test for significance of the difference between the observed and expected frequencies. The five percent level was selected for rejection of the null hypothesis. The formula used for the chi square test was \( \chi^2 = \frac{(f - F)^2}{F} \).1 For some of the data

the t-test was used to determine the significance of the difference between the means. The formulae for the t-test were: 
\[
s_{x_1-x_2}^2 = \sqrt{\frac{x_1^2 - x_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right),
\]
and
\[
t = \frac{(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) - (m_1 - m_2)}{s_{x_1-x_2}}.
\]
Where relevant, the data were reduced to percentages or proportions. Summary and recapitulation tables were also used when applicable.

In summary, this study was an attempt to measure the conformity to four occupational values of students differentially oriented to social work as an occupational goal, based on the proposition that understanding the values which motivate students to choose social work as a career will aid attempts to increase recruitment and admission of new social work students. For the sample, students from five fields of study were selected and sent a questionnaire consisting of two main sections, identifying characteristics and weighted value orientation questions.

A review of the literature relevant to the present problem, a brief description of the setting of the study, and an analysis of the baseline characteristics of the study sample are presented in Chapter II. An analysis of the data is presented in Chapter III, and findings and interpretations are presented and discussed in Chapter IV.

\[1\] Ibid., 93-94.
CHAPTER II
BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Review of the Literature

The primary body of research from which the present study was derived is from that dealing with the "Cornell Study of Student Values." The major findings of the Cornell project are reported in What College Students Think. The authors of the research were seeking information on a wide range of topics such as the students' attitudes toward education, religion, government, social life, sex and marriage, and, most important to the present study, toward the choice of a career. In reporting the results of the latter area, the authors sought to

... examine the kinds of careers the students choose, the motivations behind these choices, ... the meaning they expect their work to have for them, ... some of the rewards and satisfactions they anticipate from their occupational lives, ... the kinds of images each profession calls up in their minds, ... how, in choosing a field, they try to strike a balance between their own estimates of their interests, values, and capabilities, and the demands and rewards they feel each kind of career might entail.

In Rosenberg's work the data from the Cornell study were analyzed in terms of the types of occupations the students were seeking to enter. Rosenberg found that certain items on the questionnaire produced rather consistent

1 Goldsen et al., I.
2 Ibid., xxi-xxii.
differences between responses of students in one field and responses of those in other curricula. The nature of these differences suggested to Rosenberg that there might be certain basic similarities in the attitudes, and therefore in the occupational value orientations, of students in a given field of study.¹

Although Rosenberg did not focus his analysis upon any one specific field of study, he points up certain characteristics of the group of social work students in the study sample which differentiated them from the other groups in varying degrees. For example, it was found that the social work students were high in their faith in people, in their interest in working with people instead of things in a job setting,³ and in their tendency to be compliant in their dealings with others.⁴ On the other hand, they were significantly low in their concern with acquiring money and status in the community.⁵ In another article, Rosenberg demonstrates the negative correlation between faith in people and the desire to get ahead in life, termed success orientation, which, therefore, also has significance in differentiating them from the other students.⁶

In a study along lines somewhat similar to the present research, Lundberg and Kidneigh asked the question

Is there relative homogeneity among social work students along certain measurable dimensions of personal and social characteristics and, if so, do social work students differ from students in other professions in these characteristics?¹

The sample consisted of entering social work students, and a control group of students at a comparable level in education, nursing, engineering, law, library science and psychology. The social work students were found to have made their occupational choices later in life than had students in the control group and to have felt less parental support in that choice. In contrast to the control group, there were no significant differences between social work students with prior work experience and those new to the field. On the whole, then, this study lends credence to the expectation that there are certain differences between social work students and those in other curricula and further suggests a relative homogeneity within the group oriented to social work.

Setting of the Study

As was indicated earlier, the sample for this study was derived entirely from the student body of Fresno State College. The school is located in the city of Fresno in the San Joaquin Valley, at the geographic center of California. As the county seat and largest metropolitan area within the county, Fresno is the center of financial and industrial, as

well as political activity for the entire central valley region.

Fresno State College is the primary institution of higher learning in the central valley area. The school, at the time of this study, had an enrollment of 8,847 students, of which 5,005 (56.5%) were men and 3,842 (43.5%) were women. The student body was drawn primarily from the central valley region and a great majority of the students were residents of Fresno and its neighboring communities. Thus, the characteristics of the student body should have been reflective of the community from which most of its students were drawn. The median age of Fresno's population was a young 29.6 years; the average income per household was $7,230 and the average size of a household was 3.01 persons.

Thus it can be seen that, on the average, residents of the city were young middle class individuals and that family units were small. In addition, due to the strong agrarian oriented influence within the community, Fresno could be considered basically conservative in its thinking.

Description of the Study Sample

The total number of questionnaires mailed to students selected for the study was 198, or 2.24 per cent of the

1Interview with secretary, Fresno State College Student Records Office, March 14, 1967.
2"Facts and Figures" (Fresno County and City Chamber of Commerce, 1966), pp. 1-2.
total student body. Of this number, 162 (81.8%) completed and usable questionnaires were returned. The six baseline characteristics describing the sample were: age, sex, ethnic origin, marital status, religion, and social class origin (TABLE 1).

From the tabulated data it is evident that there was a concentration of respondents at the lower end of the age range; nearly one-half (46.3%) of there were either 21 or 22 years of age. An additional 52 (32.1%) students were between 23 and 29 years old. Of the remaining sample, 24 (20.9%) were over the age of 30 while only one student was below the age of 21. These findings indicate that, for the total sample, more than three-fourths (78.4%) of the students fell within the range from 21 to 29 years of age, as might have been expected with a sample composed entirely of college students.

The number of men and women in the study sample was approximately equal. There were 88 (54.3%) men as compared with 74 (45.7%) women. This distribution, it was noted, corresponded closely with the ratio of men to women in the Fresno State College student body as a whole, which was 56.5 per cent men and 43.5 per cent women. The study sample was composed of a preponderance of Caucasians (88.3%). The number of Orientals, 10 (6.2%), and Negroes, 9 (5.5%), together comprised less than one-eighth of the sample. By comparison, in Fresno County, 88 per cent of the

1See appendix C for flow chart.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Items</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number (N = 162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 22</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 - 24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^a)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^b)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class Origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Included those listing themselves as widowed, separated, and divorced.

\(^b\) Included three listing themselves as members of the Jewish faith.
population was Caucasian, 8 per cent was Negro and the remaining 4 per cent was Oriental. Thus, although the latter two groups represent the same total percentage in the student body as in the county population, there was a shift in the ratio of Negroes to Orientals enrolled in Fresno State College who took part in this study.

More than one-half (54.3%) of the students indicated their religious affiliation as Protestant, and another 20 per cent listed themselves as Catholics. Of the remaining 41 students, 18 (11.2%) had other religious affiliations, including 3 who were of the Jewish faith. Interestingly, more than 14 per cent of the study sample indicated that they had no religious affiliation.

There was a concentration of students from middle class backgrounds. Class III\(^1\), with 52 (32.1%) students, had the largest concentration, while Class IV had slightly less, 44, or 27.2 per cent. There were almost equal numbers in each of the remaining three classes; Class I had 24 students (14.8%), Class II had 20 (12.3%), and 22 (13.6%) were in Class V. Thus, although 96 of the 162 students in the total sample were from middle or upper class backgrounds, two-fifths (40.8%) were from lower class origins.

In considering the study sample as a whole, it appears that the students were mainly under the age of 30, with a large concentration in the 21 and 22 year old range. They were predominantly single, middle class Caucasians, and

\(^1\text{See Hollingshead, pp. 1-6, for definitions of Social Classes I through V.}\)
a majority were of the Protestant faith. The sample was composed of slightly more men than women.

The study sample was trichotomized by field of study, nonwelfare undergraduates in business, art and engineering, social welfare undergraduates, and first-year social work graduate students and cross tabulated by the six baseline characteristics (TABLE 2). Of the six characteristics, four significantly differentiated the trichotomized study sample. The two remaining characteristics, ethnic origin and social class origin, while not significant at the .05 level, both indicated certain tendencies in the subsamples. With regard to ethnic origin, while the proportion of Caucasians and Orientals in each of the three groups were similar, there was a higher number of Negroes among the graduate students than in either of the undergraduate groups. There were, in fact, no Negroes among the 59 business, art, and engineering students. Of slightly less significance, statistically, was the difference in the three groups on the basis of social class origin. In the graduate group there were more than twice as many students (.246) from upper class backgrounds as in the nonwelfare group (.119) and almost four times as many as among the welfare students (.065). On the whole, there was a slightly greater tendency toward lower class origin among the welfare undergraduates than in the other two groups.

The greatest difference among the three groups was
the age distribution. Almost three-fifths (.593) of the nonwelfare students were in the 21-to-22-year-old range, and more than three-fourths (.783) of the welfare undergraduates were in this range. By comparison, only 4 (.070) of the graduate students were 22 years old or younger. On the other hand, nearly one out of three (.316) of the graduates was from 25 to 29 years of age whereas only 5 (.085) and 3 (.065) of the nonwelfare and welfare undergraduates, respectively, were in this age group. Almost one-half of the graduate students (.456) were over the age of 30 while, again, 5 nonwelfare undergraduates (.085) and 3 welfare undergraduates (.065) were this age or older. It can be seen that although there were slightly more nonwelfare students (.220) in the 23-to-24-year-old group than welfare students (.087), the two groups were rather similar in their age breakdowns, in contrast to the relatively older and less concentrated distribution of the graduate students. The age difference between the undergraduates and graduate students is not surprising, since the latter may be expected to be older, for the most part, than students at the undergraduate level. The degree of difference between the median ages for the undergraduates, 22, for both groups, and the graduates, 29, indicates that the latter group probably had a certain amount of work experience between graduation from college and entrance into graduate school.

\[1_{\text{Age}}, \quad 2 = 75.661, 12 \text{ d.f.}, \quad P \approx .001.\]
With regard to the second item, sex, there were almost three times as many males (.746) as females (.254) in the nonwelfare group.¹ A possible explanation is the fact that two of the majors comprising this group, business and engineering, attract males almost exclusively. The reverse was found in the welfare group where nearly two-thirds (.652) of the students were females as compared to only 16 (.348) males. The graduates were composed of almost exactly equal numbers of males (.491) and females (.509).

Proportionately, there were nearly equal numbers of single and married students in the nonwelfare (.729 and .254 respectively) and welfare (.783 and .196) groups.² There was only one student in each group in the divorced, widowed, and separated category. By contrast, more than one-half (.561) of the graduate students were married as compared with only 20 (.351) single graduates and 5 (.088) in the "Other" group. The fact that more graduates are married than are the undergraduates is probably related to the relatively younger age of the undergraduates.

Finally, one item, religion, was significant at the .05 level.³ It can be seen that there were approximately equal numbers of Protestant students, proportionately, in each of the three groups. More than one-half of the students in each group, 34 (.576) nonwelfare, 25 (.543) welfare, and

1 Sex. \( \chi^2 = 17.453, \) 2 d.f., \( P < .001. \)

2 Marital status. \( \chi^2 = 26.009, \) 4 d.f., \( P < .001. \)

3 Religion. \( \chi^2 = 12.878, \) 6 d.f., \( .05 > P > .02. \)
29 (.509) graduates were tabulated in this category. Slightly greater differences were found within the Catholic category; this religious affiliation claimed 15 (.254) in the nonwelfare group, 9 (.196) of the welfare students, and 9 (.158) of the graduates. With regard to the proportion of undergraduate students listing themselves as having other religious affiliations, in the nonwelfare group, 7 (.119), and in the welfare group, 7 (.152), identified with this classification, while only 4 (.070) of the graduates listed themselves thus. The greatest difference, and that which is primarily responsible for the statistical significance of the differences found on this item, is in the number of students in the three groups who listed themselves as having no religious affiliation. More than one-fourth of the graduate students (.263) listed themselves in this category as compared with only 3 (.050) in the nonwelfare group and 5 (.109) in the welfare group.

In summary, when the chi square test for the significance of the difference was computed for the six baseline characteristics, four of the six items were found to differentiate the three student groups at the .05 level of significance or below, indicating that the differences could not have occurred by chance. Two of the items, ethnic origin and social class origin, although not significant, also indicated a tendency toward differentiation of the three groups. Thus, it may be concluded that the three subsamples were dissimilar in distribution when cross
tabulated by the six baseline characteristics. These differences may have significance for the groups' degrees of conformity to the social work value orientation complex as indicated by their responses to the questionnaire.

In Chapter III a statistical analysis of the responses to the questionnaire by the three subsamples is discussed. Certain of the baseline characteristics are reexamined for their effect upon the pattern of responses. Interpretation of these findings is presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER III
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter is divided into two sections. In the first section, profiles of the student's responses to questionnaire items comprising the four scales of the social work value orientation complex are presented. The scores obtained by the three subsamples on the four value scales are presented and analyzed in the second section.

Responses to Questionnaire Items

As noted earlier, there are five questions constituting the Faith in People scale. The three subsamples were cross tabulated by responses to these questions and the chi square test for the significance of the difference was computed for each question (TABLE 3). Examination of the table reveals that differences in response to four of the five questions in the scale are significant at the .001 level. In response to question 9, a fairly large proportion of welfare (.717) and social work (.702) students scored high, disagreeing with the statement that people would take advantage of them, while relatively few of the nonwelfare students (.237) responded this way. More than one-half (.593) of the nonwelfare students agreed with the statement
and the difference in response accounted for the .001 level of significance on the question. A large proportion of each subsample agreed with the statement that, "Human nature is fundamentally cooperative . . .," question 11, and consequently the question failed to differentiate them at the .05 level. Again, on question 13, the welfare and social work students disagreed, for the most part (.826 and .860, respectively), with the statement that no one would care about them, and slightly more than one-third (.339) of the nonwelfare students agreed with the statement. The probability value exceeded .001 on this question. On question 15, contrary to the expected response, more of the nonwelfare students (.881) believed that people would be inclined to help others than did either the welfare (.141) or the social work students (.474), and the probability value was again highly significant. A relatively large proportion of students in all three subsamples agreed, on question 18, that people can be trusted; nevertheless, the differences between the three subsamples were sufficiently great that the question differentiated them at the .001 level.

When the responses to the seven interest areas of the Job Orientation scale were cross tabulated by the three subsamples and the results analyzed by the chi square test, several significant differences were noted (TABLE 4). In his study of these areas, Rosenberg found that the interest areas related to one another in clusters or "value
orientations." Rosenberg termed these orientations "self-expression," "extrinsic reward," and "people."¹ In the following discussion, items are considered in terms of these clusters. It should be kept in mind with regard to the scoring of choices, that this section, like the others, was scored according to the predicted conformity to the social work value orientation complex. Thus, if a person considered to be of great importance to him an interest area which was of little importance according to the complex, he would receive a low score for that choice.

Under the self-expression cluster, on the first item, the opportunity to use abilities and aptitudes, a large proportion of all three subsamples received a low score, rating it as of great importance to them. The welfare students had the largest proportion (.283) rating it as of moderate importance, and only one student, in the nonwelfare subsample, considered it of little importance. The probability value, between .20 and .10, was not significant. With regard to the opportunity to be creative, the pattern of response was markedly similar to the previous item. Again, the welfare subsample showed the largest proportion of students (.457) scoring high on this factor. One-half or more of each subsample rated creativity of great importance and few rated it of little importance. The item differentiated the students at a slightly higher probability

¹Rosenberg, pp. 11-13.
value, between .10 and .05, but still not significant. Thus, neither self-expression item significantly differentiated the three subsamples.

With regard to extrinsic reward items, the chance to earn money was considered of little importance to less than one-fourth of the students in each subsample. Nearly equal numbers, proportionately, of the welfare (.630) and social work (.632) students rated it as of moderate importance, while only slightly less of the nonwelfare students (.559) responded similarly. More than one-third of the latter subsample considered it of great importance, however, so that the probability value was significant below the .05 level. Again, with regard to status, nearly equal numbers of nonwelfare (.356) and social work students (.333) placed little importance on this factor, and therefore scored high, while nearly one-half of the welfare students (.467) were in this category. For the nonwelfare and social work students approximately one-half or more assigned a moderate importance to status, while slightly fewer welfare students (.422) rated it thus than rated it of little importance (.467). The probability value was between .10 and .05 on this item. A small proportion of the two undergraduate subsamples considered a secure future of little importance, which, according to the complex, was the high score alternative; slightly more of the social work students (.140) rated it thus. More than three-fourths of all students rated security as of moderate or great importance.
Of these, relatively more of the nonwelfare students scored low on the item, indicating it to be of great importance, while more than one-half of the welfare (.652) and social work students (.561) rated it as moderate. The differences were significant at between the .01 and .001 level. Thus, two of the three extrinsic reward items, money and security, significantly differentiated the three subsamples.

In the people-oriented cluster, as might be expected, a large proportion of both the welfare (.978) and social work students (.860) scored high, rating work with people as being of great importance to them. Few of the welfare and social work students considered it of moderate importance and none rated it of little importance. By contrast, the nonwelfare students were more equally spread over the three choices, with the largest proportion (.441) rating it as of moderate importance. This item was found to significantly differentiate the three subsamples at the .001 level. A quite similar pattern of responses is present for the helpfulness item. Slightly more social work students (.877) than welfare students (.848) rated it of great importance, while only 22 (.373) nonwelfare students rated it thus. Again, the largest proportion of the nonwelfare students (.559) rated it as moderate, and the probability value was again at the .001 level. Therefore, both of the people-oriented items significantly differentiated the three subsamples at the .001 level.
In contrast to the above, when students in the three subsamples were cross tabulated by their responses to the three questions of the Compliance Preference scale (TABLE 5), the chi square test indicated little significance for any one of the questions. With regard to question 16, less than one student in ten in each of the three subsamples indicated that he strongly disliked having to give orders to others, the high score choice. More than one-half of the students (.559 nonwelfare, .609 welfare, and .596 social work) indicated that they were a little bothered by giving orders and approximately one-third of each subsample were not at all bothered by it. The probability value for the differences was extremely low, between .98 and .95, indicating that the findings were almost certainly due to chance alone. On question 19, the significance level was only slightly higher, with a probability value of somewhat less than .90. The pattern of responses was quite similar to that of the previous question, with more than one-half of the students in each subsample indicating that they have a slight dislike to being given orders by others. Again, only slightly more than one in ten in each subsample indicated a strong dislike to receiving orders from others. In response to the question of the importance of being liked by people, a large proportion, more than two-thirds of each subsample, chose the second highest alternative, indicating it to be fairly important to them. Approximately equal numbers, proportionately, believed it to be very important,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Nonwelfare Undergraduates</th>
<th>Welfare Undergraduates</th>
<th>Social Work Graduates</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Dislike receiving orders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Importance of being liked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly important</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly unimportant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unimportant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 > .98$
the high score choice, or fairly unimportant to them, and only two nonwelfare and one each of the welfare and social work students considered it very unimportant. The probability value on this question was again between .98 and .95. Thus, none of the questions on this scale even tended toward significance.

Finally, for the Success Orientation scale, responses to the five questions included in it were cross tabulated as in the previous tables and the significance of the differences computed by the chi square test (TABLE 6). In response to a statement that, "It's who you know that counts . . . ," a large proportion of the social work students (.789) disagreed. Slightly less of the welfare students (.674) scored high, and the responses of the nonwelfare students were more evenly distributed over the three choices, with more than one-fourth (.208) agreeing with the statement. The probability value exceeded .001 for this item. Question 12, which stated, "In order to get ahead . . . you can't afford to be squeamish about the means you use," also differentiated the three subsamples at the .001 level. Again, the social work students had the largest number, proportionately, (.947) who received a high score, disagreeing with the statement, while the two undergraduate subsamples had slightly less (.627 nonwelfare and .761 welfare) but still more than one-half responding similarly. Students in the welfare and social work subsamples responded
to question 14 in somewhat the same pattern as they did to
the previous question. In the nonwelfare subsample, however,
more than one-half (.525) of the students agreed that it is
important to make people do what one wants in order to get
ahead. The difference in response between the nonwelfare
subsample and the two others is primarily responsible for
the .001 level of significance on this question. Question
17, which asked what the student wants most to be, was not
significant at the .05 level. Roughly equal numbers,
proportionately, of students in all three subsamples
indicated a desire to be liked, the high score choice, and
to be successful, the low score choice. However, slightly
more of the nonwelfare students (.356) indicated an interest
in success than in the other two choices, in contrast to the
welfare (.217) and social work (.246) subsamples, where
fewer chose this alternative. With regard to the importance
of getting ahead, question 21, the welfare and social work
students again showed similar profiles of responses, with
nearly two-thirds (.652 and .649, respectively) seeing
success as fairly important. The nonwelfare students saw
success as slightly more desirable, with nearly one-half
(.458) indicating it to be very important to them, and only
a small proportion seeing it as fairly (.102) or very (.017)
unimportant. The question differentiated the three subsamples
at the .05 level. For the scale as a whole, four of the five
questions significantly differentiated the three subsamples,
three of them at the .001 level.
Analysis of Mean Scores

As was discussed in Chapter II, questionnaires were scored on the basis of the degree of conformity of each weighted answer to the response predicted to be most closely congruent with the social work value orientation complex. Scores were totaled for each of the four scales on each questionnaire, and the scale scores added to provide a total score for the value scales and for the total; means were computed for the three subsamples, and standard deviations for the scales were also computed (TABLE 7). The social work students scored highest on two of the four scales, Faith in People and Success Orientation, followed by the welfare and nonwelfare undergraduates. On both scales, the social work and welfare student's scores were relatively close together compared to the difference between their scores and those of the nonwelfare students. The graduate students also indicated a greater degree of central tendency on both scales, as reflected in the smaller standard deviations, than did the other two subsamples. The standard deviation of the nonwelfare students on the Faith in People scale was the highest for any subsample on any of the four scales. By contrast, the standard deviations of the three subsamples on the Compliance Preference scale were smaller than for any other scale, and of these the graduate students had the narrowest deviation. The pattern of responses on this scale was the reverse of the previous two; however, the relative
TABLE 7

ONE-HUNDRED SIXTY-TWO NONWELFARE, WELFARE, AND SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS BY FOUR SCALES OF THE SOCIAL WORK VALUE ORIENTATION COMPLEX: MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith in People</td>
<td>13.52 ±4.93</td>
<td>16.99 ±3.85</td>
<td>17.41 ±3.79</td>
<td>15.89 ±3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Orientation</td>
<td>18.36 ±3.73</td>
<td>24.01 ±3.99</td>
<td>22.60 ±3.10</td>
<td>21.43 ±3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Preference</td>
<td>10.76 ±1.88</td>
<td>10.72 ±1.75</td>
<td>10.68 ±1.67</td>
<td>10.75 ±1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>57.52a</td>
<td>70.95a</td>
<td>70.06a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aTotal scores may not equal total of mean scores due to rounding off.

difference between the mean scores was slight. For the Job Orientation scale the pattern of responses was again different. The welfare undergraduates scored highest, followed by the social work graduates and then by the nonwelfare students. The same pattern is present in the total scores for the complex, although the difference between the social work and welfare students is rather small, and suggests that the fact that the welfare students had the highest scores is related their high scores on the Job
Orientation scale. Again, it can be seen that the relative difference between the social work and welfare students on the total score is small compared to the spread between the nonwelfare and welfare subsamples.

For the purposes of analysis, the sample means for the four scales and the total score were used as cut-off points. The study sample was dichotomized on the basis of the number of persons scoring above and below these means, and the significance of the difference was computed by means of the chi square test (TABLE 8). Scores on three of the scales, Faith in People, Job Orientation, and Success Orientation, were found to differentiate the three subsamples at the .001 level. The remaining scale, Compliance Preference, as might be expected, did not significantly differentiate the three subsamples, and there was only a slight tendency toward significance.

On each of the four scales the proportion of persons scoring above and below the mean was quite similar for the social work and welfare students, with more than one-half scoring above the mean in each instance. By contrast, the nonwelfare students had the reverse trend on all scales except Compliance Preference where the proportion above the mean was only slightly less than for the other two subsamples.

In order to clarify the similarities and differences between the three subsamples in their scores on the four scales, the mean scores of the graduate students were compared with those of the other two subsamples and the
## Table 8

**Study Sample by Value Scales and Scores in Relation to Sample Mean: Chi Square and Probability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Scales</th>
<th>Scores in Relation to Sample Mean</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Proportion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith in People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwelfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwelfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwelfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwelfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwelfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2$ values are calculated to assess the significance of differences between observed and expected scores. The probability values indicate the likelihood that the observed differences are due to chance. Probabilities less than .05 are considered statistically significant.
When the social work students were compared with the nonwelfare students (TABLE 9), significant differences were noted in three of the four scales. The greatest difference between the two subsamples was found on the Job Orientation scale, for which the t-value was 6.66, which was significant at the .001 level. The social work students also had the higher scores on the Faith in People and Success Orientation scales, and while the t-values were somewhat lower than for the Job Orientation scale, the differences in both instances were significant at the .001 level. As was expected, the significance of the difference was tested by the t-test.¹

TABLE 9

MEAN SCORES OF FIFTY-NINE NONWELFARE STUDENTS AND FIFTY-SEVEN SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS BY FOUR VALUE SCALES: T-VALUES AND PROBABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Scales</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonwelfare</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith in People</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Orientation</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Preference</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Orientation</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹For formulae used, see p. 14.
difference in mean scores on the Compliance Preference scale was extremely small by comparison and the difference was found not to be significant at the .05 level. There was, however, some tendency toward significance.

By comparison with the significant differences found between nonwelfare and social work students, when the welfare students were compared with the social work students (TABLE 10), the differences were small. Differences on the Faith

TABLE 10
MEAN SCORES OF FORTY-SIX WELFARE STUDENTS AND FIFTY-SEVEN SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS BY FOUR VALUE SCALES: T-VALUES AND PROBABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Scales</th>
<th>Mean Scores Welfare</th>
<th>Mean Scores Social Work</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith in People</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.40 &gt; P &gt; .30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Orientation</td>
<td>24.01</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>P &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Preference</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>.40 &gt; P &gt; .30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Orientation</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>.30 &gt; P &gt; .20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in People, Compliance Preference, and Success Orientation scales were all below 1.00, and were not found to be significant at the .05 level. For the Faith in People and Compliance Preference scales, the probability values were between .40 and .30, and for the Success Orientation scale,
between .30 and .20. On the Job Orientation scale, although the difference was not so great as were those of the significant differences in the previous table, it was found to be significant at the .05 level. As noted earlier, the mean score on this scale was higher for the welfare subsample.

In examining the baseline characteristics of the study sample, it was noted that several of the items differentiated the three subsamples significantly at the .05 level or below. One of these factors, age, was seen to have a higher probability value than any of the other items. In order to determine the effect which age differences might have on the mean scores of the three subsamples, the median age of the study sample as a whole was computed and the students in each subsample were dichotomized on the basis of their ages in relation to this point. Mean scores were then computed for each set of students in the three subsamples and the differences between the means were indicated (Appendix D). Examination of the differences reveals that in only one instance did the difference between two scores exceed 2.00, this being by the social work students on the Success Orientation scale. It should be kept in mind, with regard to this difference, that there were only four students under 23 years of age in the social work subsample, so that any differences noted may be subject to considerable variation. The only consistency noted with regard to the effect of the age factor on the mean scores was that, for
both the welfare subsample and for the study sample as a whole, the scores were higher for the older students. For the most part, however, the positive and negative differences were sufficiently self-cancelling that for the study sample as a whole, none of the scale score differences were very large.

In summary, responses to questions in three of the four value scales, Faith in People, Job Orientation, and Success Orientation, were found to differentiate the three subsamples at the .001 level of probability. The fourth scale, Compliance Preference, did not significantly differentiate the three subsamples. Differences in mean scores between nonwelfare students and the social work students were found to be significant for the same three scales at the .001 level and not significant for the Compliance Preference scale. Differences between the mean scores of the social work students and the welfare students were significant at the .05 level only for the Job Orientation scale. Age differences were found to account for little of the difference in scores between the three subsamples.

In Chapter IV, the findings of the study will be examined in relation to the hypotheses and basic questions as stated in Chapter I. Interpretations of these findings will be presented, along with suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine certain areas of a college student's value system in order to determine to what extent his choice of a career was associated with his occupational values. More specifically, the intent was to compare occupational values of students differentially oriented to social work in order to discover whether the value orientations of graduate social work students, those most strongly oriented to the profession, would be different from those of students less strongly oriented. The graduate students were therefore compared with students at the undergraduate level in social welfare, defined as being less strongly oriented to social work, and with undergraduates in curricula other than social welfare—business, art, and engineering—who were defined as being not oriented to social work at all.

The study was based on the hypothesis that:

There is a significant difference between undergraduate nonwelfare majors, undergraduate social welfare majors and first-year graduate social work students in their conformity to the social work value orientation complex.

The null hypothesis state that:

There is no significant difference between undergraduate nonwelfare majors, undergraduate social welfare majors, and first-year graduate social work students in their conformity to the social work value orientation complex.
In addition, three basic questions concerning these hypotheses were posed. The first question asked:

What previous research has been done that would tend to confirm the expectation that there would be a difference in the value orientations of students preparing to enter social work as compared to students in other fields of study?

A review of pertinent literature indicated that a number of earlier studies have suggested differences between social work students and those in other areas with regard to occupational values. These values seem to coincide with certain basic characteristics of the profession. The studies revealed that the social work students, when compared with students in nonsocial work majors, have a more positive attitude toward, and interest in, other people. It is, therefore, not surprising to find these students choosing a field such as social work which would allow them the opportunity to be friendly with and helpful to others. The literature also suggested that social work students are relatively less concerned than students in other curricula with the financial remuneration which they would receive from a job. This finding would suggest that much of the reward which a social worker derives from his job is intrinsic to the work itself and that, as a result, he has less need to be concerned with the compensation he receives in the form of outside benefits, such as status and salary. Other studies indicated that these values and attitudes seem to vary little depending upon the degree of one's exposure to the profession, suggesting that they are already developed prior to choosing social work as a field. It
would be interesting to know more about when and how these social attitudes are developed, that is, what factors in a person's social environment influence the development of social work oriented values and attitudes. This would be a good area for future research.

The second question asked:

What were the descriptive characteristics of the study sample as defined by the first eight questions in the questionnaire? Did these questions differentiate the sample when trichotomized by fields of study?

Responses to these questions indicated that more than one-half of the students in the study sample were between twenty-one and twenty-four years of age, were single, Caucasian, Protestant and males, and had been raised in a family of social class III or IV background.1 Four of the six baseline characteristics, age, sex, marital status, and religion significantly differentiated the study sample at or below the .05 level of probability. A larger proportion of the graduate students were above twenty-four years of age, married, and claimed no religious affiliation in comparison to the undergraduates. On the other hand, the graduates showed a more equal distribution of males to females than did the undergraduates, where the nonwelfare students were mostly males and the welfare students were mostly females. Thus, for these items, the hypothesis of no difference (null) may be rejected. The two remaining items, ethnic origin and

1 Hollingshead, p. 5.
social class origin did not significantly differentiate the three subsamples, although there was a tendency toward significance in each instance.

With regard to the students' responses to the weighted section of the questionnaire, it is important to recognize the possible influence of the factors which significantly differentiated the three subsamples, particularly those which differentiated them at the .001 level, on the differences found between the three subsamples. When one of these factors, age, was examined for its effect upon the differences in mean scores of the three subsamples, no conclusive effects were noted. A similar procedure is necessary with reference to the factors of sex, marital status, and religion in order to be certain that differences among the three subsamples on these items are not contributing to the significance of the differences in scores on the weighted section.

Finally, the third question asked:

To what extent did the weighted items in the questionnaire significantly differentiate the trichotomized study sample when cross tabulated?

In order to attempt to answer this question, each of the questionnaire items was considered separately, grouped according to the scale of which it was a part, and the chi square test was computed for the significance of the differences between the three subsamples. On the Faith in People and Success Orientation scales, four out of five questions of each scale produced significant differences at or below the .05 level of probability. On the Job
Orientation scale, four out of seven items significantly differentiated the subsamples at the .05 level or less; whereas, on the Compliance Preference scale, none of the items produced significant differences. When mean scores were computed for each of these scales, it was found that the pattern of responses occurred as predicted on the Faith in People and Success Orientation scales: The social work graduate students scored highest, followed by the welfare and then by the nonwelfare students. Contrary to expectation, the welfare students scored higher than the graduate students on the Job Orientation scale; on the Compliance Preference scale the pattern was the reverse of that predicted, with the nonwelfare students scoring highest and the social work students scoring lowest.

In order to determine the differences in the proportion of students in each subsample indicating a high versus a low conformity to the values in the complex, the subsamples were dichotomized by the sample mean. On this basis, the social work graduate students showed the largest proportion of high conformity responses on all scales but Job Orientation and, therefore, on the total score for the complex also. Thus, the third basic question can be answered affirmatively. The probability that the differences in conformity to the total social work value orientation complex could have occurred by chance is less than .001. In fact, highly significant differences in
conformity occurred on all scales except Compliance Preference, including the Job Orientation scale where the welfare students showed the highest conformity.

When the differences between the mean scores of the nonwelfare and the social work students were tested by the t-test, they were found to be highly significant for all scales except Compliance Preference, where the nonwelfare students obtained slightly higher scores. On the other hand, there was a significant difference between the scores of welfare and social work students on only one scale, Job Orientation. This finding suggests that the occupational value orientations of the undergraduate welfare students are quite similar to those of the supposedly more strongly social work oriented graduate students. This conclusion, if valid, would support the findings of Varley, who found little change in students' values as a result of exposure to graduate social work training, and of Lundberg and Kidneigh, who found relative homogeneity among social work students regardless of prior experience in the field. The above findings suggest that social work students, as well as students in other curricula, may have their value systems well established before committing themselves to their occupational goal, so that their commitments are in response to a need to fulfill goals established by this value system.

With regard to the Job Orientation scale, on which, contrary to the predicted outcome, the welfare students
outscored the social work graduates, it appears that the basis for scoring the responses was inappropriate. The scoring system, unlike other research utilizing Rosenberg's Occupation Values Scale, was based on an extrapolation of Rosenberg's findings that social work students scored high on people-oriented factors, medium to low on self-expression factors, and low on extrinsic reward factors. Although the social work oriented students—both welfare and social work—indicated a high interest in people-oriented work, they were also highly interested in opportunities for self-expression, which were given a low score. Furthermore, although they did not have as great an interest in extrinsic reward factors as the nonwelfare students, they did indicate such rewards to be of moderate interest to them. This finding seems to be somewhat contradictory to the statement that social workers are disinterested in extrinsic rewards derived from their work. The answer to the contradiction apparently lies in the fact that the difference between nonsocial work and social work students on this factor is relative. That is, the social work students feel less interest, rather than no interest, in gaining extrinsic rewards for their services. Where the nonsocial work oriented student places primary importance upon this factor, it is secondary to other factors for the social work student. It is difficult, in fact, to conceive of an individual, student or otherwise, who is conditioned to respect the American ideal of material
wealth as an indication of achievement, who would show no desire to maximize his returns for service rendered. Furthermore, in response to the comment that the social work student indicates a low interest in extrinsic rewards because he "ought to," there is no less reason to believe that the nonsocial work oriented student would also respond to a perceived obligation or that the obligation is so much different from that of social work oriented students. Without research to examine this issue, however, such statements are in the realm of speculation.

Finally, with regard to the Compliance Preference scale, it appears that, either the items comprising the scale were not sufficiently powerful to differentiate the three subsamples, the students in the study sample were not representative of the population from which they were drawn, or, contrary to previous research findings, there is no actual difference between social work and nonsocial work oriented students in their preference for compliant interpersonal relationships. One other possibility remains, suggested by the pattern of responses to the scale, that, in fact, the social work oriented students are less desirous of compliant relationships than are other students. More research is needed to clarify the question of compliance preference.

In summary, the social work oriented students were found to be significantly different from nonsocial work
oriented students in their conformity to all but one of the values contained in the hypothesized social work value orientation complex. Furthermore, the social welfare and social work students were found not to be significantly different in their value orientations regardless of the supposed differences in their commitments to the profession. This study, thus, lends support to the previous research findings which suggest, first, the existence of certain differences in value orientation between students in nonsocial work oriented and social work oriented curricula; and, second, relative homogeneity among the latter. More important, the findings of this study may also give a somewhat better focus to the problem of establishing a basis for recruitment efforts for potential social work students, and, perhaps, provide a clue to the establishment of improved criteria for admissions decisions regarding these prospective social workers.
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