

44



129
646
THS

THE INFLUENCE OF SECOND YEAR
FIELD WORK PLACEMENT UPON
ULTIMATE EMPLOYMENT OF STUDENTS
GRADUATED FROM SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL
WORK USING THE GENERIC CURRICULUM

By
Jesse Clermon Vickers



THESIS



THE INFLUENCE OF SECOND YEAR FIELD WORK PLACEMENT
UPON ULTIMATE EMPLOYMENT OF STUDENTS GRADUATED
FROM SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK USING
THE GENERIC CURRICULUM

by

Jesse Clermon Vickers

A PROJECT REPORT

Submitted to the School of Social Work
Michigan State University in
Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

June

1958

Approved:

Morris Gluckin
Chairman, Research Committee

Ernest B. Haysler
Director of School

G47229
12-28-67

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express appreciation to all those who made the completion of this project report possible.

Especially he wishes to thank Mr. Morris Gluckin, Chainman of his committee, and Mr. Manfred Lilliefors for their valuable suggestions and their encouraging support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.	ii
LIST OF TABLES.	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND CURRENT OPINION.	4
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	7
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	10
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	23
Major Findings	
Secondary Findings	
Recommendations	
APPENDICES	27
BIBLIOGRAPHY	33

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Sex of Students Receiving Masters of Social Work Degrees from Selected Generic Schools, 1952, 1954, 1956.	10
2.	Age of Students at Time of Receipt of Master of Social Work Degrees from Selected Generic Schools, 1952, 1954, 1956.	11
3.	Undergraduate Majors of Social Workers Receiving their Master of Social Work Degrees from Selected Generic Schools 1952, 1954, 1956.	12
4.	Second Year Field Placement, First Employment, and Most Important Factor Influencing Job Selections, All Students	14
5.	Employment in Field of Second Year Placement, First Employment, and Ultimate Employment and Most Important Factors Influencing Job Selection of Each	17
6.	Students With Previous Social Work Employment, by Field of Interest, Second Year Placement, Ultimate Employment and Most Important Factor in Job Selection.	20
7.	Field of Second Year Placement and Those Remaining in This Same Field for First Employment Following Graduation from Selected Generic Schools, 1952, 1954, 1956.	21
8.	Field of Ultimate Employment, by School, of Graduates Receiving Master of Social Work Degrees from Selected Generic Schools 1952, 1954, 1956.	21

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For the past several years there has been, in the minds of our educators, the question of the relative merits of a specialized versus a generic curriculum in preparing students for the social work profession.¹ Much was said and written concerning this controversy but no actual decision was made until 1956.

On January 14, 1956 the Committee on Specialization in Social Work Education adopted the changed policy as stated below and recommended it to the Commission on Accreditation of the Council on Social Work Education.

This Committee recommends that a school of social work be accredited for its basic generic curriculum and that there be no accrediting for any specialization by any definition.²

¹The term generic curriculum as used herein does not mean that portion of the curriculum which is basic to all social work, but a curriculum which is basic to all social work and does not contain elements of specialization. It is a curriculum containing the basic items that all social workers need to know, to do, and to be.

The above is in contrast to the authors use of specialization, which is; A curriculum designed to instill competence in one area, with the general assumption that this competence is not transferable.

²Ruth E. Smalley, Specialization in Social Work Education. A paper presented at the 83rd Annual Forum of the National Conference of Social Work, St. Louis, Missouri, May 1956. Reproduced by the Council on Social Work Education in a pamphlet #6-64-3.

The Board and Council of Delegates adopted this changed policy, with respect to approval of specialized programs in social work education. It is anticipated that approval of specialized programs will be discontinued in June, 1959.³

The above, at a first glance, may seem to have but a remote connection with the subject matter of this paper. It was, however, the basic reason for this project being done, in that it posed a serious question. Would the policy of approval of a school's generic curriculum only, solve the problem of specialization, or would the second year field placement assume control over the field of ultimate employment in a method similar to specialization? Answering the above might also bring an answer to the question of why certain fields of social work have much greater success in their recruitment of employees than others, even when comparable salaries and working conditions were offered. In order to answer this first question it is necessary to know the extent of influence which the second year field placement exerts upon ultimate employment.

The study was planned to enable schools of social work to make better use of available placements and to bring to the school the realization of the importance of this second year field placement.

The data, upon which the study is based, were obtained through a questionnaire mailed to persons who

³Social Work Education, Bi-monthly News Publication, Council on Social Work Education, August 1957.

received their Master of Social Work degrees from schools having a generic curriculum only. Selection of the sample was determined by not only the criteria of the generic curriculum, but also by the geographic location of the school within the nation. There was limitation in this selection because of the few schools offering these curricula. It is felt, however, that those schools selected are representative of the different areas of the country and constitute a sample sufficient for the purpose needed.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND CURRENT OPINION

So far as a search of current literature could determine there has been no research done on the specific relationship of second year field placement in social work to ultimate employment.

Mr. David G. French of the University of Michigan Coordinating Committee on Social Welfare Research conducted a Survey of Employment Status, as of October 1, 1957, of Social Work Students Who Were Enrolled in the Spring Semester or Quarter, 1957. It was found, however, through correspondence with Mr. French that there would be no duplication of effort or findings in the two projects since his did not deal in any way with placement (See Appendix A).

The importance of field work placement has long been recognized and was aptly emphasized by Lyndell Scott when he stated that, "Field work, in some form, is an almost universal characteristic of education for a profession."¹ Specifically, in reference to social work, Scott writes:

That a given field work experience will be weighted in a certain direction is, of course, inevitable and desirable. In the second year of training, this

¹Lyndell Scott, "The Function of Field Work in Professional Education," The Social Service Review, XXV (December, 1951), p. 441.

weighing can provide the basis for selective placement or specialization, with consideration given to interest and special aptitude.²

Dorothy Sumner, writing five years after Scott and speaking strictly of field work in generic social work said:

Field work content, in order to make the fullest contribution to professional education, should have sufficient breadth to enable the student to see his practice in relation to the community and the entire social work profession rather than an isolated and narrowly focused technical skill.³

The extent to which this content is brought to reality would seem to depend upon the experience and attitude of the field work supervisor and the student.

Several studies have been done on job satisfaction. These writers have very successfully explained the factors which tend to make a person satisfied on his job but few if any have explained why he took the job in the first place.

In studies on job satisfaction Trier found that, "Workers receiving higher wages were significantly more satisfied,"⁴ and Eicher states that, "In terms of this study, job satisfaction was found to be positively related

²Ibid., p. 447.

³Dorothy Sumner, "An Experiment with Field Work in Generic Social Work," Social Case Work, XXXVII, Number 6 (June, 1956), p. 291.

⁴Howard E. Trier, "Job Satisfaction and Occupational Status" (unpublished Master's thesis, Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1954), p. 34.

to occupational prestige, upward occupational mobility and high social position."⁵

If the factors which make a person satisfied on a job are related to the reason for choosing a job then these points should be brought out by this study also.

⁵Joanne Bubolz Eicher, "Job Satisfaction, Its Relationship to Occupation Stratification and Community Variables" (unpublished Master's thesis, Sociology and Anthropology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1956), p. 96.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

A list of accredited schools of social work showing their curriculum as to specialization was obtained from the Council on Social Work Education. From this list four schools were selected whose curricula were generic, in that there were no accredited specializations.

Those chosen and the area they represent were: Michigan State University, North Central; University of Texas, South Central; University of Utah, West; and University of West Virginia, East.

In order to obtain a sample large enough to be valid it was decided that three graduating classes would be used. At the time this study was started, in October, 1957, it was felt that it might be too early to obtain an accurate list of all the graduates of that year. Since it was believed that alternate classes should be used because this would constitute a greater span, the graduating classes of 1952, 1954, and 1956 were chosen. Letters were written to the schools concerned, requesting a listing of their graduated Masters' of Social Work of these years. A copy of the study was promised to each of the schools in return for these lists. Their co-operation was very prompt with a great deal of interest being shown in the study.

The questionnaire was prepared and submitted to the criticism of a research class of second year graduate social work students. This class together with the instructor offered constructive criticism and advice which greatly aided in the construction of the final questionnaire. This final product contained twelve questions, all but four of which were of the multiple choice type (See Appendix B).

The response to the questionnaire was excellent with an eighty-four per cent completed return (98 of 114 which reached the persons to whom sent). Of these ninety-eight, forty-two per cent made a comment in the space provided at the end of the questionnaire. The promptness of the replies and the high percentage of comments shows a definite interest in the subject.

In establishing the validity of the questionnaire, it, as is often the case where the questions require one to look back over an experience, depends upon the element of memory. Question six, principle field of interest upon entering graduate study, and questions ten and twelve, factors influencing acceptance of employment, are highly dependent upon memory and an analysis of ones motives which might be colored by experiences which have occurred since that time. There is, however, no other way of obtaining this information and so one might say that the results are as valid as the human element will permit it to be. Size of the sample and percentage of return also tend to lend validity to the project.

The use of graduates of Michigan State University might be thought to influence the findings, especially in connection with that part of question eight, assigned by school with no choice on your part. This, however, did not prove to be the case since those checking this category were in proportion to the other schools according to sample size.

The cover letter accompanying the questionnaire (See Appendix C) assured the respondent of his anonymity in the total study. The name of the person answering the questionnaire was not asked for, nor was the questionnaire coded in any manner.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The original plan of this paper was to treat the subject by geographic area. This idea, however, had to be abandoned when a tabulation of data showed no great difference in a division of this sort. In view of this, the data will be presented in tota and with respect to individual schools only in specific instances.

One of these instances of difference was in the age-sex distribution of the sample, and this only insofar as the University of Texas was concerned (Tables 1 and 2). Here it will be seen that the University of Texas was the only school with a majority of students under thirty years of age and also the only school to have graduated more women than men. These facts, however, did not seem to affect a difference in any phase of the study.

TABLE 1.-- Sex of Students Receiving Masters of Social Work Degrees from Selected Generic Schools, 1952, 1954, 1956.

School	Total	Male	Female
Total	98	60	38
University of Utah	37	29	8
University of Texas	26	10	16
Michigan State University	23	14	9
University of West Virginia	12	7	5

TABLE 2.--Age of Students at Time of Receipt of Master of Social Work Degrees from Selected Generic Schools, 1952, 1954, and 1956.

School	Total	Under 30	30 and Over
Total	98	48	50
University of Utah	37	15	22
University of Texas	26	17	9
Michigan State University	23	12	11
University of West Virginia	12	4	8

An interesting sidelight to the study is the undergraduate majors of members of the sample (See Table 3). Here we see that eighty-five of the ninety-eight sample members had an undergraduate major in social sciences, with sociology accounting for more than half of these.

Only nine sample members had an undergraduate major in social work with six of these being from Michigan State University. Since the school where the undergraduate major was obtained is unknown it cannot be determined if a social work major was offered. One point of significance is that of these nine persons with undergraduate majors in social work, eight were under thirty years of age at the time of receiving their Master of Social Work degrees. Perhaps this indicates a trend or perhaps only that undergraduate degrees in social work were not being offered so profusely at the time those over thirty attended undergraduate school.

TABLE 3.--Undergraduate Majors of Social Workers Receiving Their Master of Social Work Degrees from Selected Generic Schools, 1952, 1954, 1956.

Undergraduate Major	Total	University of Utah		University of Texas		Michigan State University		University of West Virginia	
		Under 30	30 & Over	Under 30	30 & Over	Under 30	30 & Over	Under 30	30 & Over
Total	98	15	22	17	9	12	11	4	8
Sociology	44	10	18	10	2	1	2	1	-
Psychology	15	2	-	4	3	4	1	1	-
Education	9	1	-	1	1	1	2	-	3
Social Work	9	1	-	-	-	5	1	2	-
History	5	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	2
English	3	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-
Home Economics	2	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-
Economics	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Engineering	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Literature	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Mathematics	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Physical Education	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Philosophy	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Pharmacy	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Rehabilitation	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Religion	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Social Administration	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Zoology	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-

In answering the direct question as to factors influencing acceptance of ultimate employment only three placed the second year placement as being the most important (Table 4). In writing in remarks, in the space provided on the questionnaire, however, twenty-six listed second year placement as a great influence in this job selection. In these remarks, the University of Utah, even though it constituted the largest section of the sample, ranked this influencing factor lowest. There seems to be no significant reasons for this since there is not great difference in the number of this school's graduates now employed in the same field as their second year placements.

Influence of the second year placement was, as shown in the written remarks, negative as well as positive. On the positive side one Michigan State University graduate wrote:

I personally feel that the second year placement, for the most part, largely determines the choice of employment. The availability of a stipend (fellowship) was certainly another determining factor. I think I would have stayed in family social work had the agency been prepared to equalize the salary, working conditions, etc. presented by my current position. I think factors such as salary etc. force changes, but the original influence is still there.

The person writing the above remark listed public welfare as his original interest. His second year field placement was in family social work because of a stipend. His first employment was in family social work to fulfill his obligation but he changed to teaching (in social work) being influenced by salary.

TABLE 4.--Second Year Field Placement, First Employment and Most Important Factor Influencing Job Selection, All Students.

Item	Total	Second Year Field Placement	
		Own First Choice	Other
Total	98	63	35
<u>Ultimate Employment</u>			
In Field of Second Year Placement	40	28	12
In Some Other Field	58	35	23
<u>Most Important Factor Influencing Job Selection</u>			
Field of Interest	47	30	17
Salary	15	9	6
Commitment	5	3	2
Lack of Other Suitable Employment	4	4	-
Locale of Agency	4	2	2
Personnel of Agency	4	2	2
Influence of Faculty Member	3	1	2
Second Year Placement	3	2	1
Status	3	3	-
Working Conditions	3	2	1
Previous Employment	2	2	-
Relative (other than spouse)	1	1	-
First Year Placement	1	-	1
Spouse	-	-	-
Other	3	1	2

Three listed second year placement as a negative factor in job selection. One, a West Virginia graduate said:

It assisted me in making my choice in that I was certain that I did not want to work in a family service agency.

This person listed original field of interest as being psychiatric social work. Her second year field

placement was family social work, for reasons of location, and her first and ultimate employment was in psychiatric social work with the most influencing factor listed as salary.

Table 4 shows that sixty-three members of the sample listed their second year field placement as being of their own first choice. Of these, twenty-eight or forty-four per cent are now employed in the same field as their second year placement. Of those who listed their second year placement as not of their own first choice, only twelve or thirty-four per cent have employment in the same field. These percentages would indicate that persons given field placements of their own first choice are more apt to choose employment in that field than those whose placements were not of their own first choice. The significance of this difference dwindles, however, when we consider that, of those who did not get a field placement of their own first choice, seventeen of thirty-five or forty-nine per cent listed field of interest as the most important factor influencing job selection. Of those whose placement was of their own free choice, thirty of sixty-three or forty-nine per cent listed field of interest as most important factor. The influence of second year field placement in ultimate job selection is shown here in that, even though the field placement of thirty-five students was not of their own first choice, over one-third of this group was

influences to remain in the same field as this second year placement.

Second year field placement seems to be of equal influence in the selection of first employment and ultimate employment. While forty-one were first employed in their field of second year placement, forty have ultimate employment in the field of second year placement. These facts are remarkable in the light of the fact that forty-two out of the ninety-eight persons have changed fields after accepting first employment. Eleven persons returned to employment in the field of their second year placement after accepting first employment in another field. These eleven replaced twelve who left the field of their second year placement after first employment in that field.

While the number of persons employed in their field of second year placement remains static, factors influencing acceptance of first and ultimate employment differ. Field of interest and salary gain in importance as factors influencing job selection in changing fields. The factor lack of suitable employment diminishes in importance as the worker gains experience. Commitment and previous employment also tend to lose influence. Second year placement is listed only four times as most important factor in selection of first employment and but three times in selection of ultimate employment. This is not surprising since sixty-three persons listed their own first choice as the principle

factor in determining their second year field placement, we may assume that the majority of these placements were made in the students' field of interest. It would seem that this would tend, in the person's mind, to negate the effect of second year placement as the most important influencing factor in accepting employment, since the person's interest was directing him in that direction originally.

TABLE 5.--Employment in Field of Second Year Placement, First Employment, and Ultimate Employment and Most Important Factors Influencing Job Selection of Each.

Item	Present Employment	First Employment
Total	98	98
<u>Employment</u>		
In Field of Second Year Placement	40	41
In Some Other Field	58	57
<u>Most Important Factor Influencing Job Selection</u>		
Field of Interest	47	36
Salary	15	9
Commitment	5	14
Lack of other Suitable Employment	4	10
Locale of Agency	4	6
Personnel of Agency	4	1
Influence of Faculty Member	3	1
Second Year Placement	3	4
Status	3	2
Working Conditions	3	3
Previous Employment	2	6
Relative (other than spouse)	1	1
First Year Placement	1	3
Spouse	-	-
Other	3	2

Of the thirty-five persons who did not list their second year field placement as their own first choice, eleven said this placement was assigned by the school with no choice on their part, while at the same time listing no extenuating circumstances. There were, however, no derogatory remarks made concerning this and it is interesting to note that two persons of these eleven accepted employment in this same field as their placement. One of these persons, from the University of West Virginia, listed field of interest as the most important factor in her selection of employment, and second year placement as a secondary factor. This person had had no previous experience and listed psychiatric social work as her field of interest when entering into graduate study. Under remarks she made the simple statement that, "My interest in family social work was influenced by my second year field placement."

The second person, from the University of Texas, listed community organization as his initial field of interest. His second year field placement was medical social work which included experience in psychiatric service in a Veterans Administration hospital. This person first accepted employment in child welfare because of financial aid received but when this commitment was fulfilled she returned to psychiatric social work, giving as the principle factor influencing the change "Appropriate preparation for further studies and professional development."

Previous employment in social work did not necessarily determine students' field of interest upon entering graduate school. In Table 6 we see that of seventy-five persons with previous social work employment only thirty-five listed their field of interest to be the same as that of their previous experience while forty listed their interest as being in another field. Second year placements were divided fairly evenly among the different categories with slightly less being in their field of interest than in other fields. However, in their ultimate selection of employment, the group is divided sharply. Of those forty persons whose original interest differed from their previous social work employment only eight returned to employment in this field of previous employment. Of those persons whose original interest and previous employment were the same, twenty-three out of thirty-five returned ultimately to this same field for employment. In first employment for this last category the returning number was even greater, twenty-nine of thirty-five. However, six changed fields at a later date.

Table 7 shows the number which did their second year placement in each field, and those who remained in this same field for professional employment. Table 8 shows the field of ultimate employment for the total sample. The only significant difference here is the number of graduates of the University of Utah now employed in public assistance

TABLE 6.--Students with Previous Social Work Employment, by Field of Interest, Second Year Placement, Ultimate Employment, and Most Important Factor in Job Selection.

Item	Total	Students with Previous Social Work Employment			No Previous Employment
		Total	Interest Same as Field of Previous Employment	Interest Not Same as Field of Previous Employment	
Total	98	75	35	40	23
Second Year Placement					
In Field of Interest	44	33	16	17	11
In Some Other Field	54	42	19	23	12
Ultimate Employment					
In Field of Previous Employ.	-	31	23	8	-
In Some Other Field	-	44	12	32	-
Most Important Factor in Job Selection					
Field of Interest	47	34	14	20	13
Salary	15	11	7	3	3
Commitment	5	3	2	1	2
Lack of Other Suitable Employ.	4	3	1	2	1
Lack of Agency	4	3	2	1	1
Personnel of Agency	4	3	1	2	1
Influence of Faculty Member	3	3	2	1	-
Second Year Placement	3	3	-	3	-
Status	3	3	1	2	-
Working conditions	3	3	1	2	-
Previous Employment	2	2	1	1	-
Relative (other than spouse)	1	1	-	1	-
First Year Placement	1	1	1	-	-
Spouse	-	-	-	-	-
Other	3	2	1	1	1

TABLE 7.--Field of Second Year Placement and Those Remaining in This Same Field for First Employment Following Graduation From Selected Generic Schools 1952, 1954, 1956.

Field	Place- ment	Employ- ment
Total	98	41
Psychiatric Social Work	44	21
Family Social Work	16	5
Child Welfare	10	5
Medical Social Work	10	1
Public Welfare	4	2
Corrections	3	1
School Social Work	3	2
Community Organization	2	1
Group Work	2	1
Rehabilitation	2	2
Juvenile Delinquency	1	-
Research	1	-

TABLE 8.--Field of Ultimate Employment, by School, of Graduates Receiving Masters of Social Work Degrees from Selected Generic Schools 1952, 1954, 1956.

Field	Total	U. of Utah	U. of Texas	Mich. State Univ.	U. of West Va.
Total	98	37	2	23	12
Psychiatric Social Work	29	10	8	5	6
Child Welfare	16	2	5	6	3
Public Welfare	11	9	2	-	-
Family Social Welfare	9	1	5	1	2
Corrections	5	2	1	2	-
Medical Social Work	5	2	2	1	-
Rehabilitation	5	5	-	-	-
School Social Work	5	4	-	1	-
Community Organization	3	-	1	2	-
Juvenile Delinquency	3	1	1	1	-
Group Work	2	-	-	2	-
Teaching	2	-	-	2	-
Other	2	1	-	-	1

and rehabilitation. The University of Utah, with the exception of one placement by the University of Texas in public welfare, is the only school to utilize these settings as second year field placements. The University of Utah School of Social Work is strongly oriented to development of students as rehabilitation counselors.¹ The number employed in public welfare can, at least in part, be explained by the fact that fifteen of Utah's thirty-seven graduates had had prior experience in public welfare, with seven of these returning to this field for employment.

Considering that there were thirty-eight women in the sample and that normally a husband's employment will determine the city or area where the family will live, it was surprising that no one checked "spouse" as a determining factor in job selection. However, four persons checked lack of other suitable job openings and four the locale of agency, these categories might well have the same connotation.

¹This is based on an interview with Mr. Morris Gluckin, Assistant Professor of Social Work at Michigan State University, on April 19, 1958, who stated that his information came from a statement made by Miss Cecile Hillyer, Chief, Division of Training, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation at "The Workshop in Rehabilitation Content and Social Work Education" held at Simmons College, November 9, 1957.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the data presented does not definitely prove or disprove that second year field placement controls ultimate employment of graduates of generic schools of social work, it does present several definite conclusions.

Major Findings

Second year field work placement as an influencing factor in job selection is being moved into the background by field of interest. This would seem to be logical since most second year field work placements were made in accordance with the student's own first choice, and it would appear to be a fair assumption that this choice would be, in most instances, in the field of interest.

The study shows that forty-three per cent of the members of the sample have changed to a different field since accepting first employment. Concerning this, in the absence of any research of this nature centered upon schools offering a specialized curriculum, we can but speculate as to its significance. It does conclusively show, however, that a significant number of members of the sample have found no detrimental influence in changing fields as a result of the generic curriculum.

Students given second year field work placement of their own first choice are more apt to choose this same field for ultimate employment than those whose placements were not of their own first choice.

Both first and ultimate employment were effected equally by second year field placement.

While the number of persons employed in the field of second year placement remains static in both first and ultimate employment, factors influencing selection of these employments differ. Field of interest and salary gain in importance while lack of other suitable employment, commitment and previous employment diminish as influencing factors.

Secondary Findings

There is an increasing number of men entering the social work profession. Helen Wright, conducting a study of employment of graduates of the School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago, found that seventy-three per cent of the graduates returning schedules were women.¹ In this current project, with the sample being graduates of the years 1952, 1954, and 1956, only thirty-nine per cent returning questionnaires were women. This, while not being statistically conclusive, does show

¹Helen R. Wright, "Employment of Graduates of the School of Social Service Administration," Social Service Review, XXI (September, 1957), p. 327.

a trend toward more men entering the social work profession, with respect to the schools under study.

Influence of second year field work placement on ultimate employment is negative as well as positive.

Less than half of students entering social work graduate schools with prior employment in social work listed their field of interest to be the same as the field in which they had been employed.

An overwhelming majority of graduate social work students of this sample, eighty-five of ninety-eight, received their undergraduate major in one of the social sciences.

Recommendations

It would seem that the absence of any significant variation which leads to area differences would indicate there is a strong identification among the professional social work graduates of these schools, in the area of professional training. The degree to which this identification is carried by all professional social work graduates could be determined only by a study conducted along the same lines using a sample from schools in the same areas but with a specialized curriculum.

A study of this sort might well confirm or disprove whether the direct relationship between the generic social work curriculum and the horizontal mobility of its graduates is unique to this type of curriculum. If this is found to

be true it may be assumed that the decision to limit the accreditation of the curriculum of schools of social work to its generic base, is fulfilling the expectations of the Council on Social Work Education in preparing social workers with a common professional base.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

December 4, 1957

Mr. Jesse C. Vickers
638 Sunset Lane
East Lansing, Michigan

Dear Mr. Vickers:

Thank you for your letter of November 22. I do not see any reason why you should not proceed with distribution of your questionnaire to graduates of the schools which you list. There will be no duplication since the only students getting the questionnaire in the study I am conducting will be those graduating last spring.

I enclose a copy for your information. I shall be looking forward with interest to the results of your study.

Very truly yours,

David G. French

DGF:1ac
Enclosure

APPENDIX B

1. What was your age at last birthday? _____
2. What is your sex? Male _____ Female _____
3. What was your undergraduate major(s)? _____
4. When did you receive your MSW? Year _____
5. Did you have any work experience (other than field placement) either before or during your graduate studies? Indicate only those fields in which you worked at least one month full time or the equivalent.

_____ Public Welfare	_____ Juvenile Delinquency
_____ Family Social Work	_____ Correctional
_____ Child Welfare	_____ Services
_____ School Social Work	_____ Group Work
_____ Psuchiatic Social Work	_____ Community
_____ Medical Social Work	_____ Organization
_____ Rehabilitation	_____ Research
_____ Other (specify) _____	_____

6. What was your principle field of interest when you entered into graduate study?

_____ Public Welfare	_____ Correctional
_____ Family Social Work	_____ Services
_____ Child Welfare	_____ Group Work
_____ School Social Work	_____ Community
_____ Psychiatric Social Work	_____ Organization
_____ Medical Social Work	_____ Teaching
_____ Juvenile Delinquency	_____ Rehabilitation
	_____ Research
	_____ Other (specify) _____

7. In what field was your second year placement?

_____ Public Welfare	_____ Juvenile Delinquency
_____ Family Social Work	_____ Correctional
_____ Child Welfare	_____ Services
_____ School Social Work	_____ Group Work
_____ Psychiatric Social Work	_____ Community
_____ Medical Social Work	_____ Organization
_____ Other (specify) _____	_____ Rehabilitation
	_____ Research

8. What was the principle factor in determining your second year field placement?

☐ Your own first choice ☐ Your own second choice
☐ Assigned by the school with no choice on your part
☐ Only placement available
☐ Influence of stipend
☐ Location (with respect to transportation and housing)
☐ Other (specify) _____

If there were any extenuating circumstances, such as late registration, etc., please indicate _____

9. In which of the following fields did you first accept employment after receiving your MSW degree?

<input type="checkbox"/> Public Welfare	<input type="checkbox"/> Correctional Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Family Social Work	<input type="checkbox"/> Group Work
<input type="checkbox"/> Child Welfare	<input type="checkbox"/> Community Organization
<input type="checkbox"/> School Social Work	<input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitation
<input type="checkbox"/> Psychiatric Social Work	<input type="checkbox"/> Teaching
<input type="checkbox"/> Medical Social Work	<input type="checkbox"/> Research
<input type="checkbox"/> Juvenile Delinquency	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____

10. What were the factors influencing the acceptance of this employment? If more than one factor, place the number 1 before that which you consider the most important, the number 2 before secondary factors.

<input type="checkbox"/> Salary	<input type="checkbox"/> Status of position
<input type="checkbox"/> Field of Interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Locale of agency
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel of Agency	<input type="checkbox"/> Influence of spouse
<input type="checkbox"/> Previous employment	<input type="checkbox"/> Influence of other relatives
<input type="checkbox"/> Second year placement	
<input type="checkbox"/> Lack of other suitable job openings	
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommendations of faculty member	
<input type="checkbox"/> Working conditions or personnel policy	
<input type="checkbox"/> Security	
<input type="checkbox"/> First year placement	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____	

If you have changed field of employment (not just positions) since first employment, please answer questions 11 and 12.

11. What is your field of present employment?

<input type="checkbox"/> Public Welfare	<input type="checkbox"/> Correctional Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Family Social Work	<input type="checkbox"/> Group Work
<input type="checkbox"/> Child Welfare	<input type="checkbox"/> Community Organization
<input type="checkbox"/> School Social Work	<input type="checkbox"/> Rehabilitation
<input type="checkbox"/> Psychiatric Social Work	<input type="checkbox"/> Teaching
<input type="checkbox"/> Medical Social Work	<input type="checkbox"/> Research
<input type="checkbox"/> Juvenile Delinquency	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____

12. What was the factor influencing the change of field of employment? If more than one factor, place the number 1 before that which you consider the most important, the number 2 before the secondary factor.

<input type="checkbox"/> Salary	<input type="checkbox"/> Status of position
<input type="checkbox"/> Field of interest	<input type="checkbox"/> Locale of agency
<input type="checkbox"/> Personnel of agency	<input type="checkbox"/> Influence of spouse
<input type="checkbox"/> Previous employment	<input type="checkbox"/> Influence of some other relatives
<input type="checkbox"/> Second year placement	
<input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation of faculty member	
<input type="checkbox"/> Termination of the existence of previous employment	
<input type="checkbox"/> Working conditions or personnel policy	
<input type="checkbox"/> Security	
<input type="checkbox"/> First year placement	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____	

If you have comments on the influence of your second year field placement on your choice of employment please use the space below.

Thank you for your co-operation. Please use the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope in mailing the finished questionnaire to:

Jesse C. Vickers
638 Sunset Lane
East Lansing, Mich.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

ERNEST B. HARPER, Director

Dear Social Worker:

For my MSW thesis I am doing a research project on:

"A study of the Influence of Second Year Field Placement on the Choice of Employment of Graduates of Generic Schools of Social Work."

In order for me to obtain the necessary information would you take a few moments, right now if possible, to check the enclosed questionnaire and to return it to me in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope.

The sample being used covers graduates receiving their degrees in 1952, 1954, and 1956. Your name was furnished by the School of Social Work from which you were graduated. Those schools included in the study are:

University of Texas
University of Utah
University of West Virginia
Michigan State University

All information will be held in strict confidence, with your school receiving a copy of the findings only. The director of your school has shown an interest in receiving a copy of this project for possible information and guidance in future planning.

Your co-operation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mr. Jesse C. Vickers
638 Junset Lane
East Lansing, Michigan

1 encl.
questionnaire

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles and Periodicals

- Scott, Lyndell. "The Function of Field Work in Professional Education," The Social Service Review, XXV (December, 1951), 441-454.
- Smalley, Ruth E. "Can We Reconcile Generic Education and Specialized Practice?" The Social Welfare Forum (1953), 313-327. Paper presented at the Eightieth Annual Meeting of the National Conference on Social Work at Cleveland, Ohio, May 31-June 5, 1953.
- Sumner, Dorothy. "An Experiment with Field Work in Generic Social Work," Social Casework, XXXVII (June, 1956), 288-294.
- Wright, Helen R. "Employment of Graduates of the School of Social Service Administration," Social Service Review, XXI (September, 1947), 316-330.

Unpublished Material

- Cheek, Gloria Lee. "A Psychometric Study of Two Indices of Job Satisfaction." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1955.
- Eicher, Joanne Bubolz. "Job Satisfaction, Its Relationship to Occupational, Stratification, and Community Variables." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1956.
- Gannon, Pierre. "The Relationship of Independence in the Work Situation to Job Acceptance." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1956.
- Trier, Howard E. "Job Satisfaction and Occupational Status." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1954.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03177 7109