Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

1974

An Attitudinal Study of Secondary School Teachers Toward School Social Workers

Raymond Merritt

Portland State University

Dwayne McNannay

Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Merritt, Raymond and McNannay, Dwayne, "An Attitudinal Study of Secondary School Teachers Toward School Social Workers" (1974). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 1738.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.1737>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ATTITUDINAL STUDY OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS
TOWARD SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKERS

by

RAYMOND MERRITT

DWAYNE McNANNAY

A report submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF
SOCIAL WORK

Portland State University
1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER .	
I INTRODUCTION	1
II METHODOLOGY	4
Formulation of a Null Hypothesis	4
Definition of Semantic Differential	5
Selecting the Concepts for the Questionnaire	
Selecting the Adjective Pairs	
Population and Sampling Procedure	7
Coding and Statistical Computation	8
Chapter Notes	9
III SUMMARY OF DATA	10
IV CONCLUSIONS	28
BIBLIOGRAPHY	31
APPENDIX	32

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

John Adams is one of fourteen public high schools in the City of Portland. It serves approximately 1,200 students and employs a teaching staff of approximately one hundred certified teachers. In addition, ancillary services include school social workers employed by the school district and a unit of graduate students from the School of Social Work, Portland State University. In this respect John Adams is somewhat unique, as other high schools in the district occupy the position of having to draw from a centralized undermanned pool of social workers at best or to function without such services at any meaningful level. From a time perspective, Adams has enjoyed a position of having as much as 224 man hours per week in available social work services. (1971-72 school year)

However, the availability of adequate resources does not by itself insure that appropriate levels of service will be maintained or that day to day operating procedures will function harmoniously. Education is the primary function of the public school system and while ancillary services, including school social workers, are desirable, they do in fact, occupy a secondary priority within the total system.

As individuals in a complementary service, it appears prudent to determine the manner in which individuals who are engaged in the primary function of the institutions, teachers, view those engaged

in the complementary service. The reality of the situation speaks to the fact that students who may be in need of assistance from a school social worker, are in the majority of cases first identified by the teacher. It is the teacher who has daily contact with the student, it is the teacher who will first become aware of changes in the student's behavior, it is the teacher who students often confide personal or family difficulties, and it is the teacher who will first be cognizant of the student's educational achievement falling below capacity. Therefore, this person is pivotal in insuring that students in need of school social work services obtain them. How does this pivotal person perceive the school social worker?

Numerous conversations with teachers revealed a wide divergence of opinions regarding school social workers, or at least we interpreted them as such. One group apparently viewed social workers as "do-gooders" whose primary responsibility involves delivering turkeys on Thanksgiving, according to one teacher. Others painted the portrait of "excuse makers." As one spokesman said, "No matter what the problem or type of behavior, you can count on social workers to explain it away by shifting responsibility to others."

Others viewed school social workers in a more positive light, but when attempts were made to define roles wide divergencies of opinion surfaced. Some teachers viewed social workers as being primarily responsible for truants and troublemakers regardless of the individual's situation. Others saw the school social worker as a junior psychiatrist who could be utilized before a problem becomes

too serious. The list of possible functions, from the teachers' perspective, seemed to be infinite.

And finally we found still another group who were unaware that social workers existed within the same institution. They possessed neither positive nor negative feelings, but were simply unaware of our existence.

Having encountered such statements in our practice as school social workers, we felt that it would be useful to gain some understanding of currently held attitudes by teachers towards social workers. With teachers being the pivotal person in the referral process in schools, these attitudes could in fact influence whether or not assistance was offered to students in need. In fact, the possibility exists that pre-existing attitudes may determine the outcome of a referral prior to that referral taking place.

A review of the existing literature, including the Erich scanning mechanism, reveals that no previous research has concerned itself with this type of study. Thus, we felt that such an undertaking could prove beneficial to all involved, including teachers, school social workers and most importantly, the student.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will include methods employed for testing the null hypothesis and means of gathering statistical data for this study. The study was designed out of apparent difficulties that have arisen between teachers, counselors, administrators and social workers in the administration of casework services. The cause of these differences has been identified in some instances and includes difficulties in the referral procedure, differences in expectations and differences in role perceptions.

The chapter will be broken down into the following sections: the formulation of a null hypothesis, definition of semantic differential; population and sampling procedures; coding and statistical computation. Decisions were made by unanimous vote of the researchers involved and with consultation of the faculty advisor.

I. THE FORMULATION OF A NULL HYPOTHESIS

The formulation of a hypothesis came from considerable discussion of the researchers and faculty advisor. It was decided that we have two main null hypotheses.

- A. Teachers at John Adams High School see social workers as effective in a school setting.

B. Teachers at John Adams High School are aware of the functions of school social workers in a public school setting.

The basis of our questionnaire and the statistical treatment of responses have been directed towards testing these two null hypotheses.

II. DEFINITION OF SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

It was decided by the researchers to use the statistical method of Semantic Differential for our testing. This particular measurement is described in the book The Measurement of Meaning by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum.

The semantic differential is essentially a combination of controlled association and scaling procedures. We provide the subject with a concept to be differentiated and set of bipolar adjectival scales against which to do it, his only task being to indicate, for each item (pairing a concept with a scale), the direction of his association and its intensity on a seven-step scale. The crux of the method, of course, lies in selecting the sample of descriptive polar terms.¹

Selecting the Concepts for the Questionnaire

The researchers and the faculty advisor selected concepts that they believed important in the area of school social work. The researchers picked seventeen concepts that were enclosed by placing all of them in a hat and then drawing one at a time. This drawing was done to avoid biases on the testers' part. The concepts drawn in order were:

1. Counseling
2. Group Work
3. Teachers
4. Truancy

5. Educational Counseling
6. Welfare Families
7. Community Organization
8. Referring
9. Minority Students
10. School Social Work
11. Teacher
12. Employment Counseling
13. Consulting
14. Family Counseling
15. Research
16. Self
17. Casework

Selecting the Adjective Pairs

They were selected by a high factor analysis score taken from the book The Meaning of Measurement.

Emotional - Rational

Kind - Cruel

Good - Bad

Example: Teacher (Concept) *

Emotional Rational

Kind Cruel

Good Bad

* See Sample Questionnaire in Appendix

The adjective pairs were set up on a flip-flop basis to avoid lining up all positive pairs against all negative pairs. From the technique in the example we have produced three definitions of the concept "teacher."

Each semantic scale, defined by a pair of polar (opposite-in-meaning) adjectives, is assumed to represent a straight line function that passes through the origin of this space, and a sample of such scales then represents a multidimensional space. The logical tool to uncover these dimensions is factor analysis.²

III. POPULATION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURE

The population of the study was divided up into three categories from John Adams High School in Portland. They were:

- A. Certified teachers (at least one of teaching at John Adams)
- B. Administration
- C. Counseling Department

It was believed that if we could get a wide range of attitude responses that it would be significant for the study.

Sampling Procedure

From the previously mentioned categories we picked thirty-four teachers, five administrators and four counselors. This was done by the means of a stratified sample. A memo was directed to these three areas at John Adams High School stating that researchers would be coming around to ask their participation in completing a questionnaire regarding school social work. The plan was to make personal contact with those selected in order to get a more responsive and reliable questionnaire return. Even with the preliminary memo, the researchers experienced hostility among those chosen for the study.

- A. Collection of data. Questionnaires were delivered personally or put in their mailbox at John Adams when personal contact was not possible. Two weeks was allowed for the completion and return of the questionnaire.
- B. Returns. Not all questionnaires were returned. Out of the forty-six questionnaires handed out, twenty-six were returned to the researchers. Fifteen teachers returned their questionnaires and all questionnaires were received from the administration and counseling departments.
- C. Attached to the questionnaire was a demographical sheet, developed to obtain information in the areas of (1) sex, (2) age, (3) years teaching, (4) years at John Adams, (5) marital status, (6) ethnic background, (7) department at John Adams and (7) type of degree.

This background information will be most helpful in determining a basis for identifying faculty views and attitudes towards school social workers.

IV. CODING AND STATISTICAL COMPUTATION

A coding procedure was used so that the data collected could be more easily analyzed. With the assistance of Dr. Deane Clarkson, the researchers developed a method of numerical coding which included the demographical sheet and the seventeen conceptual responses. These identifying numbers were put down on a large computer printout sheet, then the data was punched on data cards. Only the means and standard deviation of each adjective pair of each concept were utilized in the analysis of the data. However, other statistical measurements were computed, such as analysis of variance and factor analysis. But, due to shortness of time and the large amount of data, the results of these measurements are not included in this study. Consequently, the null hypotheses cannot be proven or disproven, but indications can be derived through the analysis of the means and standard deviation.

CHAPTER NOTES

1. Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci and Percy H. Tannerbaum. The Measurement of Meaning. Illinois, University of Illinois, 1957.
2. Ibid.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY OF DATA

The respondents to the questionnaire produced the following profile from the demographic information. Forty-six questionnaires were distributed and twenty-six were returned. Of these, twenty are males and six are females. Six are between the ages of twenty-six to thirty, seven are between the ages of thirty-one to thirty-five, and thirteen are over thirty-five. The marital status of the twenty-six is as follows: four are single, nineteen are married, one is divorced, and two are separated. Twenty-four indicated a non-minority background and two are black. Tenure at John Adams among the respondents is as follows: nine are in their first year, seven are in their second year, nine are in their third year and one is in his fourth year. Twenty have utilized the services of a school social worker in their capacity as a teacher, five have not, and one failed to respond to this question.

The following tables demonstrate the respondents' cumulative responses to each concept. Each pair of adjectives used to measure the respondent's attitude towards the concept, has been computed to show the mean scores between the range of zero to seven. The right hand column is the computation of the standard deviation of responses for each set of adjectives.

<u>SELF</u>			<u>Std</u>
Emotional	4.461	Rational	1.630
0	7		
Unimportant	6.346	Important	0.689
0	7		
Productive	2.076	Destructive	0.688
0	7		
Uncertain	5.076	Definite	1.598
0	7		
Kind	2.115	Cruel	1.210
0	7		
Dynamic	2.307	Static	0.837
0	7		
Masculine	3.000	Feminine	2.039
0	7		
Unfair	6.000	Fair	1.058
0	7		
Intimate	3.038	Remote	1.370
0	7		
Insensitive	5.730	Sensitive	1.150
0	7		

Utilizing the concept "self" as a primary anchor, the respondents' attitudes indicate a positive self image. They see themselves as being important, productive, and dynamic individuals. The scores further reveal that these teachers see themselves as being extremely fair and with a high degree of sensitivity. While they lean towards being definite and rational, these attributes do not occupy the position of extreme significance in their total make-up. The masculine-feminine mean of 3.000 and standard deviation of 2.039 merely indicate the composition of the sample.

TEACHER

Emotional	$\frac{4.961}{0 \quad 7}$	Rational	<u>Std</u> 1.341
Unimportant	$\frac{6.461}{0 \quad 7}$	Important	0.760
Productive	$\frac{2.115}{0 \quad 7}$	Destructive	1.107
Uncertain	$\frac{5.384}{0 \quad 7}$	Definite	1.168
Kind	$\frac{2.615}{0 \quad 7}$	Cruel	1.098
Dynamic	$\frac{2.615}{0 \quad 7}$	Static	1.098
Masculine	$\frac{3.884}{0 \quad 7}$	Feminine	0.816
Unfair	$\frac{5.346}{0 \quad 7}$	Fair	1.495
Intimate	$\frac{3.076}{0 \quad 7}$	Remote	1.230
Insensitive	$\frac{5.576}{0 \quad 7}$	Sensitive	1.270

As teachers, the respondents attach extreme significance to their profession as the 6.461 mean and standard deviation of 0.760 demonstrate. However, in moving from "self" to "teacher" the respondents move towards the negative adjectives of destructive, static, and insensitive although the amount in each case is negligible. This may indicate some frustration in their roles as teachers or a feeling that they are unable, for some reason, to be themselves.

SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKER

Emotional	<u>5.115</u>	Rational	<u>Std</u> 1.306
0	7		
Unimportant	<u>5.692</u>	Important	1.349
0	7		
Productive	<u>2.573</u>	Destructive	1.172
0	7		
Uncertain	<u>4.653</u>	Definite	1.647
0	7		
Kind	<u>2.384</u>	Cruel	1.022
0	7		
Dynamic	<u>3.115</u>	Static	1.608
0	7		
Masculine	<u>3.576</u>	Feminine	1.026
0	7		
Unfair	<u>5.576</u>	Fair	1.172
0	7		
Intimate	<u>3.115</u>	Remote	1.531
0	7		
Insensitive	<u>5.692</u>	Sensitive	1.319
0	7		

The concept "school social worker" rated primarily positive responses, but certain comparisons are noteworthy. The concept is viewed as important, but not as important as "teachers." However, "school social worker" is seen as being slightly more rational and sensitive than "teacher." Interestingly, although the social worker is seen as being sensitive, he is at the same time seen as being more remote than the teacher.

TEACHING

Emotional	<u>4.769</u>	Rational	<u>Std</u> 1.422
0	7		
Unimportant	<u>6.461</u>	Important	0.646
0	7		
Productive	<u>2.076</u>	Destructive	0.796
0	7		
Uncertain	<u>4.961</u>	Definite	0.958
0	7		
Kind	<u>2.692</u>	Cruel	0.884
0	7		
Dynamic	<u>2.346</u>	Static	1.129
0	7		
Masculine	<u>3.961</u>	Feminine	0.344
0	7		
Unfair	<u>5.384</u>	Fair	1.022
0	7		
Intimate	<u>2.884</u>	Remote	1.177
0	7		
Insensitive	<u>5.461</u>	Sensitive	1.066
0	7		

Teaching is viewed as an important function and there is significant agreement among the respondents as evidenced by the 0.646 standard deviation. Additionally, the concept is viewed as being productive, kind, dynamic, fair, intimate and sensitive. The indications are all towards the positive adjectives and the standard deviations indicate a collective agreement among the respondents.

COUNSELING

Emotional	<u>4.269</u>	Rational	<u>Std</u> 1.372
0	7		
Unimportant	<u>6.230</u>	Important	1.106
0	7		
Productive	<u>2.461</u>	Destructive	1.103
0	7		
Uncertain	<u>3.807</u>	Definite	1.523
0	7		
Kind	<u>2.269</u>	Cruel	1.282
0	7		
Dynamic	<u>3.153</u>	Static	1.541
0	7		
Masculine	<u>4.038</u>	Feminine	0.999
0	7		
Unfair	<u>5.730</u>	Fair	1.079
0	7		
Intimate	<u>2.884</u>	Remote	1.531
0	7		
Insensitive	<u>5.653</u>	Sensitive	1.263
0	7		

The concept "counseling" appears to produce a somewhat ambivalent response as evidenced by the more centralized mean scores. The uncertain-definite pairing produced a mean of 3.807 and the dynamic-static pairing produced a mean of 3.153. These responses would appear to indicate that teachers view counseling as a passive activity producing limited or suspected benefits.

EDUCATIONAL COUNSELING

Emotional	<u>5.269</u>	Rational	<u>Std</u> 1.429
0	7		
Unimportant	<u>5.923</u>	Important	1.163
0	7		
Productive	<u>2.346</u>	Destructive	1.263
0	7		
Uncertain	<u>4.961</u>	Definite	1.482
0	7		
Kind	<u>2.884</u>	Cruel	1.478
0	7		
Dynamic	<u>3.000</u>	Static	1.264
0	7		
Masculine	<u>3.923</u>	Feminine	0.483
0	7		
Unfair	<u>4.807</u>	Fair	1.414
0	7		
Intimate	<u>3.346</u>	Remote	1.695
0	7		
Insensitive	<u>5.269</u>	Sensitive	1.662
0	7		

Educational counseling is viewed as a rational, sensitive, and important function. Its productivity appears to be questioned and the dynamic-static pairing indicates an absence of forcefulness in pursuing this activity. In general, the responses indicate a "matter of factness" about the activity with strong feelings being noticeably absent.

CASEWORK

Emotional	<u>4.307</u>	Rational	<u>Std</u> 1.715
	0 7		
Unimportant	<u>6.038</u>	Important	0.870
	0 7		
Productive	<u>2.653</u>	Destructive	1.056
	0 7		
Uncertain	<u>4.769</u>	Definite	1.680
	0 7		
Kind	<u>2.807</u>	Cruel	0.980
	0 7		
Dynamic	<u>2.923</u>	Static	0.890
	0 7		
Masculine	<u>4.038</u>	Feminine	0.527
	0 7		
Unfair	<u>5.384</u>	Fair	0.982
	0 7		
Intimate	<u>2.923</u>	Remote	1.440
	0 7		
Insensitive	<u>5.461</u>	Sensitive	1.174
	0 7		

The concept "casework" produced data which indicates that teachers see this activity as being important, fair, and sensitive. However, the productivity, the dynamics, and the intimacy of the activity, while being viewed as positive, indicates skepticism from the respondents:

FAMILY COUNSELING

Emotional	<u>3.846</u>	Rational	<u>Std</u> 1.689
	0 7		
Unimportant	<u>6.000</u>	Important	0.894
	0 7		
Productive	<u>2.384</u>	Destructive	0.752
	0 7		
Uncertain	<u>4.769</u>	Definite	1.242
	0 7		
Kind	<u>2.769</u>	Cruel	0.908
	0 7		
Dynamic	<u>2.692</u>	Static	1.010
	0 7		
Masculine	<u>4.000</u>	Feminine	0.692
	0 7		
Unfair	<u>5.384</u>	Fair	1.061
	0 7		
Intimate	<u>2.730</u>	Remote	1.313
	0 7		
Insensitive	<u>5.769</u>	Sensitive	0.908
	0 7		

School social workers engaged in the task of family counseling are viewed by teachers as performing an important function that is basically fair and sensitive. However, they do not see it as being particularly rational, productive, kind, intimate, or dynamic. In essence there appears to be a commitment to the concept as being important, but the usefulness of the activity is suspect.

GROUP WORK

Emotional	<u>4.038</u>	Rational	<u>Std</u> 1.865
0	7		
Unimportant	<u>5.884</u>	Important	1.142
0	7		
Productive	<u>3.038</u>	Destructive	1.660
0	7		
Uncertain	<u>4.423</u>	Definite	1.419
0	7		
Kind	<u>3.423</u>	Cruel	1.629
0	7		
Dynamic	<u>2.692</u>	Static	1.517
0	7		
Masculine	<u>4.076</u>	Feminine	0.890
0	7		
Unfair	<u>5.000</u>	Fair	1.356
0	7		
Intimate	<u>3.076</u>	Remote	1.467
0	7		
Insensitive	<u>5.423</u>	Sensitive	1.361
0	7		

The concept "group work" produced data which indicates that as an activity of school social workers, it ranks lower than either casework or family counseling. This may represent the respondents' increased exposure to the other concepts as they are practiced more frequently by school social workers.

CONSULTING

Emotional	<u>4.269</u>	Rational	<u>Std</u> 1.662
	0 7		
Unimportant	<u>5.884</u>	Important	0.993
	0 7		
Productive	<u>2.692</u>	Destructive	1.010
	0 7		
Uncertain	<u>4.576</u>	Definite	1.447
	0 7		
Kind	<u>3.307</u>	Cruel	1.192
	0 7		
Dynamic	<u>2.730</u>	Static	0.961
	0 7		
Masculine	<u>3.846</u>	Feminine	0.367
	0 7		
Unfair	<u>5.153</u>	Fair	1.046
	0 7		
Intimate	<u>3.269</u>	Remote	1.079
	0 7		
Insensitive	<u>5.038</u>	Sensitive	1.038
	0 7		

Consulting produced data which indicates that school social workers in this capacity are viewed in a more impersonal light. The activity is viewed as neutral on the kind-cruel pairing as well as on the intimate-remote pairing. These responses appear to indicate that their experiences have been positive although productivity is again questioned.

EMPLOYMENT COUNSELING

Emotional	<u>5.346</u>	Rational	<u>Std</u> 1.383
0	7		
Unimportant	<u>6.230</u>	Important	0.710
0	7		
Productive	<u>2.500</u>	Destructive	1.140
0	7		
Uncertain	<u>4.923</u>	Definite	1.440
0	7		
Kind	<u>3.076</u>	Cruel	1.128
0	7		
Dynamic	<u>3.384</u>	Static	1.267
0	7		
Masculine	<u>3.692</u>	Feminine	0.549
0	7		
Unfair	<u>5.076</u>	Fair	1.262
0	7		
Intimate	<u>3.692</u>	Remote	1.543
0	7		
Insensitive	<u>4.692</u>	Sensitive	1.349
0	7		

The school social worker providing employment counseling is seen as performing an important, fair, and basically rational service. Again the productivity and the forcefulness of the activity appear to be questioned by the respondents. However, this may represent the attitude that this is basically an information giving function and attributes of sensitivity, kindness, and intimacy are not required.

MINORITY STUDENTS

Emotional	$\frac{3.307}{0 \quad 7}$	Rational	<u>Std</u> 1.407
Unimportant	$\frac{6.346}{0 \quad 7}$	Important	0.797
Productive	$\frac{3.846}{0 \quad 7}$	Destructive	1.566
Uncertain	$\frac{4.423}{0 \quad 7}$	Definite	1.604
Kind	$\frac{3.500}{0 \quad 7}$	Cruel	1.303
Dynamic	$\frac{2.807}{0 \quad 7}$	Static	1.442
Masculine	$\frac{3.846}{0 \quad 7}$	Feminine	0.464
Unfair	$\frac{4.192}{0 \quad 7}$	Fair	1.357
Intimate	$\frac{3.538}{0 \quad 7}$	Remote	1.475
Insensitive	$\frac{5.000}{0 \quad 7}$	Sensitive	1.743

The concept of "minority students" produced data which indicates that this is an important area for school social workers to address themselves and that it requires a significant amount of sensitivity. Interestingly, they do not see this as being a rational activity nor one that requires significant amounts of kindness or intimacy.

WELFARE FAMILIES

Emotional	<u>3.769</u>	Rational	<u>Std</u> 1.557
	0 7		
Unimportant	<u>5.807</u>	Important	0.895
	0 7		
Productive	<u>4.500</u>	Destructive	1.702
	0 7		
Uncertain	<u>3.615</u>	Definite	1.651
	0 7		
Kind	<u>4.038</u>	Cruel	1.427
	0 7		
Dynamic	<u>4.115</u>	Static	1.728
	0 7		
Masculine	<u>4.500</u>	Feminine	0.905
	0 7		
Unfair	<u>3.269</u>	Fair	1.563
	0 7		
Intimate	<u>4.076</u>	Remote	1.622
	0 7		
Insensitive	<u>4.307</u>	Sensitive	1.691
	0 7		

The concept "welfare families" produced data which suggests that its priority ranks below minority students and truancy as concerns for school social workers. The central positioning of the mean scores suggests that the often heard identification of social workers with welfare families does not exist.

TRUANCY

Emotional	<u>3.500</u>	Rational	<u>Std</u> 2.063
0	7		
Unimportant	<u>6.307</u>	Important	1.049
0	7		
Productive	<u>6.423</u>	Destructive	0.902
0	7		
Uncertain	<u>4.346</u>	Definite	1.853
0	7		
Kind	<u>4.730</u>	Cruel	1.079
0	7		
Dynamic	<u>4.230</u>	Static	1.795
0	7		
Masculine	<u>3.961</u>	Feminine	0.999
0	7		
Unfair	<u>3.500</u>	Fair	1.581
0	7		
Intimate	<u>3.923</u>	Remote	1.695
0	7		
Insensitive	<u>4.307</u>	Sensitive	1.805
0	7		

The responses to "truancy" suggest that teachers see this concept as an important area of concern for school social workers. The mean on the productive-destructive scale reflects a concerned attitude for students experiencing this problem. The remainder of the scales suggests that an attitude of hopelessness prevails in regards to assisting students with this difficulty.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

Emotional	<u>4.576</u>	Rational	<u>Std</u> 1.836
0	7		
Unimportant	<u>5.884</u>	Important	1.306
0	7		
Productive	<u>3.076</u>	Destructive	1.809
0	7		
Uncertain	<u>4.153</u>	Definite	1.736
0	7		
Kind	<u>3.846</u>	Cruel	1.222
0	7		
Dynamic	<u>3.769</u>	Static	1.607
0	7		
Masculine	<u>4.307</u>	Feminine	0.928
0	7		
Unfair	<u>4.615</u>	Fair	1.298
0	7		
Intimate	<u>4.769</u>	Remote	1.607
0	7		
Insensitive	<u>3.961</u>	Sensitive	1.684
0	7		

School social workers engaged in community organization projects fail to achieve a significant level of support from the respondents. As an activity it ranks well below casework, family counseling, and educational counseling. However, this may again reflect the teacher's experiences with school social workers and seeing them operate within a casework framework in most situations.

REFERRING

Emotional	<u>4.500</u>	Rational	<u>Std</u> 1.679
0	7		
Unimportant	<u>5.615</u>	Important	1.298
0	7		
Productive	<u>2.846</u>	Destructive	1.347
0	7		
Uncertain	<u>4.346</u>	Definite	1.809
0	7		
Kind	<u>3.384</u>	Cruel	1.626
0	7		
Dynamic	<u>3.423</u>	Static	1.527
0	7		
Masculine	<u>4.038</u>	Feminine	0.720
0	7		
Unfair	<u>4.884</u>	Fair	1.583
0	7		
Intimate	<u>3.615</u>	Remote	1.722
0	7		
Insensitive	<u>4.846</u>	Sensitive	1.641
0	7		

As an activity, referring produced data showing limited support from the teachers. It achieved a mean score on the important scale of only 5.615 in comparison to the other concepts which demonstrate higher results. The remaining responses indicate that the process is viewed as being a matter of fact operation.

RESEARCH

Emotional	<u>6.269</u>	Rational	<u>Std</u> 0.961
0	7		
Unimportant	<u>5.576</u>	Important	1.301
0	7		
Productive	<u>2.807</u>	Destructive	1.132
0	7		
Uncertain	<u>4.692</u>	Definite	1.463
0	7		
Kind	<u>4.000</u>	Cruel	0.400
0	7		
Dynamic	<u>3.730</u>	Static	1.563
0	7		
Masculine	<u>3.653</u>	Feminine	0.689
0	7		
Unfair	<u>5.038</u>	Fair	1.427
0	7		
Intimate	<u>5.269</u>	Remote	1.313
0	7		
Insensitive	<u>3.269</u>	Sensitive	1.733
0	7		

The concept "research" as an activity for school social workers produced surprising results. The respondents view this as an extremely important activity. Further, this activity is viewed as highly rational, fair, but somewhat remote. The remaining scores suggest that the activity is seen as one not requiring significant amounts of interpersonal skills.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

This study has been concerned with the attitudes of teachers towards school social workers and their roles at John Adams High School. Our goal was to obtain reliable data to see if there was a significant difference in teachers' attitudes versus school social workers' assumptions. These assumptions were developed into two null hypotheses, but the large amount of data and the shortness of time prevented us from analyzing all the data as well as proving or disproving the two null hypotheses. All statistical information was gathered and analyzed by standard deviation and mean. From the information it would appear to indicate:

1. That teachers at John Adams do not see school social workers as effective in a school setting.
2. That teachers at John Adams are aware of the functions of a school social worker in a public school setting.

Because of the limited amount of data analyzed, further statistical analysis must be done to prove or disprove the two null hypotheses.

The analysis of the concepts found that three were more important than the rest of the concepts. The three being the concepts of "self," "teacher," and "teaching," where the mean was greater on these particular concepts.

Every concept was seen as important by the respondents. But when it came down to the productiveness, the dynamics and the intimacy, the respondents began to question the social work profession. They questioned the area of practice in school social work and had ambivalent feelings to whether school social workers are productive or useful. Conclusions drawn from the data would indicate:

1. That the respondents' experience with school social workers has not been helpful, but a further research to determine why teachers are responding in this fashion is needed.
2. The respondents saw that education is the primary function in a school setting and school social workers are a secondary service. This low priority was reflected in a higher mean score and a lower standard deviation. The concepts analyzed were "self," "teacher," and "teaching," compared to the remaining concepts.
3. School social work is not seen as either a masculine or feminine function.
4. Of the normal modes of operation by school social workers, which include casework, group work, family counseling, community organization and consulting, casework is seen in the most positive light. Interestingly, the greatest ambivalence is shown towards the concept of "consulting."
5. Often, the expressed or held opinion is that social workers are identified as working with welfare families or the racial minorities, which is not implied by the data. This is reflected in the response of the concepts "welfare families" and "minority students."

SUMMARY

It would seem appropriate to implement further research in a follow-up study. This recommendation is a result of the extensive amount of statistical data and measurements that were not utilized. But for our particular purpose, we only used the mean and the standard deviation of all the concepts. In addition, the researchers would recommend that school social workers at John Adams become consistent in follow-up contacts with teachers in regards to a student referral. This lack of follow-up has hindered positive consultation between teachers and school social workers. This would tend to work in a perpetual cycle of questioning whether school social workers can perform functions well or whether what they do is productive.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alderson, John J. (ed.). Social Work in Schools: Patterns and Perspectives. Illinois, Whitehall Co., 1969.
- Costin, Lela B. A Historical Review of School Social Work. Social Casework, October 1969.
- Johnson, Arlien. School Social Work: Its Contribution to Professional Education. New York, National Association of Social Workers, 1962.
- Osgood, Charles E., Suci, George J. and Tannerbaum, Percy H. The Measurement of Meaning. Illinois, University of Illinois, 1957.
- Rapaport, Lydia. Consultation in Social Work Practice. New York, National Association of Social Workers, 1963.
- Sarri, Rosemary C. and Maple, Frank F. (eds.). The School in the Community. Washington, D.C., National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 1972.
- Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York, Random House, 1970.

APPENDIX

TEACHER ATTITUDINAL STUDY: QUESTIONNAIRE

TEACHER ATTITUDINAL STUDY: QUESTIONNAIRE

You have been selected from a sample of John Adams faculty to participate in an evaluation of teachers' attitudes regarding school social workers. Your participation in this study will provide information that will be helpful in improving the function of social workers who work in educational settings.

The questionnaire consists of a number of concepts to which you are asked to indicate your responses. Please give all items your careful consideration. Your responses will be very important because you will in effect be representing the views of your fellow teachers who were not selected. All individual responses will be treated confidentially.

Your cooperation is sincerely appreciated.

Thank you.

**Ray Merritt & Dwayne McNammy
Social Work Graduate Students
Portland State University**

DEMOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

SEX:

_____ Male
_____ Female

AGE:

_____ Under 26
_____ 26-30
_____ 31-35
_____ Over 35

TYPE OF DEGREE:

YEARS OF TEACHING:

YEARS AT JOHN ADAMS HIGH SCHOOL:

MARITAL STATUS:

_____ Single
_____ Married
_____ Divorced
_____ Separated
_____ Widowed

ETHNIC BACKGROUND:

_____ Non-Minority
_____ Black
_____ Chicano
_____ Asian
_____ Native American
_____ Other

DEPARTMENT AT JOHN ADAMS:

In capacity of teacher, have you
utilized the service of a social
worker? YES _____ NO _____

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this study is to measure the meanings of certain things to various people by having them judge them against a series of descriptive scales. In taking this test, please make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you. On the following pages you will find different concepts to be judged and beneath each a set of scales. You are to rate the concept on each of these scales in order.

Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair X : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ unfair

OR

fair ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : X unfair

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check-mark as follows:

strong ____ : X : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ weak

OR

strong ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : X : ____ weak

If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

active ____ : ____ : X : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ passive

OR

active ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : X : ____ : ____ passive

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you're judging.

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the concept, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space:

safe _____ : _____ : _____ : **X** : _____ : _____ : _____ **dangerous**

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your check-marks in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries:

THIS NOT THIS
: : : X : X :

- (2) Be sure you check every scale for every concept -- do not omit any.
- (3) Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.

Sometimes you may feel as though you've had the same item before on the test. This will not be the case, so do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the test. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items, that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we want your true impressions.

COUNSELING

Emotional _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Rational
Unimportant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Important
Productive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Destructive
Uncertain _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Definite
Kind _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Cruel
Dynamic _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Static
Masculine _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Feminine
Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair
Intimate _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Remote
Insensitive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Sensitive

GROUP WORK

Emotional _____ Rational

Unimportant _____ Important

Productive _____ Destructive

Uncertain _____ Definite

Kind _____ Cruel

Dynamic _____ Static

Masculine _____ Feminine

Unfair _____ Fair

Intimate _____ Remote

Insensitive _____ Sensitive

TEACHER

Emotional _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Rational
Unimportant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Important
Productive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Destructive
Uncertain _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Definite
Kind _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Cruel
Dynamic _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Static
Masculine _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Feminine
Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair
Intimate _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Remote
Insensitive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Sensitive

TRUANCY

Emotional _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Rational
Unimportant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Important
Productive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Destructive
Uncertain _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Definite
Kind _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Cruel
Dynamic _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Static
Masculine _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Feminine
Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair
Intimate _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Remote
Insensitive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Sensitive

EDUCATIONAL COUNSELING

Emotional _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Rational

Unimportant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Important

Productive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Destructive

Uncertain _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Definite

Kind _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Cruel

Dynamic _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Static

Masculine _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Feminine

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

Intimate _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Remote

Insensitive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Sensitive

WELFARE FAMILIES

Emotional _____ Rational

Unimportant _____ Important

Productive _____ Destructive

Uncertain _____ Definite

Kind _____ Cruel

Dynamic _____ Static

Masculine _____ Feminine

Unfair _____ Fair

Intimate _____ Remote

Insensitive _____ Sensitive

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

Emotional _____ Rational

Unimportant _____ Important

Productive _____ Destructive

Uncertain _____ Definite

Kind _____ Cruel

Dynamic _____ Static

Masculine _____ Feminine

Unfair _____ Fair

Intimate _____ Remote

Insensitive _____ Sensitive

REFERRING

Emotional _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Rational

Unimportant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Important

Productive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Destructive

Uncertain _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Definite

Kind _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Cruel

Dynamic _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Static

Masculine _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Feminine

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

Intimate _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Remote

Insensitive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Sensitive

MINORITY STUDENTS

Emotional _____ **Rational**

Unimportant _____ **Important**

Productive _____ **Destructive**

Uncertain _____ **Definite**

Kind _____ **Cruel**

Dynamic _____ **Static**

Masculine _____ **Feminine**

Unfair _____ **Fair**

Intimate _____ **Remote**

Insensitive _____ **Sensitive**

SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKER

Emotional _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ **Rational**

Unimportant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ **Important**

Productive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ **Destructive**

Uncertain _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ **Definite**

Kind _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ **Cruel**

Dynamic _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ **Static**

Masculine _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ **Feminine**

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ **Fair**

Intimate _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ **Remote**

Insensitive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ **Sensitive**

TEACHING

Emotional _____ Rational

Unimportant _____ Important

Productive _____ Destructive

Uncertain _____ Definite

Kind _____ Cruel

Dynamic _____ Static

Masculine _____ Feminine

Unfair _____ Fair

Intimate _____ Remote

Insensitive _____ Sensitive

EMPLOYMENT COUNSELING

Emotional _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Rational

Unimportant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Important

Productive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Destructive

Uncertain _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Definite

Kind _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Cruel

Dynamic _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Static

Masculine _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Feminine

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

Intimate _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Remote

Insensitive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Sensitive

CONSULTING

Emotional _____ Rational

Unimportant _____ Important

Productive _____ Destructive

Uncertain _____ Definite

Kind _____ Cruel

Dynamic _____ Static

Masculine _____ Feminine

Unfair _____ Fair

Intimate _____ Remote

Insensitive _____ Sensitive

FAMILY COUNSELING

Emotional _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Rational
Unimportant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Important
Productive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Destructive
Uncertain _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Definite
Kind _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Cruel
Dynamic _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Static
Masculine _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Feminine
Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair
Intimate _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Remote
Insensitive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Sensitive

RESEARCH

Emotional _____ Rational

Unimportant _____ Important

Productive _____ Destructive

Uncertain _____ Definite

Kind _____ Cruel

Dynamic _____ Static

Masculine _____ Feminine

Unfair _____ Fair

Intimate _____ Remote

Insensitive _____ Sensitive

SELF

Emotional _____ **Rational**

Unimportant _____ **Important**

Productive _____ **Destructive**

Uncertain _____ **Definite**

Kind _____ **Cruel**

Dynamic _____ **Static**

Masculine _____ **Feminine**

Unfair _____ **Fair**

Intimate _____ **Remote**

Insensitive _____ **Sensitive**

CASEWORK

Emotional _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Rational

Unimportant _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Important

Productive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Destructive

Uncertain _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Definite

Kind _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Cruel

Dynamic _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Static

Masculine _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Feminine

Unfair _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Fair

Intimate _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Remote

Insensitive _____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____ Sensitive