1975

An Analysis of Professional Roles & Career Patterns of Portland State University School of Social Work graduates, 1964-1973

B. Michael Des Camp
Portland State University

Howard H. Marshack
Portland State University

AN ANALYSIS OF PROFESSIONAL ROLES & CAREER PATTERNS OF PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK GRADUATES 1964 - 1973

by

B. MICHAEL DES CAMP
and
HOWARD H. MARSHACK

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

MASTER
OF
SOCIAL WORK

Portland State University
1975

ABSTRACT

This was a follow-up study of graduates of Portland State University's School of Social Work from 1964 to 1973. The study gathered information in four areas: (1) graduates' career patterns, (2) tasks graduates presently perform in their jobs, (3) tasks graduates felt are necessary for students to learn in a school of Social Work, and (4) graduates' continuing education needs and experiences. It was hoped that this information would prove valuable in curriculum design, both in the School of Social Work and in the Division of Continuing Education.

A stratified random sample of sixty-one graduates, totalling 15.4% of the ten-year population of 396 graduates, was surveyed by mailed questionnaire. Fifty-two of these responded for a return rate of 85.3%. Results from the questionnaire were transferred to punch cards and frequencies, means, standard deviations, and a factor analysis of data were performed by computer.

Forty-five of the fifty-two respondents considered themselves to be presently practicing social work. Twenty-four of these respondents worked primarily in direct treatment, and all but one of these reported having collateral duties in administration or facilitative services.

Respondents showed almost no interest in pursuing further graduate study in social services or any other field, and indicated only moderate interest in continuing education seminars or classes. Of all continuing education offerings, family therapy received the highest interest score and research received the lowest.

Respondents felt that the most important tasks to be taught in graduate school were direct service tasks. A factor analysis was performed to reduce these tasks to more easily reportable shared factors, and the tasks seen as most crucial for learning were those concerned with direct treatment, resource assistance, and client contact. Although respondents believed that direct service tasks should be stressed in the School curriculum, most of the respondents also were performing non-direct service tasks such as leadership and consultation in group process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

This study is a demographic and descriptive analysis of a stratified random sample of the graduates of Portland State University's School of Social Work from 1964 to 1973. The following information concerning the School of Social Work is taken from the School's Self Study of 1974 and is provided to help place the study in historical perspective.

Portland State University's School of Social Work is the third of three efforts to establish social work education in the State of Oregon. The first of these was a program located at the University of Oregon in the early 1930's, which lasted only a few years and terminated as a result of the Depression. A similar program was begun at Marylhurst College near Portland prior to World War II, but succumbed to the economic exigencies of the War years. In 1961, the Oregon State Legislature established the School of Social Work at Portland State College, which was then in its sixth year of existence. The School began operation in 1962 and conferred its first Master of Social Work degrees in 1964. After ten years it is still the only School of Social Work in Oregon.

The School derives its funding from three sources; the Federal government, the State, and the local community. There has been a steady and continuous growth in funding support from all three sources since the School began, from a total of $94,886 in 1962-63 to $839,525 in 1973-74. Likewise the School has grown steadily from eighteen graduates

in 1964 to seventy-three graduates in 1973, for a total of 396 graduates over the ten year period. The scope of the School's growth is also evidenced by increases in the programs offered in response to the needs of the community. In 1965, a program in Continuing Education was established, the next year an undergraduate certificate program began, and the present Regional Research Institute in Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention was started in 1972. Increased enrollment necessitated an increase in faculty, from eight in 1963 to forty-one in 1973. Despite shifts in the economic climate, the School has consistently maintained a student/teacher ratio well within the 15:1 ratio recommended by the State System of Higher Education.

The history and evolution of the School's curriculum is not within the purview of this report but may be examined in detail in the aforementioned Self Study of 1974. Briefly, the present curriculum is comprised of the following essential elements: (1) The Generalizing Core, (2) Human Behavior and the Social Environment, (3) Social Problems, (4) Social Welfare Policy and Services, (5) The Social Service Concentration, (6) The Social Welfare Planning Concentration, (7) The Subconcentration in Facilitative Services, (8) The Field Practicum, and (9) Social Welfare Research. The overall goal of the curriculum is

> to produce an advanced professional practitioner who will have a general orientation to the whole of Social Work practice and will have specialized competence in either Social Services or Social Welfare Planning.[1]

While we have at our command a wealth of knowledge concerning the history, aims, and functions of the School, very little information is

---

[1]Portland State University School of Social Work,"Curriculum Design," (Portland, Ore.: May, 1973), p. 4.

available on the status, location, interests, and functions of the School's 396 graduates. One thrust of this study was the gathering of just such descriptive information, which could serve as the basis for an outreach effort to graduates and might assist in the formation of a viable alumni organization. We were also concerned with the graduates' post-MSW education and training in the Social Work field. Since the role of professional implies keeping pace with changes in one's profession through life-long learning, we wished to determine (1) the degree to which graduates have taken advantage of further educational opportunities available to them, and (2) the kinds of educational opportunities they view as vital to their professional growth. This information would be used to provide input to the Continuing Education component of the School. The final area of interest in this study was twofold: the reporting and analysis of (1) the tasks graduates were performing and saw as essential to their particular Social Work jobs, and (2) the tasks they felt were essential for a student to learn in a graduate School of Social Work.

The rationale for this last area of research deserves some discussion. Rapid and far-reaching changes on the social scene have necessitated concomitant changes in social work education. Client populations and client's needs have undergone radical changes over the years, especially in the last decade, and the general focus of social work has shifted from an early emphasis on social reform to an emphasis on individual change, then to a combination of both. And there are almost yearly shifts in specific practice emphases as new problems capture public interest and as new knowledge is acquired in the Social Work field and in allied professions.

For social work education the end result of these shifts in emphasis is a " . . . general theme of great diversity and the elusiveness of a common core,"[1] where "'education for uncertainty' becomes . . . an accurate description of the reality of the situation."[2] Gurin and Williams state that "Social Work education today is faced with the task of preparing students for a rapidly changing, fluid, and ill-defined field of professional practice."[3] It is their belief that schools of Social Work cannot train or prepare their students for specific roles in the future since these roles are impossible to predict, and that the most schools can expect to do is provide students with some basic tools and concepts with which to combat the inevitable change and uncertainty that awaits them.[4]

In order to better prepare students for competent practice in our "uncertain" profession, information is needed concerning the tasks Social Workers perform and the skills necessary for the adequate performance of these tasks. One source of such information is the direct reporting from practitioners who must struggle daily with the changes previously mentioned. At present, however, there is no ongoing, structured method by which the School can receive input from its graduates with regard to the curriculum-based experiences which they see as im-

---

[1]Gurin, Arnold, "Education for Changing Practice," Shaping The New Social Work, (New York, Columbia University Press, 1973), p. 172.

[2]Ibid., p. 169.

[3]Gurin, Arnold and David Williams, "Social Work Education," Education For the Professions of Medicine, Law, Theology, and Social Welfare, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. 212.

[4]Ibid., p. 213.

portant to their work. Since " . . . the social work curriculum rests upon a comprehensive view of the profession and its practice,"[1] an understanding of emphasis shifts in task and skill requirements as reported by the School's graduates will help to answer the question 'What do Social Workers do?", and can begin to give an idea of how well tasks taught coordinate with tasks necessary for competent practice.

In summary, this study was designed to examine responses by graduates of the School of Social Work regarding demographic data and work history, tasks essential to job performance, tasks essential for graduate training, and interest in continuing education opportunities.

---

[1]Council on Social Work Education, Curriculum Policy for the Master's Degree Program in Graduate Schools of Social Work, (New York, N. Y.), p. 1.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire consisted of the following four sections:

(1) Work History - This section contained twenty items which elicited information from graduates about their work experiences since they received their MSW degrees, their present work settings, and their professional designations. A list of commonly used terms describing work settings and professional designations was developed through discussions with Portland State University School of Social Work faculty and field instructors, from the NASW membership application form, and from a Master's research practicum.[1]

(2) Task Performance - A list of thirty-three common social work related tasks and skills was developed. Some were indigenous to areas of specialization while others were of a more general application.[2,3] (See Appendix A for relevant exerpts from reference 2, "Roles and Functions of Mental Health Workers.") Each respondent was asked to rate, on a scale from one (absolutely essential) to five (not at all essential), how

---

[1] Powell, Hedy-Jo, A Follow-up Study of Community Organization Concentrators, Research Practicum, Portland State University School of Social Work, 1974, pp. 48-51.

Soci

[2] Levin, Arnold M., "The Study of Attitudes of Social Workers in Mid-Career," Research Survey, University of Chicago, School of Social Service Administration, Jan., 1974.

[3] "Roles and Functions of Mental Health Workers," Report of a Symposium, Southern Regional Education Board, NIMH, Dec., 1969, pp. 41-54.

essential performance of each task was to the overall performance of his or her present job.

(3) Task Performance Training - This section required each graduate to rate, on the same five point scale, how essential he believed it was that a graduate student learn each of the preceding tasks during the MSW program.

(4) Continuing Education - This section contained seventeen items, through which respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their post-MSW educational experiences and their needs for further education in the social work field.

(Appendix B contains a copy of the cover letter and questionnaire.)

Implementation

A major methodological decision was whether the survey would be conducted by mailing questionnaires, by an interview schedule, or by a combination of both. An interview schedule would have produced more in-depth responses through dialogue and made possible a higher return rate.[1] The major disadvantage in interviewing concerned location of respondents. The population was scattered over the United States and several foreign countries, and interviewing a random sample of this population would have necessitated extensive travel. Neither time nor money was available for this purpose.

Mailing questionnaires had the advantage of allowing for more contacts

---

[1] Maas, Henry S. and Norman A. Polansky, "Collecting Original Data," Norman A. Polansky (Ed.), Social Work Research, (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1960), p. 151.

at a fraction of the cost of interviewing. The disadvantages were a lower expected rate of return and the impossibility of rephrasing questions for clarity of intent.[1]

The alternative of interviewing only Portland area residents was considered. A sample of this nature would not have provided data representative of the entire graduate population, however, and therefore this alternative was discarded. The final decision was to mail questionnaires to a random sample of the entire population and to conduct no interviews.

Sampling Technique

A computer printout of all Portland State University School of Social Work graduates was obtained from the alumni office of the University. The printout listed all 396 graduates of the School of Social Work during the first ten years of the School's existence (graduating classes of June 1964 through June 1973). To ensure adequate representation from each graduating class a random sample, stratified according to year of graduation, was selected. Sampling was done by the technique of optimal allocation[2]; after a random start every fourth graduate was selected from each of the first five graduating classes (1964-1968), and every eighth graduate was selected from each of the second five graduating classes (1969-1973). This was done because graduating classes in the first five years were considerably smaller than in the second five years (see Table 1), and the optimal allocation method of sampling would

---

[1] Ibid., p. 152.

[2] Sckoff, Russel L., The Design of Social Research, (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1953), p. 124.

correct for both the smaller size of the early classes and the greater expected diversity of response and variability of employment possibilities in these early classes as a function of longer employment history. The resulting sample size was sixty-one, or 15.4% of the population.

After isolating the sample, addresses of fifty-three prospective respondents were identified from the printout and from the following sources: the local telephone directory, official School of Social Work correspondence, and information of personal contacts provided by faculty members of the School. Addresses of the remaining eight prospective respondents were unobtainable. Since the sampling frame was defined as including only graduates for whom addresses were available, each of these eight was then replaced by the next subsequent graduate of the same sex and year of graduation with an address listed on the printout. The adjusted sample therefore totalled sixty-one.

Pretest

Seven graduates who were not drawn in the random sample were selected as pretest respondents on the basis of their proximity to Portland and their year of graduation. All seven graduates lived in Portland; two graduates represented the graduation years 1963-1966, two represented 1967-1969, and three represented 1970-1973. Three of these respondents completed the mailed questionnaire and were then interviewed for information regarding clarity of the questionnaire. Another four graduates were given the questionnaire in the form of an interview schedule.

The average reported time for completion of the mailed questionnaire was twenty minutes. There were no major difficulties noted in questionnaire content or instructions by either those who took the pretest ques-

tionnaire themselves or those to whom the questions were given in an interview schedule. Slight revisions were made based on the comments of the pretest sample and the questionnaire was implemented by mail.

Survey

Sixty-one questionnaires were sent to the most current addresses of our sample members. Cover letters and self-addressed, stamped envelopes were enclosed with the questionnaire to facilitate return. Each questionnaire was given an identifying code number for the purposes of confidentiality and for follow-up of non-responses. On each envelope was stamped the notation "Address Correction Requested" to ensure that the questionnaire would be forwarded to the respondent's current address.

Twelve notices of address correction were received and eight questionnaires were returned as undeliverable. These eight respondents were replaced with other graduates of a corresponding sex and year of graduation by the method described previously.

After six weeks, forty graduates had returned completed questionnaires. The non-respondents were contacted by telephone and letter and were sent new questionnaires. Twelve graduates returned completed questionnaires after the second mailing. Fifty-two of a possible sixty-one graduates participated in the survey for a return rate of 85.25%, and all fifty-two completed Sections A and D. Of these fifty-two, seven were no longer in the social service field and therefore could not appropriately answer Section B.

Eight graduates who returned questionnaires either failed to respond to Section C, "Task Performance Training," or responded to that Section

incompletely. It was speculated that incomplete returns of Section C were due to the instructions for that section, which were somewhat unclear. Section C did not contain a list of tasks; the instructions required the respondent to return to the list in Section B and once again rate tasks on a one to five scale. A partial questionnaire and explicit instructions for completing Section C were sent to these eight graduates. Six of them returned the partial questionnaire and of these, five completed Section C according to instructions. In all, forty-nine of the fifty-two respondents to the survey completed Section C.

Data Processing

Most of the data collected was of the "fixed alternative" type, allowing for only a limited number of responses to each question. These responses were coded numerically on punch cards and processed at Portland State University's computer center. The numbers and types of responses were tallied and the means and standard deviations were compiled. A factor analysis was performed to group numbers of tasks together into general factors for greater ease in reporting of data.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Return Rate

Sixty-one subjects were chosen from a population of 396 graduates of the School of Social Work from Spring, 1964 to Spring, 1973. The sample size was 15.4%. Of the sixty-one graduates sampled, fifty-two, or 85.3%, responded to the questionnaire. Table 1 shows the number of graduates sampled, and the distribution of returns for each year of graduation.

TABLE 1

SAMPLE SIZE AND DISTRIBUTION OF RETURNS BY YEAR OF GRADUATION

Year of Graduation	Population Size	Sample Size	Percent Sample	Number Returned	Percent Returned
1964	18	4	22.2	1	25.0
1965	20	5	25.0	4	80.0
1966	20	5	25.0	4	80.0
1967	24	7	29.2	7	100.0
1968	28	6	21.4	5	83.3
1969	42	4	9.5	4	100.0
1970	53	6	11.3	6	100.0
1971	58	7	12.1	7	100.0
1972	62	8	12.9	7	87.5
1973	71	9	12.6	7	77.7
Totals	396	61	15.4	52	85.3

A high rate of return is required to reduce the probability of a non-response bias, and to ensure that the findings elicited from the sample are representative of the population. Moreover, a relatively high return rate for each year is necessary if the findings are to be generalized to represent all graduates from that year. Except for 1964, where 25% responded, the return rate for each year of graduation was between 75% and 100%.

The return rate was too low in 1964 to reliably compare data across each of the ten years of graduation. A more reliable comparison of data across years of graduation is achieved by collapsing the ten years of graduation into two sets of five years.

Table 2 shows a return rate of 77.8% for the first five years and 91.2% for the more recent five years.

TABLE 2

SAMPLE SIZE AND DISTRIBUTION OF RETURNS BY FIVE YEAR SETS

Year of Graduation	Population Size	Sample Size	Percent Sampled	Number Returned	Percent Returned
1964-1968	110	27	24.5	21	77.8
1969-1973	286	34	11.9	31	91.2

Demographic Data

Of the sixty-one graduates sampled, forty-one were women and twenty were men. Thirty-five women and seventeen men responded to the questionnaire.

The overall mean age of respondents at the time of their graduation was 36.5 years. The oldest average graduating class was 1968 at 48.5

years of age. The class of 1964, with only one respondent, was the youngest at thirty-three years of age. Table 3 shows the mean age of graduates of the first five graduating classes as 39.5 years of age at the time of graduation, and the mean age of the more recent graduates as 34.5 years.

TABLE 3

MEAN AGE OF GRADUATES BY FIVE YEAR SETS

Year of Graduation	Mean Age At Graduation	Number of Respondents
1964-1968	39.5	21
1969-1973	34.5	31

Fifty-three percent of the respondents reported practicing in the Portland area. Eighty-four percent practice social work in the State of Oregon. Table 4 shows the present geographic locations where respondents practice social work.

TABLE 4

PRESENT GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION OF RESPONDENTS BY YEAR OF GRADUATION

Year of Graduation	Portland	Oregon	WA./Idaho	Elsewhere USA	Foreign
1964-1968	13	4	1	0	1
1969-1973	11	10	4	1	0
Totals	24	14	5	1	1

Graduates of the first five classes of Portland State University's

School of Social Work were an average of five years older at graduation than graduates of the more recent five classes. Although a large number of respondents from all graduating classes reported practicing social work in the State of Oregon, slightly more of the earlier graduates reported practicing social work in Portland than later graduates.

Undergraduate Education and Experience

Fifty-nine percent of the respondents reported receiving undergraduate degrees in the social sciences. Table 5 shows the frequency distribution of undergraduate study areas.

TABLE 5

FREQUENCY OF UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES BY STUDY AREA

Study Area	Frequency	Percentage
Social Sciences	31	59.6
Arts and Letters	9	17.3
Education	5	9.6
Other	4	7.7
Business/Economics	3	5.8

Thirty-eight respondents, or 73% reported having at least two years experience working or volunteering in social services prior to entering graduate study. Table 6 shows the amount of relevant experience respondents had before entering the Master of Social Work (MSW) program.

TABLE 6

FREQUENCY OF YEARS EXPERIENCE PRIOR TO ENTERING GRADUATE STUDY

Length of Experience	Frequency	Length of Experience	Frequency
Over five years	20	Six months to one year	2
Two to five years	18	Up to six months	2
One to two years	10	No experience	0

Table 7 shows the distribution of pre-MSW educational and practical experiences by year of graduation.

TABLE 7

PRE-MSW EDUCATIONAL AND PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE BY GRADUATION YEAR

Year of Graduation	Over 2 Years Practical Experience	Social Sciences Degree Only	Both Social Science Degree and Practical Experience	Neither Social Science Degree nor Practical Experience
1964-1968	6 (28%)	2 (10%)	10 (48%)	3 (14%)
1969-1973	8 (26%)	6 (26%)	13 (42%)	4 (13%)
Totals	14 (27%)	8 (15%)	23 (45%)	7 (13%)

Eighty-seven percent of the respondents admitted into the graduate program entered with either two years of social work relevant job experience or an undergraduate degree in social science or both. In comparison with the earlier graduates, a slightly higher percentage of the recent graduates were admitted with only undergraduate study experience.

Post-MSW Work Experience

Forty-five respondents, or 86.5%, reported they are presently working in the social service field. Of these, twenty-four graduates considered themselves primarily working in direct treatment, thirteen reported they provide facilitative services (such as consultation, research, or instruction), and eight graduates reported their primary role is administration or program planning. Table 8 indicates the distribution of professional designations according to work settings.

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF PROFESSIONAL DESIGNATIONS BY PRIMARY WORK SETTINGS

Work Settings	Number of Respondents	Professional Title Designation
Public Welfare & Social Services	15	Program Developer (4), Administrator (5), Supervisor (3), Caseworker (3)
Mental Health	7	Therapist (6), Program Developer (1)
Hospital	4	Administrator (2), Therapist (1), Caseworker (1)
School	4	Groupworker (2), Caseworker (1), Family Therapist (1)
Group Home	3	Group Worker (3)
Corrections	2	Administrator (1), Therapist (1)
Private Practice	2	Psychotherapist (1), Family Therapist (1)
College	2	Instructor (2)
County Health	1	Caseworker
Nursing Home	1	Caseworker
HEW	1	Program Developer
Day Care	1	Consultant
County Commission	1	Program Developer
County Court Family Counseling	1	Family Therapist
Total	45	

Table 9 shows the distribution of graduates by professional designation. The mean length of time graduates have spent in their present primary position is 4.2 years.

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF PRIMARY DESIGNATIONS

Professional Designation	Frequency	Professional Designation	Frequency
Administrator	8	Supervisor	3
Program Developer	7	Psychotherapist	3
Caseworker	7	Family Therapist	3
Therapist	6	Instructor	2
Group Worker	5	Consultant	1

Since receiving their MSW degrees, twenty-four, or 53%, of the forty-five respondents still in the social work field reported having been employed in more than one work setting, either simultaneously or consecutively. Table 10 shows the full range of work settings in which graduates have been employed since receiving their MSW degrees.

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF ALL WORK SETTINGS SINCE GRADUATION

Work Setting	Frequency	Work Setting	Frequency
Public State/local agencies	26	College University	6
Public Welfare	15	Health Care	5
Private Agency	12	Corrections	5
Mental Health	10	Public-Federal Agency	4
School	9	Nursing Home	1
Private Practice	8	Police Instructor	1

Respondents Not Practicing Social Work

Seven respondents, or 13.5%, reported they consider themselves presently not working in the social service field. Four intend to return to social service work, two are undecided, and one graduate does not intend to return to social service work. Three graduates left the field due to temporary unemployment, two to pursue different careers, one moved to a foreign country with little opportunity for social service work, and one graduate is in a doctoral program in Human Relations and Social Policy.

Although respondents still in the social service field received undergraduate degrees in a variety of fields, undergraduate majors were an indication of the present occupation of those graduates presently not employed in the social service field. Table 11 shows the relationship of undergraduate major to present employment, orientation to return to social service work, and pre-MSW social service experience.

TABLE 11

FACTORS AROUND PRESENT UNINVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL SERVICE WORK

Present Work	Undergraduate Major	Pre-MSW Work Experience	Intention to Return to Social Work
Doctoral Candidate	Social Services	2-5 years	Yes
Bank President	Business/Economics	None	No
Temporarily Unemployed	Social Sciences	2-5 years	Yes
Homemaker	Home Economics	1-2 years	Undecided
Temporarily Unemployed	Social Sciences	None	Yes
Instructor of Art	Arts & Letters	2-5 years	Undecided
Temporarily Unemployed	Social Sciences	2-5 years	Yes

Year of graduation was not a factor for leaving the social services profession.

Needs for Post MSW Continuing Education

Overall, respondents indicated only a moderate interest in continuing education. Respondents were asked to indicate on a five point scale their interest for each of ten study areas. A mean value of 1.0 indicates a high interest in the study area and a mean value of 5.0 indicates no interest at all. Table 12 shows the mean interest/disinterest value for each study area.

TABLE 12

INTEREST/DISINTEREST IN CONTINUING EDUCATION STUDY AREAS BY MEANS

Study Area	Mean	Study Area	Mean
Family therapy	2.50	Specific social problems	3.25
One to one therapy	3.02	Teaching	3.36
Administration	3.04	Proposal writing	3.60
Supervision	3.04	Community organization	3.75
Group therapy	3.10	Research	3.88

Family therapy, (2.50), was the only study area in which respondents expressed a general desire for continuing education. Less interest was shown for one-to-one therapy, (3.02); administration, (3.04); supervision, (3.04); group therapy, (3.10); specific social problems, (3.25); teaching, (3.36); proposal writing, (3.60); community organization, (3.75); and least interest was shown for research, (3.88).

Sixty-nine percent of all respondents preferred a workshop or seminar as the learning format for their continuing educational needs. Seventeen percent indicated a preference for classes with academic credit. Fourteen percent indicated a preference for evening classes without

credit or for an unlisted alternative learning format.

One graduate indicated present involvement in an advanced degree program, a doctoral program in Social Psychology and Public Policy. Two respondents indicated they may very likely enroll in a doctoral program in the next three years. Twenty-eight respondents, or 54%, indicated that their enrollment in a doctoral program was only a remote possibility and twenty-one respondents, or 40%, indicated they were definately not going to enter a doctoral program in the next three years.

Sixteen respondents, or 31%, indicated that they wanted to be in the social service field in an advanced position five years from now. Ten respondents, or 19%, indicated that after five years they wanted to be in the same social service job. Six respondents indicated they wished to be employed in a different aspect of social services; five indicated private practice as their desire for the future; five indicated they wished to leave the social service field; one was undecided; and five graduates did not respond to the question.

Tasks Essential to Present Occupation

The forty-five respondents presently employed in social services were asked to rate on a five point scale how essential each of thirty-three tasks was to their present occupation. A mean value of 1.0 indicated that the task was absolutely essential to their present job and a mean value of 5.0 indicated that the task was absolutely not essential. Table 13 ranks the tasks according to mean values and indicates the standard deviation.

TABLE 13

RANK ORDER OF TASKS ESSENTIAL TO PRESENT OCCUPATION

Rank	Task	Mean	Standard Deviation
1.	Use knowledge of group theory and organizational analysis	1.87	1.12
2.	Observe and evaluate small group and community needs	2.09	1.20
3.	Conduct 'helping interviews' in a one-to-one setting	2.22	1.26
4.	Read and critically review pertinent literature	2.22	1.73
5.	Contact and establish relationships with organized groups	2.24	1.25
6.	Refer clients if services aren't available through your agency	2.31	1.59
7.	Instruct in informal training programs	2.33	1.28
8.	Provide consultant services to a group or agency	2.36	1.48
9.	Help bring about changes in rules and regulations of social service agencies	2.53	1.38
10.	Carry out in-service training or staff development	2.53	1.58

TABLE 13--Continued

Rank	Task	Mean	Standard Deviation
11.	Utilize various therapeutic techniques	2.53	1.66
12.	Once initial help has been given, follow up with clients to determine progress and further assess needs	2.56	1.65
13.	Perform a psychosocial diagnosis and use it to plan a course of treatment	2.56	1.71
14.	Conduct 'helping interviews' in a family therapy setting	2.56	1.74
15.	Design informal training programs	2.60	1.33
16.	Perform ongoing supervision of workers	2.60	1.56
17.	Perform functions of therapist or leader in a group setting	2.62	1.57
18.	Initiate contact with clients to help with problems that have been made known to you	2.67	1.80
19.	Instruct clients in ways to use social service systems & obtain services	2.69	1.46
20.	Use knowledge of research design to evaluate a program or agency	2.69	1.52
21.	Use knowledge of research design to collect data	2.76	1.57
22.	Use knowledge of research design to perform a needs assessment	2.78	1.51
23.	Plan for maintenance of a program, department, or agency	3.00	1.68
24.	Plan for the budget of an agency or program	3.09	1.76
25.	Prepare a research report	3.09	1.56
26.	Initiate contact with clients to determine if problems exist	3.11	1.70

TABLE 13--Continued

Rank	Task	Mean	Standard Deviation
27.	Bring groups together to deal with a specific neighborhood or community need	3.12	1.48
28.	Organize a group to deal with a particular neighborhood or community need	3.27	1.48
29,	Instruct in a field practice setting	3.38	1.56
30.	Write a grant proposal and present it to a funding source	3.38	1.61
31.	Administer diagnostic tests and plan treatment on the basis of those tests	4.07	1.40
32.	Teach in a classroom setting at the undergraduate level	4.33	1.37
33.	Teach in a classroom setting at the Masters or Doctorate level	4.60	1.14

The mean values ranged from 1.87 to 4.60. No one task or skill was rated as absolutely essential to the aggregate of respondents' occupations. "Use knowledge of group theory and organizational analysis" was the most essential task to the aggregate of respondents' jobs, with a mean of 1.87. Other very essential tasks were: "Observe and evaluate small group and community needs," (2.09); "Conduct 'helping interviews' in a one-to-one setting," (2.22); "Read and critically review pertinent literature," (2.22); and "Contact and establish relationships with organized groups," (2.24).

Tasks with mean values of more than 4.0 were defined as not essential to the aggregate of the respondents' jobs. The most unessential tasks were: "Teach in a classroom setting at the Masters or Doctorate level," (4.60); "Teach in a classroom setting at the undergraduate level," (4.33); and "Administer diagnostic tests and plan treatment on the basis

of those tests," (4.67).

Task Performance Training

All respondents were asked to rate, on a five point scale, how essential they felt it was that a graduate student learn each of the thirty-three tasks during the MSW program. A mean value of 1.0 indicated that it was absolutely essential for students to have an opportunity to learn the task, and a mean value of 5.0 indicated that learning to perform the task in graduate education was absolutely not essential. Of the fifty-two respondents, only forty-nine completed the section in a correct and usable form. Table 14 ranks each task's essentiality according to mean values and indicates standard deviations.

TABLE 14

RANK ORDER OF TASKS ESSENTIAL FOR TRAINING

Rank	Task	Mean	Standard Deviation
1.	Conduct 'helping interviews' in a one-to-one setting	1.16	.43
2.	Once initial help has been given, follow up with clients to determine progress and further assess needs	1.22	.47
3.	Conduct 'helping interviews' in a family therapy setting	1.29	.65
4.	Refer clients if services aren't available through your agency	1.31	.68
5.	Initiate contact with clients to help with problems that have been made known to you	1.33	.55
6.	Perform a psychosocial diagnosis and use it to plan a course of treatment	1.41	.89
7.	Perform functions of therapist or leader in a group setting	1.47	.82

TABLE 14--Continued

Rank	Task	Mean	Standard Deviation
8.	Instruct clients in ways to use social service systems & obtain services	1.51	.79
9.	Use knowledge of group theory and organizational analysis	1.51	.84
10.	Utilize various therapeutic techniques	1.55	.84
11.	Help bring about changes in rules & regulations of social service agencies	1.65	.99
12.	Initiate contact with clients to determine if problems exist	1.69	1.14
13.	Observe & evaluate small group & community needs	1.78	.85
14.	Read & critically review pertinent literature	1.90	1.03
15.	Contact & establish relationships with organized groups	2.08	1.15
16.	Use knowledge of research design to perform a needs assessment	2.14	1.12
17.	Use knowledge of research design to collect data	2.14	1.17
18.	Perform ongoing supervision of workers	2.18	1.22
19.	Provide consulting services to a group or agency	2.20	1.29
20.	Use knowledge of research design to evaluate a program or agency	2.24	1.23
21.	Prepare a research report	2.29	1.29
22.	Organize a group to deal with a particular neighborhood or community need	2.45	1.24
23.	Bring groups together to deal with a specific neighborhood or community need	2.45	1.27
24.	Design informal training programs	2.49	1.34

TABLE 14--Continued

Rank	Task	Mean	Standard Deviation
25.	Carry out in-service training or staff development	2.49	1.34
26.	Instruct in informal training programs	2.59	1.26
27.	Plan the budget of an agency or program	2.65	1.28
28.	Write a grant proposal & present it to a funding source	2.82	1.30
29.	Instruct in a field practice setting	3.00	1.37
30.	Administer diagnostic tests & plan treatment on the basis of those tests	3.04	1.43
31.	Plan for maintenance of a program, department, or agency	3.04	1.43
32.	Teach in a classroom setting at the undergraduate level	3.53	1.30
33.	Teach in a classroom setting at the Masters or Doctorate level	3.86	1.38

Tasks with a mean of less than 3.0 were defined as 'important' for a student to learn while tasks with a mean of less than 2.0 were defined as 'essential' for a student to learn.

According to Table 14, respondents felt it is most essential that MSW students learn the following tasks: "Conduct one-to-one 'helping interviews'," (1.16); "Follow-up on client progress," (1.22); "Conduct 'helping interviews' in a family therapy setting," (1.29); "Make appropriate referral of clients," (1.31); and "Initiate contact with clients," (1.33).

Tasks which respondents felt were least essential for a student to learn in an MSW program were: "Instruct in a field practice setting," (3.00); "Administer diagnostic tests and plan treatment on the basis of

those tests," (3.04); "Plan for maintenance of a program, department, or agency," (3.04); "Teach in a classroom setting at the undergraduate level," (3.53); and "Teach in a classroom setting at the Masters or Doctorate level," (3.86).

Factor Analysis

A factor analysis of Section C was performed to reduce the thirty-three specific task questions to a smaller, more easily reportable number of general factors contained in the questions. If several tasks showed a common pattern, these tasks would tend to cluster in a group based on the similarity of responses to them. The underlying factor could then be defined and reported. Once tasks had been grouped according to factors, a group mean was computed from the means previously reported for Section C in Table 13. The essentiality of each factor could then be determined by comparing the factor mean with the essentiality scale used in Sections B and C of the questionnaire (See Appendix B), where a score of 1.0 indicated "absolutely essential" and a score of 5.0 indicated "not at all essential."

The factor analysis was performed using the Honeywell computer at Portland State University's computer center. A BMD08M subprogram of the UCLA BIMED program was utilized, and seven vectors of factor weighting were extracted by means of varimax rotation (See Table 15 in Appendix C: "Factor Weightings for Social Work Tasks").

Factor I. Factor I represented tasks 14, 15, 16, and 18, with high inter-task factor weightings between 0.70 and 0.81. These tasks were concerned with the role of the Social Worker in traditional direct treatment, using "helping interviews" and therapeutic techniques such as

behavior modification and Gestalt. The factor shared by these tasks was designated Direct Treatment and scored a group mean of 1.35 with very small standard deviations (0.43 to 0.88). Direct Treatment was one of two factors to score a mean of 1.35, the lowest mean reported, and therefore one of two to receive the highest essentiality rating for a group factor.

Factor II. Tasks 3, 4, and 5 tended to have high weightings on this factor, which was concerned with assisting the client through follow-up and referral as well as teaching the client to use the social service system to achieve his ends. This factor was defined as Resource Assistance and the mean for this factor was also 1.35, implying extremely high essentiality.

Factor III. High weightings for this factor were found only in tasks 1 and 2, both of which dealt with initiating contact with clients. The group mean for this factor was 1.56 and the factor was designated Client Contact.

Factor IV. There were high weightings for this factor in tasks 21, 22, 23, and 24. The tasks described working with groups in order to effect neighborhood and community change, and the underlying factor was therefore called Group Skills. The four tasks had a collective mean of 2.18.

Factor V. This factor was represented by tasks 27, 28, 29, and 30, all of which had exceptionally high factor weighting (from 0.87 to 0.93). All of the above tasks were concerned with knowledge of research design, and the underlying factor was thus designated Research. The overall mean for this task factor was 2.20.

Factor VI. Significant weightings were found between tasks 6, 11,

19, and 25. However, it was difficult to define an underlying factor for these four tasks. Task 11 (Instructing in a field practice setting) could be expected to have a higher weighting in Factor VII (Teaching/Training), yet its weighting in Factor VII was 0.50 and its weighting in Factor VI was 0.61. In addition to the task of field instruction, the tasks for this factor were: changing social service agencies, writing a proposal, and providing consultation services. The group mean for this factor was 2.84.

Factor VII. This factor represented tasks 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12, with intertask weightings between 0.74 and 0.83. All five tasks dealt with some facet of teaching, information sharing, instruction, or staff development, and the factor shared by these five tasks was designated Teaching/Training. The group mean for this factor was 2.99 with an extremely wide range of standard deviations (up to 1.38), making this the least essential factor.

In summary, seven factors were isolated by means of factor analysis and factor rotation, accounting for twenty-six of the thirty-three tasks in Section C. General designations were given to factors in each task group in order to simplify reporting of task training essentiality. Tasks concerned with Direct Treatment and Resource Assistance were seen to be the most essential in graduate training. Their shared mean of 1.35 showed them to be almost "absolutely essential." Tasks concerned with Client Contact also scored extremely high on the essentiality scale, with a group mean of 1.56. Tasks in Group Skills (2.18) were seen as only slightly more important for students to learn than tasks concerned with Research (2.20). Tasks in Factor VI (undefined) had a group mean of 2.84, and Teaching/Training tasks were found to be lowest in essentiality

with a group mean of 2.99. All task factors scored above 3.00 (the midpoint between "absolutely essential" and "not at all essential" as defined by the questionnaire) and all of the task factors could therefore be said to be essential to the training of graduate students.

We had intended to perform a factor analysis on Section B, "Task Performance," but did not due to time restraints and the smaller number of respondents answering that Section (See "Methodology," p. 27). For high reliability in factor analysis it is necessary to have at least as many respondents as questions, and it is desirable to have at least twice as many respondents as questions.[1] The results of the factor analysis on Section C (with thirty-three task questions and forty-nine respondents) should therefore be viewed with some caution since the optimum ratio of questions to respondents was not possible.

---

[1]Discussion with Nancy Koroloff, research advisor and faculty member, Portland State University School of Social Work, April 21, 1975.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

Because the overall return rate of questionnaires was 85.3%, the roles and career patterns indicated in the survey can be generalized reliably to graduates of the School of Social Work. The following is a profile of a typical graduate based on the results of the study.

The typical respondent is a woman who was 37 years old at the time she received her MSW degree. She presently works in social services within the Portland area. Before entering the MSW degree program she had at least two years of practical work experience in the social service field and received an undergraduate degree in the social sciences. This respondent has been employed in more than one social service position since graduation from the School, and plans to be working in social services five years from now. She works primarily in direct services but has collateral duties in facilitative services and administration. The most essential tasks in her present job include group work and community organization. In contrast, this respondent considers direct service tasks such as one-to-one interviewing and initiating client contact as the tasks most essential for a social work student to learn in graduate school. She has moderate to little interest in continuing education, but if she were to pursue such education she would prefer a workshop or seminar learning format rather than a formal classroom situation. She plans no further formal education now or in the forseeable future.

A profile of graduates' career patterns more comprehensive than the above is difficult to portray for several reasons. First, this was not a longitudinal study of the employment and role changes individual graduates experienced in their careers. Rather, this was a cross-sectional study focused on the graduates' positions and professional roles at the time the study was conducted. The study's methodology therefore does not allow a reliable statement to be made concerning typical MSW career development except as indicated by graduates' present positions.

Additionally, social work is a diverse profession encompassing a broad spectrum of professional roles. Graduates have assumed a wide range of roles within the profession and have reported working in a variety of private and public settings. The diversity of the field thus makes a comprehensive and channeled profile of MSW career development difficult.

The study indicated that over two-thirds of the respondents who graduated from the School of Social Work in the first five years still remain within the immediate Portland area. Of those graduating in the next five years slightly less than half remained in Portland, but over 80% are still in Oregon.

The decline in numbers of respondents who remained in Portland after graduation can perhaps be understood when viewed in the context of two factors: the growth of the School and the history of social services within the economy. In the School's early years (which coincided with the Johnson Administration and the forward thrust of social services through the "Great Society"), there were more jobs available for fewer MSW's. Since the School was then, and still is, the only School of Social Work in the State of Oregon, we can conjecture that the

School's earlier graduates had a greater quantity and variety of jobs to choose from within the Portland area alone.

During the years 1969 to 1973, this picture changed considerably. The size of the graduating classes had more than doubled since the School's beginnings (from eighteen in 1964 to forty-two in 1969) and had redoubled by the time this study was conducted. In addition, the thrust of national priorities during the years of the Nixon Administration (beginning in 1968) had been away from social services. A third factor, suspected but not documented, may be the attraction of highly skilled Social Workers to Oregon from other states, thereby further decreasing the number of jobs available to graduating MSW's. The end result is that the School has, over the years, graduated increasing numbers of Social Workers who are faced with the prospects of fewer jobs each year, and who must now seek employment not only outside Portland but also outside the state. Since enrollment in the School is still increasing and there are also plans to activate a baccalaureate program of social work at Portland State University, the above mentioned trend (more Social Workers for fewer jobs) is not expected to change within the near future.

One of the assumptions made by the authors in the Introduction to this study was that " . . . the role of professional implies keeping pace with changes in one's profession through life-long learning." We therefore expected that respondents would show a high degree of interest in continuing education opportunities within the social work field and some degree of interest in formal education after graduation (such as doctoral study in social work or a related field). Responses to the continuing education portion of the questionnaire could thus be used to

help focus the curriculum of the School's continuing education department to meet graduates' present and future needs in the social work field.

Questionnaire results showed that only one respondent was presently enrolled in an advanced degree program (a doctoral program in Social Psychology and Public Policy), and only two respondents indicated that it was likely they would enter such a program in the near future. In addition, there was considerably less interest shown in continuing education as a whole than had been expected. On a scale of 1.0 to 5.0, where scores under 3.0 indicated interest and scores over 3.0 indicated disinterest, the only study area to receive a score under 3.0 was Family Therapy. This would seem to indicate that, since moderate to little interest was shown for all but one of the study areas in question, graduates of this School are not following an expected pattern of professional growth through "life-long learning."

These results, however, must be viewed from several different perspectives in order to gain a clear understanding of graduates' responses. We do not know to what degree respondents have already taken advantage of continuing education opportunities in the years since their graduation. These results may be distorted by the responses of graduates who have had considerable ongoing exposure (through independent study or within the agencies for which they work) to the content areas cited, and merely do not have a need for further education in those areas at the present time. We also do not believe that the continuing education options listed covered the whole of educational opportunities desired by graduates. It is probable that the inclusion of other options such as Gestalt therapy, women's liberation, or sexual dysfunction may have produced entirely different results.

An overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that they preferred the workshop or seminar learning format over classes taken for credit. These results are also incomplete, however, since learning format should be linked to learning content in order to achieve a reliable picture of interest in continuing education as a whole. Further research will therefore be necessary to provide a clear direction for curriculum content and format in continuing education.

The social work tasks which respondents saw as essential to job performance were considerably different from those they saw as essential for a student to learn while in graduate school. Respondents indicated that, overall, administrative and facilitative tasks were most essential to the performance of their present jobs. By contrast, they rated direct service tasks as those most essential for students to learn in school. It was theorized that this disparity between task performance and task training essentialities was due to the work experience of the respondents. The mastery of direct service tasks was considered by respondents as necessary to the beginning competence of a Social Worker, and should thus be stressed in the MSW program. This seems to validate the School's generic thrust which emphasizes direct service content in the curriculum design. However, as Social Workers become more experienced, they are expected also to perform the additional functions of administration, supervision, and consultation.

Since the results of this survey did indicate that typical career development leads graduates into facilitative and administrative task performance, several questions arise. First, do graduates gain expertise in these tasks primarily through work in their agencies or primarily through continuing education opportunities? Second, should the School

increase the number of courses in its curriculum that stress facilitative and administrative content? It is felt that the availability of course content should be enhanced to lay the groundwork for graduates' future involvement in these areas. The results of this survey indicate that typical career development leads graduates into facilitative and administrative duties, and at present there is little in the School's curriculum to prepare graduates for these responsibilities.

APPENDIX A

ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF MENTAL HEALTH WORKERS

Functional roles as identified by the symposium were these:

1. Outreach (human link) worker--reaches out to detect people with problems, to refer them to appropriate services and to follow them up to make sure they continue to their maximum rehabilitation.

2. Broker--helps people get to the existing services and helps the services relate more easily to clients.

3. Advocate--pleads and fights for services, policies, rules, regulations, and laws for clients.

4. Evaluator--assesses client or community needs and problems whether medical, psychiatric, social, educational, etc. This includes formulating plans and explaining them to all concerned.

5. Teacher-Educator--performs a range of instructional activities from simple coaching and forming to teaching highly technical content directed to individuals or groups.

6. Behavior Changer--carries out a range of activities planned primarily to change behavior, ranging from coaching and counseling to casework, psychotherapy, and behavior therapy.

7. Mobilizer--helps to get new resources for clients or communities.

8. Consultant--works with other professions and agencies regarding their handling of problems, needs, and programs.

9. Community Planner--works with community boards, committees, etc., to assure that community developments enhance positive mental health and self and social actualization, or at least minimizes emotional stress and strains on people.

10. Care Giver--provides services for persons who need on-going support of some kind (i.e., financial assistance, day care, social support, 24-hour care).

11. Data Manager--performs all aspects of data handling, gathering, tabulating, analyzing, synthesizing, program evaluation, and planning.

12. Administrator--carries out activities that are primarily agency or institution oriented rather than client or community oriented (budgeting, purchasing, personnel activities, etc.)

13. Assistant to Specialist--This role is kept in since there is undoubtedly some need for aides and assistants to the existing professions and specialties.

LEVEL I

Outreach (Detection, Referral, Follow-up)

1. Do outreach visits, calls, etc., to homes, families, neighborhoods to detect people with problems, help them to understand the problem, and to motivate them to seek help. Let people know where help is available.
2. Assess and decide how to best handle problem.
3. Do outreach to follow up clients and assure that they are progressing with their rehabilitation in the community.
4. Make self available - not just be available.
5. Work with families at home or in offices to help implement services, interpret laws, policies, regulations.
6. Interview and gather information.

Broker

1. Expedite getting services for clients (fill out forms, get medications, provide and arrange transportation).
2. Make referrals.
3. Give support to clients and families.
4. Gather information and give clients and agencies (mental health agencies and general social welfare agencies such as Travelers Aid, YMCA).
5. Coordinate services on behalf of a client or small group of clients (i.e., 8-10 mentally retarded or psychiatrically ill persons).
6. Listen to crisis calls, emergency calls--coach and give information.
7. Provide feeling of concern, trust, confidence to clients and families.
8. Help clients to solve social problems--make appointments, alert agencies to the referral, find housing, etc.
9. Help families and small groups know how to go about getting services.

Evaluation

1. Attend to clues, observe and report.
2. Evaluate client problem enough to make referral or make simple adjustment.
3. Assess attitudes of families and clients.

Teacher

1. Coach regarding behavior.
2. Give simple instructions (i.e., daily living skills).
3. Give information and advice.
4. Provide role model for client for social living skills.

Behavior Changer

1. Coach clients regarding behavior.
2. Conduct remotivation programs.
3. Apply interpersonal skills.
4. Conduct programs prescribed by others (i.e., behavior modification.

LEVEL I--Continued

Behavior Changer (Cont.)

5. Interpret programs to clients and families.
6. Dispense medications.
7. Be empathic listener, reassure client, interpret program.
8. Provide experience of joy (camping programs, recreation programs).

Mobilizer

1. Promote neighborhood programs and resources for clients (i.e., encourage school to make playground available).

Consultant

1. Work with neighborhood workers and local care takers (clergymen, public health nurses, welfare workers, etc.) regarding problems of clients.

Community Planner

1. Be a neighborhood worker.
2. Observe and report needs of neighborhood.
3. Participate in planning.
4. Organize in conjunction with others in neighborhood.

Care Giver

1. Be a homemaker.
2. Be a parent surrogate.
3. Be a care giver (feeding, clothing, support, recreation, etc.) for clients or small groups (mentally retarded, etc.) 24 hour or day care.
4. Help get money, housing, etc.
5. Give social and psychological support (approval, coaching, etc.) to clients.

Data Manager

1. Interview and gather data, keep records.
2. Listen and record personal history, family data, etc.
3. Give information.

Administrator

1. Administer daily living services for a small group of clients (i.e., 8-10 mentally retarded youngsters).
2. Plan for meals, personal care services, getting clients to services, etc. for a small group of clients.

LEVEL II

Outreach (Detection, Referral, Follow-up)

1. Reach out to small groups (neighborhood groups) for detection of problems and understanding.
2. Reach out to organize and follow up groups (alcoholics, expatients, offenders).
3. Reach out to work with prisoners, the physically disabled and others who can't come to mental health center for services.

Broker

1. Liaison between specialist and Level I.
2. Arrange and negotiate for services for small groups of clients with local agencies (Alcoholics Anonymous, etc.).
3. Help solve ordinary daily living problems for clients - find jobs, get financial assistance, serve as fiscal agent.
4. Assist with legal restorations.

Evaluation

1. Evaluate problems of clients, families and groups.
2. Do intake evaluation and make "routine" decisions.
3. Do screening tests.
4. Do emergency evaluations (jails, schools, etc.).

Teacher

1. Educate small client groups in daily living skills, vocational attitudes, orientation programs, etc.
2. Show and tell new patterns of behavior.
3. Counsel and coach with individuals or small groups.
4. Provide role model for clients and groups.

Behavior Changer

1. Counsel--coach individuals or groups.
2. Serve as role model for clients.
3. Liaison between Level I and specialists in techniques (behavior modification, group work).
4. Lead unit activity.
5. Help with physical therapies and rehabilitation therapies.
6. Set limits and deal with behavioral reactions.

Mobilizer

1. Organize local programs with guidance (neighborhood groups, etc.).
2. Promote and assist development of new programs and resources in local area (i.e., AA groups; evening hours for after care services).
3. Arrange for local agencies to serve the retarded, disturbed children, ex-hospital clients, etc.

Consultant

1. Work with local agencies and workers (neighborhood centers, health clinics, etc.) regarding client and agency problems.

LEVEL II--Continued

Community Planner
1. Organize small programs (i.e., recreation program for retarded, halfway house).
2. Serve as liaison between mental health agencies and other agencies.
3. Organize neighborhood.
4. Work with local workers (police, public health nurses, clergymen) to include mental health information in local plans.

Care Giver
1. Be a parent surrogate for groups (cottage, ward).
2. Help clients with money matters, housing, physical care, etc. (Determine eligibility, serve on fiscal committee, etc.).
3. Give social and emotional support to more complex problems.

Data Manager
1. Gather data - interview and record.
2. Do investigations for courts, judges, agencies, etc.
3. Tabulate and analyze data of a rather routine sort.
4. Write reports.

Administrator
1. Administer small units (wards, cottages, etc., cottage parent, halfway house supervisor).
2. Supervise Level I workers.

LEVEL III

Outreach (Detection, Referral, Follow-up)
1. Reach out to community groups and agencies (orphanages, churches) to help them appreciate and manage psychosocial problems.

Broker
1. Be a liaison worker with other local agencies (welfare department, vocational rehabilitation agency).
2. Expedite changes in local rules, regulations, etc.
3. Help solve clients' social problems (jobs, housing, money).

Evaluation
1. Do evaluation of more complex client and group problems.
2. Make social, vocational diagnoses and plan for groups and programs.
3. Do screening tests and some interpretation.
4. Do evaluation of local and nieghborhood problems.

LEVEL III--Continued

Teacher
1. Teach or instruct clients or groups of persons.
2. Teach staff (own and other agencies) (in-service training, staff development).
3. Do general public information (talks, films).
4. Prepare teaching materials.

Behavior Changer
1. Counsel with individuals and groups.
2. Do case work--ordinary situations.
3. Direct therapeutic recreation programs.
4. Lead groups.
5. Monitor clients' work assignments.
6. Local community planner and organizer.
7. Do role playing and psychodrama.
8. Carry out behavior modification.

Mobilizer
1. Organize local community for development of programs and resources.
2. Establish and promote social rehabilitation programs, ex-patient clubs, etc.
3. Promote agency program (public information and support).
4. Conduct workshops on behalf of programs and services.
5. Expedite changes in local rules and regulations.
6. Work with industry to create jobs for mentally ill and retarded.

Consultant
1. Work with major community agencies (welfare departments, courts, health departments, industry, medical society, hospital authorities, etc.) regarding problem clients and situations.
2. Conduct agency workshops, seminars, etc., regarding mental health problems.

Community Planner
1. Participate in local planning - serve on boards and committees of recreation, aging, rehabilitation programs.
2. Consult with local agencies and programs (courts, schools, etc.)
3. Organize local communities - mental health association executive.
4. Help community understand mental health needs.

Care Giver
1. Provide program leadership to care for larger groups and programs (i.e., nursing homes, day care programs, terminal sheltered workshops).

Data Manager
1. Gather data, analyze, synthesize.
2. Evaluate programs.
3. Plan programs (intermediate programs).

LEVEL III--Continued

Administrator
1. Administer intermediate programs (geriatric service, sheltered workshop).
2. Plan and organize intermediate programs.
3. Supervise Level I and II workers.
4. Provide liaison with other community agencies and departments units, etc.

LEVEL IV

Outreach (Detection, Referral, Follow-up)
1. Reach out to major agencies, industries, etc., to help them identify, analyze and solve psychosocial problems (i.e., alcoholism, absenteeism).

Broker
1. Organize a community in behalf of the mentally disabled (i.e., participation in the development of a sheltered workshop to serve all disabilities including the mentally disabled).
2. Provide major agency liaison for services to clients (i.e., arranging for the vocational rehabilitation agency to serve alcoholics).

Evaluation
1. Do evaluation and diagnosis of difficult or complex cases.
2. Do evaluation and diagnosis of specialized problems (medical tests, psychological testing, etc.).
3. Set treatment plan for difficult cases and groups.
4. Do evaluation of community, state, or agency problems.

Teacher
1. Teach informal training and education programs.
2. Supervise staff development.
3. Conduct public information programs.
4. Direct the preparation of teaching materials.

Behavior Changer
1. Do psychotherapy.
2. Prescribe and design behavior modification programs.
3. Do case work with difficult or complex cases.
4. Do group work with complex or problem groups.
5. Prescribe medication and techniques.
6. Do community planning and organizing--cities, states, etc.

LEVEL IV--Continued

Mobilizer

1. Organize community--city or state.
2. Organize and promote major programs and resources in the city, state, county, etc. (publicity, fund campaigns, develop support).
3. Promote changes in laws, rules and regulations (state, city, etc.).

Consultant

1. Work with major state, city and voluntary agencies and units regarding problems of the agencies' clients, staff or operations.

Community Planner

1. Participate in planning major state, city, county programs to include mental health insights in planning.
2. Consult with other major agencies and staff.
3. Organize major communities.
4. Serve on Boards of Urban Renewal agencies, model cities programs, juvenile delinquency boards, etc.

Care Giver

1. Provide specialized skills and services (i.e., medical services, supportive psychotherapy).

Data Manager

1. Do research (design studies, methodologies, etc.).
2. Analyze and evaluate programs.
3. Plan programs (major communities, agencies, state level, etc.).

Administrator

1. Administer major programs (state, city, county, personnel, budget, facilities).
2. Plan and organize major programs.
3. Supervise staff, unit heads, etc.
4. Provide liaison with other major agencies (legislatures, mayors, governors, councils, commissions, etc.).

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

724 S. W. Harrison
Portland, Oregon 97201

Dear Respondent:

We are requesting your participation in completing the enclosed questionnaire as part of our research practicum study in Portland State's MSW program. Your name was randomly drawn from those of the 404 graduates of the MSW program through its first ten years. Because this is a random sample it is extremely important that we get as close to a 100% return as possible. If we don't we cannot, with any validity, make generalizations about the entire group from the information available. Pre-tests have shown that the questionnaire takes only about 20 minutes to complete. Please return the questionnaire as soon as you can (hopefully within a week) since we have a limited amount of time in which to complete our practicum. Thanks in advance for your assistance.

Now to the purpose of this study. We wish to gather information in three main areas:

1. Where have all the graduates gone? (Social work or non-social work careers, types of jobs held, etc.)
2. What kinds of tasks are graduates performing in their various roles as social workers, and how do these tasks relate to the MSW curriculum?
3. What sorts of on-going professional development experiences do graduates need and want?

This information will be extremely valuable both in curriculum design and in the planning of future continuing education programs for graduates.

We are interested in the total body of information gathered and not in individual responses. All personal information will therefore be kept in strict confidence. We plan to complete the study by early Spring quarter, 1975. At that time we will send you an abstract of the study. Thanks again for your prompt completion of the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Howard Marshack
Michael Des Camp
Sonja Matison, Practicum Advisor

A. GENERAL INFORMATION AND WORK HISTORY

1. In which area of study did you receive your undergraduate degree?
   ( ) social sciences ( ) arts and letters ( ) education
   ( ) physical sciences ( ) business/economics ( ) other_____

2. What was your primary reason for wanting to enter the social service field? _____

3. Prior to entering PSU's MSW program, how much work experience or volunteer experience did you have in the social service field?
   ( ) none ( ) six months to one year ( ) two to five yrs.
   ( ) up to six months ( ) one to two years ( ) over five years

---

4. If you consider yourself to be presently working in the social service field, please answer the following questions. If not, please skip to question #5.
   a. What is the title of your present position? (the position which occupies most of your time) _____
   b. How long have you held this position?_____months or_____years
   c. What is the most satisfying aspect of your present position? _____
   d. What is the most dissatisfying aspect of your present position? _____
   e. What is the name of the agency in which you are presently employed? _____
   f. Below is a list of work settings. Please check all settings in which you have ever been employed since receiving your MSW.
      ( ) private agency ( ) college/univ. ( ) private practice
      ( ) public-state or local ( ) public welfare
      ( ) public-federal ( ) school ( ) health care
      ( ) mental health ( ) military ( ) other (specify)
      ( ) corrections ( ) private industry _____
   g. Which setting designation best describes your present employment? _____.
   h. Below is a list of professional designations. Please check all those which describe the kind of work you are now doing.
      ( ) family therapist ( ) caseworker ( ) program developer
      ( ) group therapist ( ) group worker
      ( ) researcher ( ) psychotherapist ( ) administrator
      ( ) consultant ( ) professor/teacher ( ) other (specify)
      ( ) community organizer ( ) supervisor _____
   i. Which one of the above professional designations do you prefer to be identified with? _____
   j. What are the most prevalent social problems you work with? (e.g., problems connected with aging, corrections, alcoholism, family disruption) _____
   k. In which age group are the majority of your clients? _____
   l. What is the approximate annual income of most of your clients? _____.

---

5. If you do not consider yourself to be presently working in the social service field, please answer the following questions, then skip to Section C.
   a. Are you presently employed? ( ) yes ( ) no
   b. If "yes," what is your present job? _____
   c. If "no," what are you now doing? _____
   d. What was the primary reason for your decision to leave the social service field? _____
   e. Do you intend to return to work in the social service field sometime in the future? ( ) yes ( ) no ( ) undecided

B. TASK PERFORMANCE

Below is a list of tasks that might be performed by someone working in the social service field. On the scale of numbers to the right of each task, please circle the number which best indicates how essential the performance of that task is to the overall performance of your present job. For example, if being able to write a grant proposal is absolutely essential to the performance of your present job, circle "1" on the scale next to that task.

		absolutely essential				not at all essential
1.	Initiate contact with clients (families, individuals, groups) to determine if problems exist.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Initiate contact with clients to help with problems that have been made known to you.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Once initial help has been given, follow up with clients to determine progress and further assess needs.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Refer clients if services aren't available through your agency.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Instruct clients in ways to use social service systems and obtain services.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Help bring about changes in rules and regulations of social service agencies.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Design informal training programs (workshops, seminars).	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Instruct in informal training programs.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Teach in a classroom setting at the undergraduate level.	1	2	3	4	5

		absolutely essential				not at all essential
10.	Teach in a classroom setting at the Masters or Doctorate level.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Instruct in a field practice setting (training students in an agency).	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Carry out in-service training or staff development (training agency workers).	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Administer diagnostic tests and plan treatment on the basis of those tests.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Perform a psychosocial diagnosis and use it to plan a course of treatment.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Conduct "helping interviews" in a one-to-one setting.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Conduct "helping interviews" in a family therapy setting.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Perform functions of therapist or leader in a group setting.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Utilize various therapeutic techniques (gestalt, behavior modification, transactional analysis, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Write a grant proposal and present it to a funding source.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Use knowledge of group theory and organizational analysis.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Observe and evaluate small group and community needs.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Contact and establish relationships with organized groups.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Organize a group to deal with a particular neighborhood or community need.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Bring groups together to deal with a specific neighborhood or community need.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Provide consulting services to a group or agency.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Read and critically review pertinent literature.	1	2	3	4	5

		absolutely essential				not at all essential
27.	Use knowledge of research design to collect data.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Use knowledge of research design to perform a needs assessment.	1	2	3	4	5
29.	Use knowledge of research design to evaluate a program or agency.	1	2	3	4	5
30.	Prepare a research report.	1	2	3	4	5
31.	Plan the budget of an agency or program.	1	2	3	4	5
32.	Plan for maintenance of a program, department, or agency (supplies, upkeep, equipment, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
33.	Perform ongoing supervision of workers.	1	2	3	4	5

C. TASK PERFORMANCE TRAINING

A primary goal of Portland State's MSW program is to " . . . produce an advanced professional social work practitioner who will have a general orientation to the whole of social work practice . . . " To achieve this goal the School must be aware of the ever-changing needs of clients and client groups and the tasks a social worker must perform to meet these needs.

With this in mind, please return to the list of tasks above. For each task, put an "X" through the number which best describes how essential you feel it is that the School offers students an opportunity to learn that task in the MSW program. This is regardless of the types of tasks you perform in your present job.

For example, if you feel that it is not at all essential for a student to learn to prepare a research report while in the MSW program, put an "X" through number "5" next to that particular task.

D. CONTINUING EDUCATION

The information from this section will help the Division of Continuing Education provide opportunities for further educational programs in areas of interest to MSW's.

1. Are you currently enrolled in a program which will lead to another advanced degree in any field? ( ) yes ( ) no

2. If "yes," please identify the degree and the field (e.g., Masters in Business Administration) degree_____ field_____

3. Please circle the number which best describes how interested you are in taking a course in each area of study listed below.

	very interested				not at all interested
a. one-to-one therapy	1	2	3	4	5
b. group therapy	1	2	3	4	5
c. family therapy	1	2	3	4	5
d. supervision	1	2	3	4	5
e. community organization/development . .	1	2	3	4	5
f. specific social problems (e.g., racism, poverty, sexism) identify _____	1	2	3	4	5
g. research	1	2	3	4	5
h. proposal writing/grant management . .	1	2	3	4	5
i. administration/program planning . . .	1	2	3	4	5
j. teaching	1	2	3	4	5
k. other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5

4. Which <u>one</u> of the following learning options would you most prefer?
( ) evening classes for academic credit
( ) day classes for academic credit
( ) evening classes <u>not</u> for academic credit
( ) one day workshop or seminar
( ) two or more day workshop or seminar
( ) other (specify) _____

5. Please check the response which most accurately describes your reaction to the following statement: "Within the next three years I will be enrolled in a program which will lead to a Doctorate in Social Work or in another field."
( ) definately ( ) possibly ( ) definately not
( ) very likely ( ) probably not

6. Since receiving your MSW, which of the following learning options have you participated in for <u>social service related</u> educational experiences?
( ) evening classes for academic credit
( ) day classes for academic credit
( ) evening classes <u>not</u> for academic credit
( ) one day workshop or seminar
( ) two or more day workshop or seminar
( ) other (specify) _____

7. Considering your career goals and desires, what would you like to be doing five years from now? _____
_____

Thanks very much for helping with our practicum. We will send an abstract of the results to you as soon as possible.

Michael Des Camp
2427 N. E. 16th Street
Portland, Oregon 97212

APPENDIX C

TABLE OF FACTOR WEIGHTINGS

FOR SOCIAL WORK TASKS

TABLE 15

FACTOR WEIGHTINGS FOR SOCIAL WORK TASKS

Social Work Task	Factors 1	Factors 2	Factors 3	Factors 4	Factors 5	Factors 6	Factors 7
1	-0.102	-0.010	0.115	-0.024	-0.869	-0.071	-0.038
2	0.077	0.185	-0.059	0.333	-0.841	-0.098	-0.059
3	0.182	0.165	-0.120	0.636	-0.414	0.022	-0.120
4	-0.132	0.041	0.030	0.824	-0.106	-0.037	0.032
5	-0.004	0.289	0.048	0.737	0.128	-0.136	-0.136
6	0.105	0.006	-0.042	0.137	-0.046	-0.259	-0.670
7	0.837	0.121	-0.032	0.038	-0.138	-0.154	-0.311
8	0.773	0.260	0.199	-0.079	0.007	-0.278	0.012
9	0.804	0.049	0.273	-0.085	0.010	-0.077	-0.053
10	0.741	0.074	0.209	0.146	0.123	-0.026	-0.272
11	0.502	-0.048	0.180	-0.013	0.064	-0.079	-0.609
12	0.741	-0.060	0.144	0.069	0.119	-0.319	-0.270
13	0.032	0.253	0.328	-0.089	-0.195	0.380	-0.390
14	0.147	0.722	-0.095	0.087	0.210	-0.299	0.113
15	0.020	0.809	0.143	0.151	-0.151	-0.144	-0.085
16	0.082	0.800	-0.024	0.128	-0.158	-0.291	-0.150
17	-0.234	0.437	0.097	-0.373	-0.444	-0.077	-0.209
18	0.137	0.703	0.255	0.200	-0.162	0.130	-0.107
19	0.163	0.284	0.247	-0.161	-0.010	0.045	-0.753
20	0.024	0.325	0.289	0.021	-0.461	-0.561	0.007
21	0.212	0.159	0.304	0.013	-0.221	-0.770	0.032
22	0.346	0.180	-0.002	0.045	-0.056	-0.676	-0.356

TABLE 15--Continued

Social Work Task	Factors 1	Factors 2	Factors 3	Factors 4	Factors 5	Factors 6	Factors 7
23	0.229	0.188	0.186	0.068	-0.011	-0.682	-0.531
24	0.274	0.287	0.131	0.126	0.043	-0.676	-0.423
25	0.173	0.078	0.067	0.343	-0.106	-0.300	-0.648
26	0.293	0.131	0.405	0.350	-0.085	0.001	-0.138
27	0.104	-0.042	0.927	-0.032	-0.044	-0.072	-0.052
28	0.136	0.054	0.925	-0.039	-0.080	-0.171	-0.101
29	0.181	0.201	0.865	-0.074	0.019	-0.236	-0.173
30	0.110	0.105	0.918	0.077	0.055	-0.051	-0.027
31	0.419	-0.065	0.631	0.052	-0.095	-0.022	-0.507
32	0.347	0.050	0.578	0.117	-0.158	0.049	-0.514
33	0.496	-0.088	0.345	0.001	-0.110	-0.105	-0.565

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackoff, Russel L. The Design of Social Research. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Armstrong, Patricia M.; Brown, James; Roy, Robert; Walter, Edward; Welch, Donald. "Constructing a Tool for Measuring Common Social Work Activities"; Master's Thesis. Portland, Oregon: Portland State College School of Social Work, 1966.

Berg, Ivar. The Great Training Robbery. New York: Praeger Publications, 1970.

Council on Social Work Education. "Curriculum Policy for the Masters Degree Program in Graduate Schools of Social Work." New York: CSWE Publications. (Mimeographed).

Gurin, Arnold. "Education for Changing Practice." Shaping the New Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1973.

_____, and Williams, David. "Social Work Education." Education for the Professions of Medicine, Law, Theology, and Social Welfare. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Kahn, Alfred J., ed. Issues in American Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

_____. Theory and Practice of Social Planning. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

Kim, Jae-On, and Nie, Norman H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Levin, Arnold M. The Study of Attitudes of Social Workers in Mid-Career. Research Survey. Chicago: University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration, 1974.

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

Miller, Roger R. "Statistical Analysis of Data." Social Work Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Powell, Hedy-Jo. "A Follow-up Study of Community Organization Concentrators." Research Practicum, Portland State University School of Social Work, 1974.

Portland State University School of Social Work. "Accreditation Team Report and School Response." Portland, Oregon, 1974.

_____. "Curriculum Design." Portland, Oregon: Portland State University, 1973.

_____. "Summary of Self-Study." Portland, Oregon: Portland State University, 1974.

Richan, Willard C. and Mendelsohn, Allan R. Social Work: The Unloved Profession. New York: New Viewpoints, 1973.

Rude, John C. Human Services Training in Oregon. Salem, Oregon: Educating Coordinating Council, 1972.

Rummel, R. J. Applied Factor Analysis. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Schein, Edgar H. Professional Education: Some New Directions. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Southern Regional Education Board. Roles and Functions for Mental Health Workers. Report of a Symposium. Atlanta, GA.: National Institute of Mental Health, 1969.

Toren, Nina. Social Work: The Case of a Semi-Profession. Beverly Hills/London: Sage Publications, 1972.

Wilensky, Harold L. and Lebaux, Charles N. Industrial Society and Social Welfare. New York: The Free Press, 1965.