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ABSTRACT

Although an important aspect of any baccalaureate social work program is the inculcation of social work values, there has not been an abundance of studies in this area. Many of those that exist have been criticized for their methodology in measuring values. It is appropriate to examine that which has been termed the "fulcrum" of social work practice relative to the educational processes which purport to put that fulcrum in place.

The purpose of this study was to compare BSW students in religiously-affiliated institutions of higher education with those in state-supported institutions on three dimensions: adherence to social work values, level of moral reasoning, and attitudes toward selected social issues and programs. Comparisons were made with the religiously-affiliated programs both aggregated and divided into three subgroups along a theologically liberal-conservative continuum.

When the religiously-affiliated schools were aggregated, no significant differences were found between the two main groups in students' adherence to core social work values or level of moral reasoning. Some significant differences were seen in student attitudes on a number of
social issues and programs, both when the religiously-affiliated programs were aggregated and when they were subgrouped. Those issues drawing the largest differences between the groups when the religious schools were aggregated were same-sex marriage, prayer in schools, helping the homeless, and the death penalty. Students in the state schools scored more "liberal" on the first two issues; students in the religious schools scored more liberal on the latter two. Other strong differences were found regarding labor unions, abortion, and civil rights for homosexuals, with students in state schools responding in a more liberal manner.

Significant differences were found in core social work values when the state programs and those affiliated with theologically conservative religious groups were compared. Furthermore, it appears that students in the state programs and those in the religious programs do not all subscribe to the same foundation for ethical decision-making. The study also confirmed that social work values are inculcated through baccalaureate social work programs, and provided documentation of the usefulness of the new Social Work Values Inventory.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One way in which baccalaureate social work programs can clearly be categorized and differentiated is along affiliation lines. Approximately 57 percent of current baccalaureate programs are housed in institutions of higher education which are publicly funded, either at the state or local level, and approximately 43 percent are privately funded. Of the latter, 72 percent (or 31 percent of the total) are affiliated with religious bodies. While one might suppose that curricula components, guided, to a large extent, by the Council on Social Work Education's Curriculum Policy Statements, are fairly uniform, one might wonder if students emerging from these institutions are similar, not only in social work skills and knowledge, but in values, attitudes, and the way in which they approach ethical decisions. Religious traditions upon which most of the private institutions are founded may influence the above student attributes. Or, students with a given constellation of attributes (e.g. value set, belief system, et cetera) may be attracted to religiously-affiliated institutions and hence differ from their public institution counterparts to begin with.
This study compares students in baccalaureate programs which are publicly funded and those in programs which are affiliated with religious bodies relative to their adherence to social work values, their level of moral reasoning, and their attitudes on selected issues. The study serves as a "snapshot" of students emerging from our baccalaureate programs at the present time. While it does not present a comprehensive picture, it does present a look at an important aspect of the social worker’s identity, that composed of a cluster of values-related elements. The population to which it is hoped the study will generalize makes up a significant percentage of the candidates who are set to enter Masters of Social Work (MSW) programs or who are about to move directly into social work practice. The rest of this section introduces the study in more detail.

When professions are discussed in the social science literature and especially in that of social work, definitions of what constitutes a "profession" are sometimes divided into three categories (Popple, 1985; Hopps & Collins, 1995) The first and earliest historically is called variously "attribute" (Millerson, 1973), "trait" (Popple, 1985), "ideal-typical" (Larson, 1977), "institutional" (Larson, 1977), "structural-functional" (Hopps & Collins, 1995), or "exchange-structural" (Cullen,
1978). This means of defining "profession" seeks to draw up a list of fixed attributes or criteria which includes true professions and excludes all other occupations. This is essentially what Abraham Flexner provided in his paper "Is Social Work a Profession?" (Flexner, 1915), followed by William Hodson's (1925), "Is Social Work Professional?" and Ernest Greenwood's (1957) "Attributes of a Profession."

The "process" model holds that as an occupation moves toward professional status, it passes through a particular sequence which includes the move from volunteer to paid activity, the establishment of training programs connected to universities, the formation of professional organizations, the development of a code of ethics, and the gaining of legal protection for the exclusive practice of its activities (Caplow, 1954; Wilensky, 1964). Popple (1985) describes the process model as a variation of the trait approach.

The third model differentiates professions based on "power" (Cullen, 1978; Freidson, 1970; Larson, 1977). Freidson (1970) emphasizes that only professions have been given the right to control their own work, while Larson (1977) asserts that professions attain market power, attempting to "translate one order of scarce resources--special knowledge and skill--into another--social and
economic rewards." (p. xvii). She notes that the professions are found only in the middle and upper strata of society.

In all likelihood, each of the models of profession bears some element of truth, which is reminiscent of the parable of the blind men and the elephant. Each can be found in the social work literature, though not all in equal measure. While Popple (1985) argues that the social work profession must define itself vis a vis its social assignment (the exchange aspect of the exchange-structural label), for the most part the social work literature has focused on the list of attributes.

One important way to define and differentiate a profession (using the attributes model) is to enumerate the unique set of values shared by the members of that profession (DePoy & Merrill, 1988). To be a professional is to be dedicated to a distinctive set of ideals and standards of conduct (Jennings, Callahan, and Wolf, 1987, as cited in Gellermann, Frankel, & Ladenson, 1990), and members of a profession are bound together by those common aspirations, values, and training (Gellermann, Frankel, & Ladenson, 1990). These statements are no more fitting than for the profession of social work, for values are preeminent in social work; they are the fulcrum of the profession's practice (Vigilante, 1974). Social work then,
is a normative reference group whose values and articulation of appropriate conduct serve as guidelines by which individual practitioners organize and perform their work and by which outsiders can understand and evaluate practitioners\' performance (Frankel, 1989). Therefore, it is of utmost importance that values be passed on to each succeeding generation of social workers.

One important aspect of any baccalaureate level social work program is the inculcation of social work values. Until recently, this was assumed to take place along with exposure to the content areas as outlined in the 1982 curriculum policy statement (CSWE, 1982). The 1992 curriculum policy statement strengthened the place of values and ethics in the curriculum, including them in their own content area in addition to their diffusion throughout the curriculum (CSWE, 1992).

Important questions continue to linger, however. One involves the degree to which social work values are actually imparted to succeeding generations of practitioners. Cooper (1993/1994) notes that a thorough immersion is necessary. "Students, especially those entering small liberal arts sectarian schools, often bring with them provincial and traditional value systems. Even in large secular state institutions, student value systems tend to reflect regional interests and students likely
find it difficult to allow social work values to permeate their personal values." (p. 1) A second set of questions relates to the first, and also to Cooper's observation: Do students graduating from different programs enter the practice world with consistently similar values? Do students receiving the Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) degree at small liberal arts colleges hold the same professional values as their counterparts at large state universities? And, is there any difference in professional values between BSW students at religiously-affiliated institutions and those at state schools? This study will focus on the last question.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to explore selected value-related dimensions among baccalaureate social work students in tax-supported, state institutions of higher education and students in BSW programs in colleges and universities which are affiliated with religious bodies. The focus of comparison will be in three related, perhaps somewhat overlapping areas. The first, and main, area is in the adherence to social work values. This speaks to the degree to which students "affirm" or "hold" what are generally thought to be core social work values. This obviously will need to be operationalized very specifically, and those "core" values enunciated.
Secondly, the students will be compared on their level of moral reasoning. Moral reasoning is like a bridge between the values one holds and the actions in which one chooses to engage. Level of moral reasoning has been found to be correlated with social work values (Rice, 1994/1995), and to distinguish between persons whose religious beliefs differ relative to theology and authority (Getz, 1984).

A third area of comparison centers around views social work students hold on a number of current social issues. The social work profession, at least to the degree that it is represented by the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), has formulated position statements on some of these issues. Some of the other social issues under comparison have been discussed in print in the Association's newspaper. It is not difficult, however, to find students and practitioners who hold views counter to those espoused by the profession's dominant organization. Evidence for divergent opinions can be found in the "Letters to the Editor" section of NASW News (Cf. "Value of Faith," NASW, 1998a; "Input Valued?" NASW, 1998b; "Question of Values," NASW, 1998c; "More on Values," NASW, 1999), candid discussions at professional meetings, and frequently in the social work classroom. The final comparative aspect of the study, then, will be to seek to
determine if viewpoints differ markedly between social work students in state universities and those in religiously-affiliated programs.

**Importance of the Study**

Evidence for the appropriateness and importance of this study, as well as the researcher's motivation to engage in it, come from several areas. One factor has to do with the critical necessity for self-evaluation and self-reflection at the level of the profession, just as it is important for the individual to engage in those exercises. A second has to do with the researcher's general impression that there has been a shift toward conservatism on the part of social work students over the last decade or two. The third factor involves the boundaries of the profession, with the related issues of inclusion and exclusion.

Standing at the brink of the 21st century certainly seems to be an appropriate time for self-scrutiny. All aspects of human enterprise are accelerating in their rate of change. This includes, and especially so, those specialized human endeavors of natural and social science inquiry, and the applied disciplines that include the helping professions, such as social work. As needs of human society change over time, so must the knowledge and
skill bases of the professions. Professional values interface with both knowledge and skill bases.

While social work can claim to be a value-driven profession, "distinguishing itself among professions for its unique and clear value base that guides and informs practices, interventions, and stances on social policies and social issues" (Jones, 1996, p. 306), a cursory look at the literature across professions suggests it is in no way at the forefront of self-evaluation relative to professional values. Numerous studies can be found among the other professions, particularly nursing (Cf. Ochsner, 1996; Wilson, 1995; Schoenly, 1996; Roberts, 1996) as well as other human services (Cf. Stern, 1996; Fagan, 1996; Nof, 1994/1995; Watt, 1992). Reamer (Reamer and Abramson, 1982) notes a similar disparity between social work and other professions relative to literature on ethics.

Regarding social work values, he states,

What literature is available in social work tends to concentrate on fairly superficial discussions of traditional (though admittedly important) values such as respecting client dignity, promoting self-determination and equity, maintaining confidentiality, and so on. The number of articles that discuss questions regarding the justification of social work values, and problems that practitioners encounter attempting to resolve conflicts among them, is relatively small. (pp. 5-6)

While Reamer's assertion is still uncomfortably true, the amount of investigation into social work values does
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appear to be increasing. There has been a steady, if slow, stream of such studies over the decades, and an increase can be seen over the last twenty years. Reamer (1983, 1990, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1998; Reamer and Abramson, 1982) has been responsible for a large portion of scholarly writing in this area during the last two decades. Many of the empirical studies during this time have come through the doctoral dissertations of people, it can be surmised, preparing to inculcate knowledge and values of future generations of social work practitioners (Cf. Howard, 1980; Watt, 1992; Da Silva, 1993; Cooper, 1993/1994; Pike, 1994; Rice, 1994/1995; Scheel, 1996/1997). Continued self-reflection on all aspects of social work practice is necessary. Evaluation of social work education and social work students goes hand-in-hand with this.

The second motivating factor for engaging in this study relates to an intuitive impression upon the part of the researcher. Almost fourteen years ago, the researcher first began to teach at the undergraduate social work level. While eleven of those have been in an adjunct capacity, and thirteen have been spent in programs under the sponsorship of a relatively conservative Christian denomination, the researcher has developed a growing impression that students over that time have moved more
toward the conservative pole. Over the course of the years, he has discussed this impression with teaching colleagues, and most recently, he has heard similar thoughts stated by doctoral classmates who are also teaching in various settings. Since the fall semester of 1997, this student has held a faculty position in a BSW program at a state-supported institution. Although there is certainly a wider range of viewpoints expressed by students he has encountered, his impression still remains that student opinions are somewhat more conservative than they once were.

To research the thesis that BSW students are more conservative than they were 20, or even 10, years ago is not the intent of this current study. Still, having experienced social work education in both religious and secular settings, both as a student and as a faculty member, this researcher does wonder, "To what extent do students in programs under the auspices of religious bodies differ from those who are in state-supported programs?" "Are any existing differences brought to the programs by the students themselves (in other words, is 'self-selection' a factor) or are differences produced by the program environments?"

This study is also important from the perspective of inclusiveness-exclusiveness and boundaries. Beginning with
the 1982 accreditation standards (CSWE, 1982), the Council on Social Work Education’s (CSWE) Commission on Accreditation (COA) has required that social work programs include sexual orientation in their nondiscrimination policy statements along with political affiliation, race, color, religion, creed, gender, ethnic or national origin, disability, and age (Commission on Accreditation, cited in Parr, 1996 and Jones, 1996). CSWE through the COA has not required, however, that the institutions housing the social work programs include sexual orientation (or political, for that matter) in the larger institution’s nondiscrimination policy, as there is no federal protection against discrimination based on sexual orientation, and such a requirement would be unenforceable (Jones, 1996). Following mounting debate which began with the University of Minnesota School of Social Work’s ethical challenge regarding the inconsistency between the standards for programs and for host institutions (Jones, 1996), the COA, in a memo to deans and directors (COA, cited in Parr, 1996 and Jones, 1996), proposed a unified standard for programs and host institutions, but "Religious institutions that qualify for religious exemption under federal laws and regulations may apply for an exemption if they cannot comply with these [nondiscrimination] standards" (Commission on

The debate continued in point/counterpoint articles (Parr, 1996; Jones, 1996) in the CSWE sponsored journal, with religious freedom, diversity, and self-determination being touted to support exemptions (Parr, 1996), and values, ethics, and the denial that an institution has "a right" to an accredited social work program used in argument against exemptions (Jones, 1996). The issue was also debated vigorously in CSWE board meetings (L. Leighninger, personal communication, June 19, 1998) and at CSWE’s annual program meeting (APM) in 1996 (COA, 1997).

This led the COA to propose a revised evaluative standard entitled, "Nondiscrimination and Human Diversity" along with a new preamble preceding the evaluative standards. The COA points out that the nondiscrimination standard is an evaluative standard, and will not remove a program from consideration for accreditation as failure to meet an eligibility standard would. (Commission on Accreditation, 1997). The new approach was then debated at the 1997 APM meeting, with a vote to come later. The debate on the larger issue will probably not die down soon.

Van Soest (1996) writes, "When schools of social work reside in host institutions that formally oppose
homosexuality, they compromise their ability to prepare students for competent, sensitive practice with lesbian and gay clients." (p.60) Herein lies the crux of the issue. Do such programs compromise their ability to prepare students? Are the value bases of social work education programs in universities and colleges sponsored by religious groups so different from those of the whole of social work education? Are students in religiously-affiliated programs significantly different in their attitudes toward homosexuality from those in public institutions? If so, does that necessarily mean they are significantly different in their adherence to the core values of the social work profession? The debaters, from whichever side they argue, have made certain values-related assumptions which need to be confirmed or rejected.

While the debate within CSWE circles has centered on the issue of granting accreditation to programs residing in institutions which will not affirm nondiscrimination statements relative to sexual orientation, and the questions first formulated by this researcher had to do with 1) whether or not students in those programs significantly differ in their attitudes toward homosexuality and 2) does that indicate a significant differences regarding the core social work values they
hold, the actual study has moved to a greater scope. The broader questions include: 1) Do students in religiously-affiliated programs and those in state-supported programs differ significantly in the attitudes they hold relating to various current social issues? Some of the social issues that can frequently be found in the press and in the discussions of social workers and the public alike include abortion, welfare programs, sex education in the schools, affirmative action, homosexual relationships and marriage, gun control, and capital punishment.

2) Do the students in these two categories of programs differ significantly in their adherence to the foundational values of the social work profession? This researcher wonders if attitudes and values are so closely tied together that differences between groups in the one area invariably predict differences between groups in the other. Conversely, could two groups differ considerably in their attitudes toward a particular issue, yet hold similar values? 3) Moral reasoning could be described as the "cognitive bridge" between the values one holds and the actions one takes. Do students in these two types of programs differ in their approach to moral reasoning, that is, the cognitive devices they use to make a moral decision? These, then, are the questions addressed in this study.
The academic level of social work education chosen for this study is the baccalaureate (BSW). There are two reasons for this. First of all, the great majority of religiously-affiliated social work programs which are accredited are BSW level programs. Second, the entirety of this researcher's social work faculty experience is at the baccalaureate level.

Summary

Social work practitioners and educators see their profession as values-driven. If this is indeed the case, the values themselves should be subject to examination. Assumptions made about the profession's values and the values of its practitioners and students should also be examined. The purpose of this study is to compare BSW students in state institutions of higher education with those in religiously-affiliated institutions, with regard to adherence to social work values, level of moral reasoning, and attitudes toward selected social issues. Research questions which have arisen from the literature review will be presented at the end of Chapter II, and specific hypotheses will be formulated in Chapter III (Methodology).
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter will review the literature pertinent to the current study, cataloging it into 4 major areas: (a) the nature of values and their relationship to attitudes, opinions, and ethics; (b) social work values placed in historical, professional, and educational contexts; (c) potential value foundations for social work practice; and (d) moral development.

The Nature of Values and Their Relationship to Attitudes, Opinions, and Ethics

The study of values has enjoyed better than a 50 year history. Names associated with pioneering work in this area are Allport (Allport, 1935; Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey, 1960), C. Kluckhohn (1951), F. Kluckhohn and Stodtbeck (1961), Kohlberg (1974; 1981), Maslow (1959), Dewey (1939), Raths (Raths, Harmin, & Simon, 1966), and Rokeach (1968; 1973). Rokeach is often given major credit for significantly increasing our understanding of values and spurring much of the research conducted since the late 1960s (Mayton II, Ball-Rokeach, & Loges, 1994).

Rokeach defines values as enduring prescriptive or proscriptive beliefs that a specific mode of conduct
(instrumental value) or end state of existence (terminal value) is preferred to another mode of conduct or end state (Rokeach, 1973). They are also said to be organized summaries of experience that capture the focal, abstract qualities of past encounters, that have a normative or oughtness quality about them, and that function as criteria or frameworks against which present experience can be tested (Feather, cited in Feather, 1994). Values provide broad, stable guides by which people may orient their actions when they must choose between two or more alternatives (Ball-Rokeach & Loges, 1994). Pumphrey (1959) describes values as "formulations of preferred behavior held by individuals or social groups. They imply a usual preference for certain means, ends, and conditions of life, often accompanied by strong feeling" (p. 23).

Contrary to the popular way of thinking, values do not decay or decline, but do ascend and descend in one's estimation of their importance (Mayton II, Ball-Rokeach, & Loges, 1994). So when lay people talk about a "decline in values," what is taking place is a reordering of priorities. Values of honesty and politeness might decline in favor of ambition and self-reliance.

There is some degree of debate as to whether values are primarily based in cognition, affect, or both. The cognitive developmentalists (as represented by Rokeach,
Kohlberg, Ball-Rokeach, Mayton, Loges, and Grube), as their name implies, have tended to restrict their explanations and descriptions of values to cognitive processes. They see values as cognitive representations of individual needs and desires, on the one hand, and of societal demands on the other; they are cognitive representations of biological and social needs (Grube, Mayton II, & Ball-Rokeach, 1994).

Actually, early in his best known treatise on human values, Rokeach (1973) presents a holistic description of values:

Values, like all beliefs, have cognitive, affective, and behavioral components: (1) a value is a cognition about the desirable...To say that a person has a value is to say that cognitively he knows the correct way to behave or the correct end-state to strive for. (2) A value is affective in the sense that he can feel emotional about it, be affectively for or against it, approve of those who exhibit positive instances and disapprove of those who exhibit negative instances of it. (3) A value has a behavioral component in the sense that it is an intervening variable that leads to action when activated. (p 7)

Rokeach does not emphasize the affective component in his later work, and his followers appear to overlook this aspect of values as well. As will be seen, however, other writers do keep a balance between cognition and affect, and some, including Rokeach, include conation as a third component.
Beane (1990) places "values" and "character education" in his review and analysis of "affect in the [public school] curriculum." He notes that various versions of affect in the curriculum based on humanistic psychology, values clarification, and moral reasoning gained ascendance in the 1960s and most of the 1970s. A conservative political and religious backlash with a cry of "back to the basics" brought the period to a close. The 1980s saw a steady decline in electives, including value and character education.

Hague (1988) notes that

Both philosophy and psychology have long pursued their penchant for breaking up the human into manageable 'parts.' Cognition and affect form one such dichotomy, with cognitive approaches holding the high ground in the battle in recent years. (p.32)

Kitwood (1984) likewise notes the dualism between cognition and emotion, saying "Western cultural tradition embodies a disastrous separation between the domains of thought and emotion, parallel to the so-called schizoid disturbance in the individual" (p. 293). He further states that this split reflected in western psychology divides the academics who have become increasingly cognitive from the therapists, who tend to give primacy to the emotions.

Both Hague and Kitwood lament the dominance cognition has been given in theories of values. This researcher
believes that values have both cognitive and affective components. The emotional component surfaces when one argues an issue that is colored by personal values. Kitwood maintains that "We may see a person's 'values', however they are structured cognitively, as having their grounding in the emotions." One could say, as this writer believes, that values are at the "crossroads" of cognition and affect. Some theorists see a third component to values, making them tripartite in their composition (Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey, 1962; Meddin, 1975; Rokeach, 1968). The third component could be described as "conation," that is, striving, acting, willing (Meddin, 1975).

Rokeach and like-minded theorists see the self-concept as being most central to the individual's personality, with values and attitudes radiating out around the self like ripples in a pool in which a stone is dropped. Belief system theory (Rokeach, 1973; Ball-Rokeach, Rokeach, & Grube, 1984) purports to provide a framework for understanding how self-concept, values, and attitudes (the belief system), and behaviors are organized and the conditions under which they will remain stable or undergo change. According to the theory, the belief system serves as a framework that guides cognitive and motivational processes (e.g., information processing,
selective forgetting and remembering, ego defense, decision making) that ultimately result in behavior (Rokeach, 1973).

Attitudes are the least central of the primary belief subsystems. While they are relatively enduring, evaluative, prescriptive-postscriptive, and motivational, they are directed toward a specific object (Grube, Mayton II, & Ball-Rokeach, 1994). One can hold as many different attitudes as there are objects of which he is aware in his environment. This suggests why there can be contradictions and inconsistencies among one's attitudes. As examples, attitudes in our society toward racial integration have become more favorable at the same time that attitudes toward governmental programs to achieve such integration are mixed; a white person can hold a favorable attitude toward racial minorities in general and still oppose an African American family moving into the neighborhood.

Opinions have been defined in their connections to values and attitudes in at least three ways. Cooper and McGaugh (1968) hold that opinions are pure cognitions or intellectual assessments without an affective component. Rokeach (1968) sees opinions as the verbal expression of attitudes. Meddin (1975) argues that opinions are a highly specific subcategory of attitudes. A later section,
"Social Workers and Attitudinal Research," will return to these different definitions.

Values, on the other hand, occupy a more central place in one's belief system, and are enduring organizations which transcend objects and situations. As was noted earlier, they are prescriptive or postscriptive beliefs that a specific mode of conduct or a certain end state of existence is preferred to another mode of conduct or end state (Rokeach, 1973). They are cognitive representations of both individual needs and desires and social needs and demands (Grube, Mayton II, & Ball-Rokeach, 1994), and are logically connected to, and guide various attitude clusters (Ball-Rokeach & Loges, 1994). People, organizations, and cultures do not differ so much in the values they hold, but in how those values are prioritized and hierarchically organized (Ball-Rokeach & Loges, 1994).

Rokeach (1973) sees self-conceptions as the most central beliefs of all. They include an individual's cognitions about those qualities that define the self. He argues (in Ball-Rokeach, Rokeach, & Grube, 1984) that maintaining and enhancing self-esteem is the primary motivation as we consider how to behave. Belief system theory suggests that all other beliefs and all behaviors are organized around self-conceptions and are in the
service of maintaining and enhancing self-conceptions (Grube, Mayton II, & Ball-Rokeach, 1994). This is accomplished by behaving in such a way that one’s self-conceptions and self-presentations provide a sense of competence and/or morality. Individuals undergo self-evaluative processes through which they compare what they say or do with their conceptions of themselves as moral and competent beings, or, at least, they try to remain consistent with others’ perceptions of them as moral and competent (Grube, Mayton II, & Ball-Rokeach, 1994). Values, then, are the standards by which individuals evaluate their other beliefs and their behavior as competent or moral (Ball-Rokeach & Loges, 1994). Finally, while values are relatively stable, they can and do undergo change, and because values are central, change in one or more values is postulated to lead to widespread changes in functionally related values, attitudes, and behaviors (Grube, Mayton II, & Ball-Rokeach, 1994).

Rokeach (1973) divides values into terminal values, defined as desired end states of existence, and instrumental values, which are preferred modes of conduct. These he further distinguishes as personal and social under terminal values, and moral values and competence values within the instrumental values. There are relatively few values (Rokeach lists 36), as they are
cognitive representations of biological and social needs (Grube, Mayton II, & Ball-Rokeach, 1994). Pumphrey (1959) distinguishes between "ultimate" or "consummate," "proximate" and "instrumental" values similar to the distinctions of Rokeach.

The list of values put forth by Rokeach (1973), with the definitions he gives for the values, is as follows:

**Terminal Values**

- A comfortable life (a prosperous life)
- An exciting life (a stimulating, active life)
- A sense of accomplishment (lasting contribution)
- A world at peace (free of war and conflict)
- A world of beauty (beauty of nature & arts)
- Equality (brotherhood, equal opportunity for all)
- Family security (taking care of loved ones)
- Freedom (independence, free choice)
- Happiness (contentedness)
- Inner harmony (freedom from inner conflict)
- Mature love (sexual & spiritual intimacy)
- National security (protection from attack)
- Pleasure (an enjoyable, leisurely life)
- Salvation (saved, eternal life)
- Self-respect (self-esteem)
- Social recognition (respect, admiration)
True friendship (close companionship)
Wisdom (a mature understanding of life)

Instrumental Values
Ambitious (hard-working, aspiring)
Broadminded (open minded)
Capable (competent, effective)
Cheerful (lighthearted, joyful)
Clean (neat, tidy)
Courageous (standing up for your beliefs)
Forgiving (willing to pardon others)
Helpful (working for the welfare of others)
Honest (sincere, truthful)
Imaginative (daring, creative)
Independent (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
Intellectual (intelligent, reflective)
Logical (consistent, rational)
Loving (affectionate, tender)
Obedient (dutiful, respectful)
Polite (courteous, well-mannered)
Responsible (dependable, reliable)
Self-controlled (restrained, self-disciplined)

Schwartz (1992, 1994) modifies somewhat the conceptualization of values put forth by Rokeach (1973), and proposes his own typology of basic value content.
He states,

In order to cope with reality in a social context, groups and individuals cognitively transform the necessities inherent in human existence and express them in the language of specific values about which they can communicate. Specifically, values represent, in the form of conscious goals, responses to three universal requirements with which all individuals and societies must cope: needs of individuals as biological organisms, requisites of coordinated social interaction, and requirements for the smooth functioning and survival of groups. (1994, p. 21)

From these three universal requirements he derived ten motivationally distinct types of values, listed below with the definitions he gives them:

- **Power:** Social status and prestige; control or dominance over people and resources
- **Achievement:** Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards.
- **Hedonism:** Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself.
- **Stimulation:** Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life.
- **Self-direction:** Independent thought and action—choosing, creating, exploring.
- **Universalism:** Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature.
Benevolence: Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact.

Tradition: Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide.

Conformity: Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms.


Schwartz found continuity of these ten value content types across 20 countries, using Smallest Space Analysis, which is also known as Similarity Structure Analysis. He considered an eleventh value, Spirituality, defined as meaning in life, a spiritual life, inner harmony, but it could be discerned as a distinct value region over only 42% of his sample. When it did emerge as a value region, it was almost always adjacent to "tradition" or "benevolence."

Schwartz organizes the value content types into a circular model of pie-shaped wedges radiating out from the self and positioned in proximity to one another according to motivational goals. Compatible value content types lie adjacent or in close proximity to one another, while
competing value content types lie opposite one another. The placement of "Conformity" and "Tradition" on the model imply that they share one motivational goal, which Schwartz sees as subordination of self in favor of socially imposed expectations (Schwartz, 1992). Adjacent value content types should be viewed as having some degree of overlap, and more so between "Hedonism" and "Achievement," and "Hedonism" and "Stimulation" (Schwartz, 1994).

Finally, Schwartz (1992, 1994) clusters the value content types into four higher order values along two bipolar dimensions, showing their competing nature. One dimension contrasts "Openness to Change" with "Conservation." The other places "Self-Enhancement" in opposition with "Self-Transcendence." The first contrasts values emphasizing one's own independent thought and action and favoring of change (self-direction and stimulation) with those emphasizing submissive self-restriction, preservation of traditional practices, and protection of stability (security, conformity, and tradition). The second opposes values emphasizing acceptance of others as equals and concern for their welfare (universalism and benevolence) to those emphasizing the pursuit of one's own success and dominance over others (power and achievement). "Hedonism" can be
seen to be relate to both "Openness to Change" and "Self-Enhancement" (Schwartz, 1994).

A brief discussion of ethics and their relationship to values would be appropriate at this point. Ethics are codified behavior that come from values. "Ethics are the application of values to human relationships and transactions" (Levy, 1993, p.1), addressing what is right and correct in the way of behavior (Loewenberg & Dolgoff, 1992). Levy (1976a) elaborates,

On the basis of these [ethics-related] values, social workers can decide on or plan their professional moves and evaluate them afterwards. These values can serve as a basis for regulatory and grievance procedures, designed to encourage ethical social work practice and to adjudicate charges of deviation. (p. 79)

Abbott (1988) summarizes the connection thus:

The ethical imperatives [which flow from professional values] give way to principles of practice (or guidelines to be applied to practice), which lead to a set of rules or commands (code of ethics) governing professional behavior and ultimately determining professional action. (p. 5)

Values, then underpin ethics, although, as Abbott (1988) points out, that does not necessarily guarantee moral or legal behavior.

From the review so far, one sees that values indeed reside in a prominent location within the individual’s personality. They underlie and influence increasingly outlying personality traits including ethics, attitudes,
and opinions, and, as will be discussed, guide ethical decision-making mechanisms. Social work students enter BSW programs previously socialized into the value systems of significant others within their environment, primarily parents and family members, but also friends, teachers, religious leaders, et cetera. Social work educators (including field supervisors) are given the responsibility of presenting to the students a specific cluster of values deemed normative for the profession. The challenge educators face is that of enabling their students to incorporate the values of the profession into the students' individual value systems. The degree of difficulty in accomplishing this task depends on the degree of overlap between each students' personal values and those touted by the profession. As has been stated, values are relatively stable, but they can and do undergo change. The common elements between the profession's values and general values as previously outlined by Rokeach and Schwartz, as well as possible mechanisms for value change, will be discussed below in the sections on social work values.

Social Work Values Placed in Historical, Professional, and Educational Contexts

Social work is a young profession. In 1998 the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) celebrated
100 years of social work as a profession, although it is probably more accurate to refer to the 100th anniversary of the formal founding of the first social work training program. Concern for values can be traced back throughout that history. Over the years, social work values themselves became a focus of research. More recently, social work education has again turned its focus on the inculcation of social work values in the students of the profession, an endeavor first engaged in by Pumphrey (1959). The broader scope of the helping professions, likewise, has seen the development of a growing consciousness regarding professional values. This section examines the nature of social work values, their historical context, research on them, and their relationship to values espoused by other helping professions.

The nature of social work values.

work practice, like the practice of all professions, is recognized by a constellation of value, purpose, sanction, knowledge, and method." (Working Definition, 1958).

In their discussion of social work values, Hunter and Saleebey (1977) outline four characteristics of values. While these apply to values in general, the specific application to social work is evident.

1. Values are conceptual abstractions drawn from immediate experience--from what we ourselves have learned about the world. Our unique experiences make each value unique to each of us (and to our clients).

2. Values are affectively charged for emotional mobilization; that is, they make us want to take action or make us feel emotionally positive or negative about a situation. Racism, for example, makes us angry when we see it in others, and perhaps embarrassed or unhappy when we see it in ourselves, and we want to do something about the problem.

3. Values are criteria by which our goals are chosen. For example, abortion is a tremendously charged value in our society. Almost everyone of us takes a stand on abortion, based on whether we believe in the right of every fetus to survive or the right of every woman to control her own body. We set goals about abortion for ourselves and often work to set abortion standards for others.

4. Values are of important rather than trivial concern. We may prefer the color blue, or to go to one university rather than another, but these issues do not stir us to emotionally charged action. Rather, issues which involve basic questions of life, death, freedom, our rights as citizens or as workers, and the concerns we have for
others-- these are concerns which move us to anger, pride, fear, hope, or love and to actions to attain or resolve these emotions.

Social work values tend to come, as do the professional values of the other helping professions, from the higher order value type "Self-Transcendence" in the Schwartz (1992) model, and the corresponding values listed by Rokeach (1973). For Schwartz, these are the values found in the category he labels "universalism" (understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature), and the category labeled "benevolence" (preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people) (Schwartz, 1992). From the Rokeach (1973) list of terminal values, one could link the following to social work values: "a comfortable life," "a sense of accomplishment," "a world at peace," "equality," "family security," "freedom," "happiness," "inner harmony," "mature love," "pleasure," "self-respect," "social recognition," and "friendship (companionship)."

How either the terminal or the instrumental values of the Rokeach (1973) lists relate to social work values is certainly open to debate, and opinions would probably not only differ among individuals, but especially geographically (at the global level), and also
historically. The list of instrumental values seems particularly susceptible to variations in definition, and social workers might argue vehemently about which ones relate positively to social work values based on how they define the value terms. Nevertheless, it could be argued that the following fit with social work values (and the reader is encouraged to review the Rokeach, 1973 entries with their synonyms): "ambitious," "broadminded," "capable," "cheerful," "forgiving," "helpful," "honest," "imaginative," "independent," "intellectual," "logical," "loving," "responsible," and "self-controlled." "Clean" would certainly have been close to the top of the list during the profession’s "friendly visitor" days!

There is no universally agreed upon set of social work values to be found in the literature (Timms, 1983), and numerous authors have provided lists of values. These include: Abbott, Baer and Federico, Barker, Bartlett, Biestek, Biestek and Gehrig, Billups, Central Council for Education and Training in Social Work (CCETSW), Compton and Galaway, Goldstein, Gordon, Hunt, A. Johnson, L. Johnson, Keith-Lucas, Levy, Morales and Sheafor, NASW, Plant, Popple, Pumphrey, Reamer, Sheafor, Horejsi, & Horejsi, Siporin, Solomon, Teicher, Timms, Varley, Wilson, and Zastrow (as cited in Reamer, 1994, 1995; Timms, 1983). At the same time, Reamer (1995) finds considerable
consistency among the various lists. Commonly cited social work values are:

Worth and dignity of the individual
Respect for persons
Acceptance
Non-judgmental attitude
Valuing individuals' capacity for change
Client self-determination
Providing individuals with opportunity to realize their potential
Seeking to meet individuals' common human needs
Commitment to social change and social justice
Confidentiality
Seeking to provide individuals with adequate resources and services to meet their basic needs
Client empowerment
Equal opportunity
Nondiscrimination
Respect for diversity
Willingness to transmit professional knowledge and skills to others

(Cited in Reamer, 1994, 1995; Timms, 1983)

The NASW Standards for the Classification of Social Work Practice (1982) give the following as basic social work values:
1. commitment to the primary importance of the individual in society
2. respect for the confidentiality of relationships with clients
3. commitment to social change to meet socially recognized needs
4. willingness to keep personal feelings and needs separate from professional relationships
5. willingness to transmit knowledge and skill to others
6. respect and appreciation for individual and group differences
7. commitment to develop clients' ability to help themselves
8. willingness to persist in efforts on behalf of clients despite frustration
9. commitment to social justice and the economic, physical, and mental well-being of all members of society
10. commitment to high standards of personal and professional conduct

Finally, the 1996 NASW Code of Ethics provides for the first time in any NASW code an explicit summary of the profession's core values (Reamer, 1998). While "Social Justice" and "Dignity and Worth of the Person" are cited in other lists, the 1996 code adds "Service," "Importance of Human Relationships," "Integrity," and "Competence," which were implicit in earlier lists.

As was stated earlier, the beliefs or preferences comprising values can be either prescriptive, that is,
including, affirming, or desiring, or proscriptive, meaning disallowing, forbidding, or undesirable. The beliefs or preferences which are expressed in the negative, and are excluding, disallowing, or forbidding have been called "disvalues" (Mohan, 1987; Pumphrey, 1959; Timms, 1983). Timms indicates that this is a large area which has generally been neglected in the social work literature (Timms, 1983, p. 61).

Disvalues may be viewed as simply the negative of the more desirable values. For example, Mohan (1987) juxtaposes inequality and injustice with the emphasized social work values equality and justice. Pumphrey (1959) states, "Values may be expressed in the negative as 'disvalues' or prohibitions, formulations of behavior to be avoided." (p. 23)

Timms (1983) describes disvalues as more than just the opposite of cherished social work values. He writes, "I wish to more than call attention to the shadows inevitably cast by 'values'; that is to say, reference is not made to the negatives, 'contained' in the assertion of positive values." (p. 61) He explains further, "... there seem to be 'values' that achieve a high degree of unpopularity, as it were, in their own right amongst social workers." (p. 61) He proceeds to discuss two: manipulation and paternalism. Other disvalues in social
work could be added as well, such as prejudice and discrimination.

Interestingly, Timms (1983) admits later in the chapter that there appear to be instances when social workers are legitimately called upon to engage in paternalistic behavior. Reamer (1983) gives a detailed discussion of conditions which justify paternalism: (1) when clients lack information that, if available, would lead them to consent to interference; (2) when clients are incapable of comprehending relevant information, either temporarily or permanently; (3) when clients consent to the paternalistic intervention prior to the interference; and (4) when clients are likely to consent to the paternalistic intervention subsequent to the interference (pp. 261-265). Reamer uses potential suicide as an example of conditions 1 and 4, while children and the mentally ill fit condition 2. The treatment of alcohol or other drug addiction readily comes to mind as examples of condition 3. It appears, then, that some disvalues are just that under any circumstances, while others, such as paternalism, are not so clear-cut.

There have been various efforts to classify social work values. Pumphrey (1959) divides social work values by levels of abstraction. She indicates that the "ultimate values" with which social work concerns itself are highly
abstract, such as "Each human being should be regarded by all others as an object of infinite worth" (pp. 43-44). Middle level abstractions of social work values include assertions about "the well-functioning person," "the good family," "the growth-enhancing group," and "the good community" (p. 46). Finally, the "instrumental values" are the least abstract, and include beliefs such as a nonjudgmental, non-blaming, warm approach toward people (pp. 48-49).

Levy (1973, 1976a) classifies social work values into three primary groups. The first group contains those values pertaining to social workers' "preferred conceptions of people," such as the worth and dignity of people, and their capacity for change. The second group contains social work values pertaining to "preferred outcomes for people" and include providing individuals with opportunity to realize their potential, and providing resources and services to help people meet their needs. The third category involves values relative to "preferred instrumentalities for dealing with people," including self-determination and non-judgmental attitude.

One could wonder if some social work values are more foundational than others, and if some take priority over others. This leads to the question, "Which social work values should be considered 'core' values?" Pike (as cited
in Popple, 1992) conducted a content analysis of the social work literature of the previous 25 years and found the most frequently cited social work values to be:

- The inherent dignity and worth of the individual
- Society’s responsibility for the individual’s welfare
- Reciprocity between individuals and the society and the reciprocity between rights and responsibilities
- Client self-determination
- Individual potential for change

In laying the groundwork for the Social Work Values Inventory (SWVI), Pike (1994, 1996) refined this list to the following four:

- Confidentiality
- Self-determination
- Dignity and worth of clients
- Social justice

Preliminary testing of the SWVI showed "Dignity and worth" to load across the remaining three, leading Pike to believe that dignity and worth may underlie the other three as the more foundational value (Pike, 1996, p. 341).

Indeed, "the dignity and worth of the individual" may be the most central value, or as Pike (1996) suggests, even more foundational, underlying all of social work values as a "value orientation." She says, "Because
dignity and worth seems to underlie the three remaining values, it may represent a value orientation rather than a value" (p. 341). Such is consistent with the thoughts of Bernstein (1960) and Biestek and Gehrig (1978), who emphasize that the innate dignity and value of the human being is the supreme value, with the second value of self-determination being the means through which the human-worth value is fully realized and honored. Pumphrey (1959) likewise describes the infinite worth of human beings first in her list of highly abstract values. Boehm (1958) and Gordon (1962, 1965), on the other hand, espouse the view that the related value, self-fulfillment or self-realization, is the most basic human need, and thus the ultimate social work value.

Tyler (in press), comparing the international literature published in English, has discovered some arguments against the idea of a core of values universal in nature, and wonders which, if any, social work values are truly universal. For example, some writers (Cf. Goldstein, 1986; Hammoud, 1988; Nagpaul, 1993) charge that a number of espoused social work values, including self-determination, come from a particularly American orientation. Additionally, several writers from the newly emerging profession in China (Jinchao, 1995; Ngai, 1996; Roan, 1980) point to the collective nature of their
society in contrast to the individualism of the West, and especially America, arguing that this presents major obstacles not only to transfer of practice techniques, but also to the total adoption of some of the values themselves. Wijeyewardene (1967) goes so far as to argue that even "dignity and worth of the individual" is alien to eastern cultural traditions.

Some authors hold out the possibility that at least some espoused social work values are universal in all settings and nations. De Graft-Johnson (1979) sees, for better or worse, a globalizing of societal values through mass communications and states, "The fact is that we are gradually approaching the conditions for a universal culture and universal values" (p. 163). Aptekar (1967a) maintains that even if individual absolute universal value assertions may not be found, that it is possible to find universal social work values as two sets of value pairs, each placed on its own continuum. One pair contains the values of "worth and dignity of the individual" and "well-being and integrity of the group"; the other pairing is made up of "progress and development of the individual and society" and "security of the individual and the society" (p. 10). He states, "We should look then, not for purity, nor for totality, but instead for an ideational influence predisposing the actor in society to certain types of
action. . . Dominance of a value and universality are not the same" (p. 11).

Asamoah, Healy, and Mayadas (1997), on the other hand, do postulate one value assertion which can be articulated at the global level. They refer to "universalism of life claims": No child should be doomed to a short or miserable life because that child is born to the wrong class, the wrong country, or the wrong sex. Their universal value assertion relates to their call for social work to be a "human rights profession."

Social work values in their historical context.

Values have played a key role in the development of the profession from the very beginning. A detailed treatise on the historical development of social work values is beyond the scope of this review. Examples of historical thinking on several key values, however, will suffice to clearly show social work as a value-based profession since its inception. The discussion below will first review the two historical movements which have formed the "lineages" of the social work profession. Both of these movements have influenced current professional values. Next, a number of specific professional values will be placed in their historical context.

Two early movements considered foundational for professional social work were (a) the charity organization
societies and (b) the settlement house movement. Contrasting values can be seen in those two early movements which began in the 1870's and 1880's. The Charity Organization Societies introduced "friendly visitors," whose purpose was "to correct the character flaws of the poor and to inspire them to strive for independence and the moral life" (Popple & Leighninger, 1993, p. 59). The settlement house movement, on the other hand concentrated on the social environment and societal reform rather than individual defects (Leiby, 1978; Lubove, 1965; Popple & Leighninger, 1993; Trattner, 1999).

Following Abraham Flexner's negative appraisal at the National Conference of Charities and Correction in 1915 as to whether or not social work was a profession, leaders increased their search for systematic techniques and specialized education based on scientific knowledge. The push for a scientific and professional social work favored the endeavors of the volunteer friendly visitors and their paid successors, or "agents" in the Charity Organization Society movement, a process that had begun to be called social casework (Richmond, 1917, 1922; see also Leiby, 1978; Lubove, 1965; Popple & Leighninger, 1993; Trattner, 1999).

Social work's "first textbook," Social Diagnosis (Richmond, 1917), out of the tradition of the friendly
visitors, espoused the values of self-help, self-reliance, and client participation, and "casework" was something done with individuals and families. Trattner (1999) quotes one commonly circulated definition of casework: "Those processes which develop personality through adjustments consciously affected, individual by individual, between men and their social environment" (p. 237).

The twin emphases with their attendant philosophies and values have competed with one another, ascending and descending in power and control in cyclic fashion throughout the profession's history. This can be seen readily in a number of good historic overviews of the profession (Cf. Leiby, 1978; Lubove, 1965; Popple & Leighninger, 1993; Trattner, 1999). Casework gained strength during the 1920's, while the Stock Market Crash of 1929 and ensuing Depression put most people "on level ground" and systemic causes rather than individual defects became the focus. Interest in psychotherapy, particularly Freudian psychodynamics brought individual treatment to the forefront again, beginning in the 1940's, prompting several prominent social workers, including Whitney Young, Benjamin Youngdahl, and Agnes Meyer, to bemoan in the 1950's the lack of emphasis on social justice (Trattner, 1999). A social environment focus gained prominence one more time beginning in the 1960's with the Kennedy and
Johnson administrations, the activism of Dr. Martin Luther King, and the publishing of Michael Harrington's *The Other America* (1963). The 1980's and 1990's have been attenuated by conservative ideologies, reduced public resources, and an extreme emphasis on individual treatment and managed health/mental health care. Again, individual treatment is the norm. This divided emphasis in the profession has led some authors to speak of the "Bifurcated Profession." (Billups, 1992; Reamer, 1992)

While these antecedent movements have left the profession with what are often times competing practice philosophies, one can also trace through their histories the development of the primary values of the profession. "Dignity and Worth of the Individual," "Client Self-determination," "Social Justice and Reform," "Multicultural Diversity," and "Confidentiality" will be so tracked in the following pages. As noted earlier, "the dignity and worth" of the individual has been argued to be the prime social work value (Bernstein, 1960; Biestek and Gehrig, 1978; Pike, 1996; Pumphrey, 1959). Mary Richmond (1922) stated, "[Social workers] must have in their hearts [the] spiritual conviction of the infinite worth of our common humanity before they can be fit to do any form of social work whatsoever" (p. 249). She used the term
"client," suggesting that the visitor had a responsibility to the individual somewhat like a lawyer's (Leiby, 1978).

Biestek and Gehrig (1978) view the value of "human dignity and worth" as strengthened in the United States during the decade of 1941-1950. Totalitarian governments, whether Nazi, Fascist, or Communist put this cherished value at risk.

The emotions of people in the democracies were exacerbated as news was received about the enslavement of nations and the efforts to exterminate some ethnic and religious groups. People in the United States felt that the basic issues in the war were freedom and the dignity and worth of each individual. (Biestek and Gehrig, 1978, p. 53)

In a similar vein, the pioneer social group worker, Konopka, a refugee from the Nazi onslaught, writes, "... if we want humanity to learn to live together peacefully and constructively we will have to help them accept differences among people, not as a liability but as something that makes life richer and more interesting." (1954, p. 46)

Pumphrey (1959), in the values volume of CSWE's first major curriculum study, describes dignity and worth first among those she labels as the highly abstract values. She states, "Each human being should be regarded by others as an object of infinite worth. He should be preserved in a state commensurate with his innate dignity and protected.
from suffering" (pp. 43-44). The value was eventually formalized and codified in 1960 in the first NASW code of ethics.

Perhaps the most discussed social work value historically is that of "client self-determination" (Cf. Bernstein, 1960; Biestek, 1951; Biestek and Gehrig, 1978; Freedberg, 1989; Hollis, 1939; Keith-Lucas, 1963; Reynolds, 1934, 1938). Biestek and Gehrig (1978), in their fifty-year history of self-determination, attribute the term to Bertha Reynolds, but they note the concept goes back much further. In fact, Freedberg (1989) says, "Long regarded as a cornerstone of the moral framework of liberal Western societies, self-determination was embodied in the spirit of benevolence of the eighteenth century Age of Enlightenment" (p. 33).

Keith-Lucas (1963) argues that the principle of self-determination is actually composed of two related principles relating to the social worker's relationship with a client: the principle of client participation in the solution of problems, and the idea of noninterference except in essentials. Mary Richmond (1922) first espoused "the fullest possible participation of the client in all plans" (p. 256). "Non interference except in essentials" speaks to the limits on self-determination quickly encountered by practitioners, relative to the client's

Biestek and Gehrig (1978, p.10) argue that the idea of client-self determination developed in the 1920’s with the use of five related terms or phrases: 1) client participation (M. A. Cannon; J. M. Lucas; Milford Conference; I. Mohr, M. S. Nichols; M. E. Richmond; G. L. Warren), 2) client responsibility for plan-making (L. B. Clow; L. Corbett; K. DeSchweinitz; M. E. Richmond; A. Vlachos), 3) self-help (H. C. Schumacker), 4) self-direction (F. L. Bruno, M. E. Richmond), and 5) self-expression (K. De Schweinitz). Several writers describe the close connection between client self-determination and the worth and dignity of the individual (Bernstein, 1960; Biestek and Gehrig, 1978; G. Hamilton, cited by Biestek and Gehrig, 1978). Bernstein (1960) put it this way: "While self-determination is not supreme, it is supremely important. Only through the rich utilization of this concept can we fully honor the human-worth value." (p. 8)

"Social justice" and "social reform" can be traced back in social work to the settlement houses, and, to a lesser extent, the charity organization societies. One of the broad areas of contribution on the part of settlement
houses was social reform, as evidenced by the topics of many of the papers presented at the 1898 National Conference of Charity and Correction (Leiby, 1978). The settlement movement was influential in a number of areas, including child labor laws, education, juvenile court, labor conditions, labor unions, the peace movement, playgrounds and clubs, political reform, racial equality, and public health, to name a few (Leiby, 1978; Lubove, 1965; Popple & Leighninger, 1993; Trattner, 1999).

Trattner (1999) sums up their huge influence, saying, "... many [settlement houses] were mechanisms for reform that made invaluable contributions to the movement for social welfare and justice in late-nineteenth- and early twentieth-century America." (p. 168)

Charity organization societies after 1900 and, later on, casework, developed against the backdrop of the Progressive era, with its enthusiasm for reform and social justice (Leiby, 1978). Lubove (1965) notes that early casework (prior to the 1920's) retained a balance between individual intervention and social justice, and the caseworker was alert to the implications of legislative reform as well as the provision of concrete services. He quotes Mary Richmond as explaining the relations between social reform movements and casework as follows:
The adapting of these large measures to the needs of the Jones family and to the needs of the newer importations whose names are more complicated than Jones; the realization of the neighborhood point of view and of the neighborhood difficulties which stand in the way of an immediate acceptance of our sanitary and other programs--these are a very important part of the process of assimilation, a very important part of the prevention which really prevents.
(cited by Lubove, 1965, p. 81)

Bertha Reynolds (1963) called the profession a great crusade for human betterment in which case-by-case personal contact with people in poor circumstances would not only raise individual families to a higher level but would furnish data for far-reaching reforms. The favored classes, learning to know their poor neighbors personally, could never thereafter be indifferent to the causes of poverty, disease, and crime, or fail to support needful reforms.
(p.44)

In the midst of the construction of Roosevelt's New Deal, Grace Coyle, best known for her work in social group work, urged her colleagues to go even further with social action, and lashed out at those who "continued to pick up the pieces without ever attempting to stop the breakage."
(Trattner, 1999, p. 274) And, as earlier noted, in the 1950's numerous social workers called for a return to social action and social justice (Trattner, 1999). Whitney Young, who later headed the National Urban League told the National Conference on Social Welfare that "social work was born in an atmosphere of righteous indignation," but that somewhere along the line 'the urge to become
professional' had overcome the initial crusading impulse." (cited by Trattner, 1999, p. 311)

The profession has continued to express its concern for social justice over the years. NASW changed its by-laws around 1970 in order to reflect the "dual obligation to use 'both social work methods and . . . social action' to prevent and alleviate deprivation, distress, and strain.'" (Trattner, 1999, p. 345) More recent examples include the specification of social and economic justice as a content area in the CSWE Curriculum Policy Statements and the inclusion of social justice as a core value in the 1996 NASW Code of Ethics.

"Multicultural diversity" has increasingly become a focal issue in social work, education, and like-minded disciplines over the past two decades. The embryo of this current social value can also be found in the settlement house movement.

Among the first social workers to realize that cultural differences were important for welfare work and the nation, an idea in sharp contrast to prevailing views during the period, [the settlement workers] even encouraged immigrants to retain and be proud of their Old World heritage." (Trattner, 1999, p. 169)

Settlement houses sponsored celebrations and exhibitions with the crafts and customs of various ethnic groups (Guzetta, 1995). Leiby (1978), describing the open invitations, effuses, "Are the neighbors Italian? Invite
them to share slides of Italian art; perhaps they will appreciate George Eliot's novel *Romola* read in Italian (so Hull House began)." (p. 130) Gans (1972) provides an interesting hypothesis that the early successes of settlements was due to the predominance of Jewish clients.

Jane Addams (1909) called for appreciation, not obliteration of differences among ethnic immigrants. Edith Abbott (1922) complained that federal immigration bureaucrats didn't deal with immigrants' difficulties as much as they dealt with "exclusion and deportation (p. 463). And when efforts to stop repressive immigration laws failed, Addams (1927) pointed out the coming consequences.

Schlesinger and Devore (1995) suggest that the social work profession's concern with cultural diversity (albeit mistakenly thinking it was transient due to the prevailing "melting pot" ideology) continued to grow through World War II. It was somewhat side-tracked, in these authors' opinion, with the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Topeka* (1954). As a result of that ruling, cultural uniqueness was de-emphasized and the integration of diverse groups into the mainstream was encouraged.

Beckett and Johnson (1995) point to the urban riots of the 1960's, resurgence of ethnic pride, and the increasing proportion of people of color among social workers' clients as influencing the profession's reconnection with
the value of cultural diversity. They also note that Cafferty and Chestang's (1976) *The Diverse Society* brought racial and ethnic issues to further prominence in social work. Beckett and Johnson (1995) state, "Social work has given increasing attention to diversity and expanded it to include differences in gender, sexual orientation, social class, physical ability, and other variables" (p. 1399).

"Confidentiality," a prominent instrumental value in social work, was championed early on, as well, though not to the extent it was mandated in later years. Workers in charity organization societies were assigned the task of documenting need and steering agencies clear of duplication of services. Therefore, confidentiality was a great deal more lax. Nevertheless, Mary Richmond stated the need for privacy and cautioned against gathering evidence from close neighbors because of the danger of idle gossip. To emphasize her point, she narrated,

> The worst example of interviewing present neighbors that has come to the attention of the writer is that of a public outdoor relief agent who habitually visited neighborhood tradesmen, janitors, etc., before seeing the family, and tried, by leading questions, to draw out anything unfavorable about them that could be either suggested or uncovered. These are the methods not of the diagnostician but of the inquisitor. . . . [This] questioning works undue hardship, moreover, to the subject of the inquiry, exposing him to gossip and humiliation without securing any insights that could not be arrived at better in some other way. (p. 274)
Likewise, the "Confidential Exchange," that network by which COS caseworkers kept the needy from receiving charity from multiple agencies needed to be protected from misuse. Richmond (1917) wrote:

> No one not directly and disinterestedly concerned, no one who cannot prove that social betterment is his aim, should be entitled to even the colorless data that the Exchange can supply. Its facts should be carefully guarded from those who might put them to other uses, such as installment collectors or other creditors. Instead of invading privacy, the Exchange insures it. (p. 306)

Early affirmation of this value is evidenced in England, as well. Canon Samuel Barnett, Vicar of St. Jude's in London, and founder of Toynbee Hall, and Octavia Hill, who influenced Mary Richmond, were advocates of confidentiality and privacy for the poor with whom they worked (Woodroofe, 1962).

One final pair of values, though not usually cited in lists of social work values, is evidenced in the historic social work literature. Those two values are "democracy" and, in the United States, "Americanization." One of the motivating factors for coming together in the settlement house, according to Jane Addams, was to move beyond formal political democracy to actual social democracy, in which people are not divided by distinctions of class, race, or religion (Leiby, 1978, p. 129). Settlement houses exemplified the democratic ideal in principle and action.
(Trattner, 1999, p. 167). Gans (1972) notes that the settlements provided information about American ways and gave poor children an opportunity to learn how to become middle class (p. 55). Mohl and Betten (as cited by Trattner, p. 167), however, acknowledge some settlement leaders took things a bit too far, Americanizing immigrants with "all possible speed," engaging in proselytizing to the workers' religious views, and transmitting the values and attitudes of the larger society.

Mary Richmond saw social casework as a democratic process. "It is not enough for social workers to speak the language of democracy," she wrote, "they must have in their hearts its spiritual conviction of the infinite worth of our common humanity before they can be fit to do any form of social work whatsoever." (1922, p. 249)

The Progressives favored the expansion of democracy and economic opportunity, but many of them also assumed that the preservation of democracy and the salvation of the industrial city depended upon the wisdom and guidance of experts (Lubove, 1965, p. 89). One early community organization experiment around 1915-1920 worked to establish "neighborhood democracy" through 31 "social units" in the Mohawk-Brighton community of Cincinnati. A key idea was for the citizens to regain control of their
own destiny through intensive civic association in conjunction with community specialists. (Lubove, 1965)

Donald Howard, speaking at the 1953 Social Welfare Forum, called social work "a creature of democracy."
(Cited by Biestek and Gehrig, 1978, p. 90) And the first NASW Code of Ethics, adopted by the Delegate Assembly October 13, 1960, contained in its preamble the idea, "Professional social work is based on humanitarian, democratic ideals."

Along about the midpoint of the profession's history, there were several developments relative to social work values which were initiated by professional organizations. In 1952, following several years of competition between the American Association of Schools of Social Work and the National Association of Schools of Social Administration over the right to set standards and accredit schools of social work, the Council on Social Work Education was established (Biestek and Gehrig (1978, pp. 87-88). Then in 1955 seven social work specialty organizations merged into the National Association of Social Workers (Leiby 1978, p. 351). A unified foundation for the profession was an immediate issue for both of these organizations. Leaders in both organizations worked to develop understandings of the value base of social work, as well as the purpose, knowledge, and methodological bases.
NASW's Commission on Social Work Practice established a "Working Definition of Social Work Practice" (1958) and CSWE launched a massive curriculum study, which included Muriel Pumphrey's volume on values (1959), itself the culmination of the efforts of a panel of 10 members. Several of the participants in both endeavors grounded their thinking in Greenwood's (1957) "Attributes of a Profession," which include (1) systematic theory, (2) authority, (3) community sanction, (4) ethical codes, and (5) a culture (p. 45). Under "professional culture," Greenwood defined the social values of a profession as its "basic and fundamental beliefs, the unquestioned premises upon which its very existence rests" (p. 52).

As stated earlier in this chapter, the 1958 "Working Definition of Social Work Practice" defined practice as "a constellation of value, purpose, sanction, knowledge, and method." (Working Definition, 1958, p. 5) The composers of the definition saw social work values as philosophical concepts basic to the practice of social work, and listed them as:

1. The individual is the primary concern of this society.
2. There is interdependence between individuals in this society.
3. They have social responsibility for one another.
4. There are human needs common to each person, yet each person is essentially unique and different from others.

5. An essential attribute of a democratic society is the realization of the full potential of each individual and the assumption of his social responsibility through active participation in society.

6. Society has a responsibility to provide ways in which obstacles to this self-realization (i.e., disequilibrium between the individual and his environment) can be overcome or prevented. (p.6)

The parallel efforts of CSWE to find a common core among social work programs in the United States included the publication of a volume on the teaching of social work values and ethics (Pumphrey, 1959). Pumphrey categorized social work values by levels of abstraction. The highest level of abstraction she called "ultimate values." These highly abstract values include:

1. Each human being should be regarded by all others as an object of infinite worth.

2. Human beings have large and as yet unknown capacities for developing both inner harmony and satisfaction and ability to make outward contributions to the development of others.

3. In order to realize his potentialities every human being must interact in giving and taking relationships with others. ...

4. Human betterment is possible.

5. Change in a positive direction, for individuals, groups, or organized societies may be speeded by active and purposive assistance or encouragement from others.
6. The most effective changes cannot be imposed.

7. Much concerning man is knowable.

8. The profession of social work is a group committed to the preservation and implementation of these values. (p. 43-44)

Pumphrey explained that in order to achieve the above highly abstract values, "social work has used scientific and philosophic understandings and seems to have fairly well delineated some ideals which have taken on meaning as values to be striven for in accord with these ultimate values" (p. 46). The goals or values used to achieve them are middle range in their abstraction, and may be called "proximate or intermediary goals" (p. 46). These middle level abstractions of social work values include assertions about:

1. The well-functioning person
2. The good family
3. The growth-enhancing group
4. The good community (p. 46)

Finally, the least abstract values Pumphrey called "instrumental values." These include desirable attributes of social agencies and professionals, such as "adapting to changing needs," "competence," "nonjudgemental, non-blaming, warm approach to people," et cetera (pp. 48-49).

Gordon (1962, 1965) offered several critiques of the Working Definition (1958), which could also be applied to
the lists formulated in the values and ethics portion of the Curriculum Study. He stated that the original working definition failed to adequately differentiate between values and knowledge. He reminded readers that values are preferences and assumptions about what is desirable; they "are not testable at present, nor are they necessarily expected to be tested in the future" (Gordon, 1962, p. 8). Knowledge statements, on the other hand are putative and confirmable, usually through testing (Gordon, 1962, 1965). Some of the statements found in both the Working Definition and the values and ethics volume of the Curriculum Study are closer to putative assertions than to value assertions.

Four events during the 1960's on the part of the two major professional organizations strengthened the profession's understanding of its value base. The first was the creation of the NASW Code of Ethics, approved by the Delegate Assembly October 13, 1960. While codes of ethics had been suggested and utilized by some of the specialty organizations and local chapters (Elliott, 1931), and an early one attributed to Richmond (Pumphrey, 1959; Reamer, 1995), this was the first promulgated by the profession as a whole. It codified some of the existing value assertions, and consisted of the preamble and 14 propositions, stated in first-person (Biestek and Gehrig,
1978; Reamer, 1995, 1998). By today's standards, this code was very general and abstract. Still, the profession's values are quite evident in that code, and include placing professional responsibility over personal interests, respecting privacy and holding confidences, giving service in time of need, contributing to the profession, et cetera. An additional principle on nondiscrimination was added in 1967, bringing the total to 15 (Reamer, 1998).

The other events consisted of three conferences sponsored by the two primary professional organizations. NASW sponsored the first conference in 1965, a Regional Institute on the theme "Values in Social Work: A Re-Examination" (Biestek and Gehrig, 1978). Biestek and Gehrig summarize this conference as a discussion of value issues in general and client self-determination in particular. They state that an underlying theme that emerged during the conference was the issue of individual freedom versus social responsibility. (pp. 128-132)

The second conference was sponsored by CSWE and took place in 1966. It was titled "An Intercultural Exploration: Universals and differences in Social Work Values, Functions, and Practice (See Aptekar, 1967a; Wijeyewardene, 1967), and the program explored the nature of social work values, the concept of universal values,
and the ramifications when values are violated or in conflict with one another.

In 1963 a third values-related conference, sponsored by the International Conference on Social Welfare, commemorated the twentieth anniversary of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It aptly focused on "Social Welfare and Human Rights." Points emphasized at this conference included the idea that social welfare is a basic means in securing the rights of both the individual and society; social justice and social welfare are essential, interrelated parts of a nation's social and economic development; and the acknowledgement that concomitant with rights is the acceptance of obligations and duties (Biestek and Gehrig, 1978).

Social work, from its inception, has been a value-based profession. This section of the study has selected historical evidence to that fact for just a half-dozen or so of the values which have remained important to the discipline. It has also shown how the historical development and promulgation of social work values have come from the hands of individuals, small groups, social movements, and professional organizations.

Each of the specific social work values scrutinized above are rooted in the early days of the profession. They have been refined and strengthened over the ensuing years.
In tracing the value statements back to their origins, this researcher has been struck by evidence for the centrality of the value "The Dignity and Worth of the Individual." All other value assertions appear to flow from this "spiritual conviction of the infinite worth of our common humanity" (Richmond, 1922). The social worker allows clients to make their own choices and set their own course because clients are worthy of those choices. Other times social workers restrain clients from their own choices and courses for the same valued belief: the worth of the individual (and the client is therefore to be protected from self-harm).

Respecting one's privacy and keeping one's conversation in confidence is an acknowledgement of the worth of the individual and a means of insuring the client's dignity. Differences, whether individual or ethnic/racial/cultural, are to be respected and celebrated for in this is the recognition of worth. And, finally, as all people have worth based on their common humanity, they deserve fair treatment economically and socially, and when equity is lacking for certain individuals or groups, it is the social worker's privilege and responsibility to work toward that equity and fairness.

These and other social work values are foundational to the profession. Therefore, it is expected that they are
at the core of each social worker's practice. The more the individual social worker (or social work student) can incorporate the profession's values into that individual's own personal value system, the more that social worker will be aligned with mainstream social work practice, at least in the value-related dimensions of practice.

It is a legitimate exercise, then, to take the measure of one's adherence to social work values. Likewise, it is legitimate to check the degree to which groups of social workers or social work students adhere to social work values, which is one of the components of this research. When personal values, say, those influenced by religious beliefs and teachings, are in conflict with those of the profession, the practitioner or student experiences a certain degree of dissonance. This idea will be advanced in the subsection on "Similarities, differences, compatibility, and conflict" in the section "Potential Value Foundations for Social Work Practice." At this time, however, it would be enlightening to examine the research which has been conducted in the area of social work values.

Research on social work values.

As far back as thirty and more years ago, researchers were concerned with the values of social work practitioners and students. Varley (1963, 1966, 1968;
Hayes & Varley, 1965) was perhaps the earliest to empirically identify and describe changes that took place in students' values during the time they are enrolled in professional social work education. The early studies found no significant differences between beginning and graduating students, or between social work and non-social work students. Furthermore, Varley's instrument, used in later studies by Brown (1970) and Judah (1979) has been criticized (Watt, 1992; Pike, 1994) on the values it was purported to measure: equal rights, service, psychodynamic-mindedness, and universalism. Neither Brown nor Judah found significant changes in values over the course of education, either. It must be noted, however, that Varley's studies did pave the way for further empirical studies of social work values, and encouraged more sophisticated instrument development.

Sharwell (1974) measured changes in MSW students' attitudes toward welfare dependency, finding their attitudes had significantly changed at graduation. Swanson and Wodarski (1982), however, found no evidence supporting the traditional assumption that the exposure of students to social work values and attitudes by social work faculty leads to students' acquisition of the values and attitudes. Colon and Asen (1989) obtained results similar to those of Swanson and Wodarski.
Some studies (Cf. Costin, 1964; Cryns, 1977; Grimm & Orten, 1973; Horner & Whitbeck, 1991; Scheel, 1996) have been handicapped by using instruments meant to either measure general values or values critical in other disciplines. In addition to Varley's pioneering work, researchers who have developed social work-specific scales to measure values have included McLeod and Meyer (1967), Howard (1980, Howard & Flaitz, 1982), Abbott (1988), and Pike (1994, 1996).

Two studies, Cooper (1993/1994) and Rice (1994/1995), have utilized the instruments of Abbott (1988) and Pike (1994, 1996), respectively. These two studies will be examined in more detail, as they are the most recent, using the most recently developed social work values instruments.

The stated purpose of the Cooper study was to investigate the extent to which baccalaureate students acquire a professional social work value system by determining if there are significant differences in the students' social environments or personal circumstances which might affect their assimilation of professional values.

First he looked at whether students scored higher on Abbott's (1988) professional social work values scales as they progressed through their program. Results supported...
two of the four scales, **Respect for Basic Rights** and **Commitment to Individual Freedom**, but not **Sense of Social Responsibility** and **Support of Self-Determination**. In fact **Sense of Social Responsibility** yielded a significant result in the opposite direction from the other three and the stated hypothesis.

The second hypothesis, students enrolled in smaller programs will score higher on the scales than students of larger programs was not strongly supported. Nor was hypothesis 3, students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds will score higher on the scales. The fourth hypothesis yielded very mixed results. Students linked to a formal religion scored significantly higher on **Respect for Basic Rights** and **Commitment to Individual Freedom**, but significantly lower on **Sense of Social Responsibility** and **Support for Self-Determination**.

No significant differences were found in the support of social work values based on race or ethnicity. Hypothesis 5 had predicted minorities would score higher. Finally, political liberals did not score significantly higher on the social work values scales as compared to political conservatives, except on **Support for Self-Determination**. The difference between the groups on **Sense of Social Responsibility**, in which liberal beginning students led, was lost as the two groups approached
graduation. Conservatives scored higher on Respect for Basic Rights, and Commitment to Individual Freedom was supported roughly equally.

A major limitation of the Cooper (1993/1994) study resides in the Professional Opinion Scale (POS) developed by Abbott (1988). While Cooper maintains that it most clearly examines the underlying value base of social work, and perhaps it did most clearly at the time of his study, whether it is actually measuring social work values or not is debatable. The main component of the scale is 121 items which are clearly opinion survey items. Examples include,

Rehabilitation and maintenance of deteriorating public housing should be the responsibility of the private sector.

and

Immigrants should learn English as a prerequisite for U.S. citizenship.

As discussed elsewhere in this chapter, values lie much deeper in the personality than opinions. Rice (1994/1995) has previously pointed out that Abbott takes a conceptual leap in assuming that opinions will consistently reflect values.

More recently, Rice (1994/1995) compared social work students at four points in social work education: (a) beginning BSW, (b) ending BSW, (c) beginning MSW, and (d) ending MSW. She also compared business students (beginning
and ending) to social work students. Dependent variables were (a) adherence to social work values as measured by the Social Work Values Inventory (SWVI) (Pike, 1994, 1996) and Moral Development, as measured by the Defining Issues Test (DIT) (Rest, 1979). The independent variable was education. She also compared students on demographic variables.

Rice (1994/1995) found that at the beginning of their respective programs, social work students and business students were similar in their expressed values, but by the end of their BSW program, the social work students exhibited an increased adherence to social work values. When she compared advanced MSW students to their BSW counterparts, however, she discovered the MSW students had regressed in their social work values.

Rice's (1994/1995) hypothesis that the newly developed SWVI would adequately discriminate between social work and non-social work students was supported, as was the hypothesis that the instrument would discriminate between levels of social work education. She was also able to get acceptable reliability coefficients (Cronbach's Alpha), and as she hypothesized, the SWVI correlates in a low-to-moderate, significantly positive way with the DIT, supporting convergent construct validity. These findings
will be discussed in further detail in the instrumentation section of the next chapter.

Although most studies related to social work values have taken place in the United States, research in other countries has been reported as well. There have been very few cross-cultural studies, however. Feldman (1970) examined the value orientations of Turkish social workers, utilizing the instrument developed by McLeod and Meyer (1967). He found Turkish social workers to favor group responsibility highest and personal liberty the least, two values, he notes, which are especially in conflict in American social work, as well as in the larger American society. Similarly, in a study of students' attitudes toward AIDS policy, Soliman and Miah (1998) note that in Egypt, societal or public rights come before personal or individual rights. Brown (1970), concerned that colonialism, along with various forms of international aid, had prevented the natural development of indigenous social work practice in the emerging countries of Africa, studied the values of social work students in Zambia, both at the beginning and end of their programs, using the Varley (1963) instrument. Results between the means of Zambian and American students were very similar when comparing the values measured.
Guttmann and Cohen (1992) charge that "social work education in Israel has failed to produce the distinctive set of attitudes and values with regard to the poor on which the profession has traditionally built its contribution to social progress" (p. 61). They see the reason for this as being that in building the modern nation-state of Israel, poverty was regarded as a temporary condition as the new society was established and its immigrants absorbed. The authors found that the Arab students in the study tended to view poverty as less important, but were also less likely to hold the poor to be responsible for their own plight.

Segal (1993) compared the values of social work students in the United States with those in India, using the California Psychological Inventory (CPI; Gough, cited in Segal). The results reported by the author, (1) suggesting that graduate American and Indian social work students are significantly different, (2) supporting the directions predicted based on the values of individualism but not collectivism, and (3) finding scores for U.S. undergraduate students to be more similar to those of the Indian graduates than those of the US graduates, should be interpreted conservatively, due to small sample sizes and inappropriate statistical analysis. As in earlier studies,
the use of an instrument not specifically designed to investigate social work values could also be questioned.

Social work values in the larger context of professional and societal values.

Professional values are human values which are held in common at the organizational level. Alan Goldman (n.d., p. 48, as cited in Gellermann, Frankel, & Ladenson, 1990) writes, "Professionals are viewed as morally committed to pursuing the dominant value that defines the goal of their professional practice... They are expected to pursue such goals on a social as well as individual level... and they are expected to do so even when self-interest may have to be sacrificed in that pursuit" (emphasis added by Gellermann, et al., 1990).

Social work values share commonalities with the value statements of other professions, especially the helping professions. Again, quoting from the 1958 working definition on social work practice,

Social work practice, like the practice of all professions, is recognized by a constellation of value, purpose, sanction, knowledge, and method. No part alone is characteristic of social work practice, nor is any part described here unique to social work practice. It is the particular content and configuration of this constellation which makes it social work practice and distinguishes it from the practice of other professions. (Working Definitions, 1958, p.5)

Concern over the transmission of values to students can be observed in other human service professions as well
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as in social work. Studies have been conducted among nursing students (Williams, Block, & Blair, 1978; Bloomquist, Cruise, & Cruise, 1980; Wilson, 1995; Ochsner, 1996; Schoenly, 1996; Roberts, 1996), medical students, (Stern, 1996), and physical therapists (Nof, 1994/1995). Additionally, studies have been conducted which examined occupational therapists (Presseller, 1982; Barris, Kielhofner, & Bauer, 1985; DePoy & Merrill, 1989) and counseling psychologists (Fagan, 1996). Furthermore, values have been shown to be key determinants of some of the behaviors in which helping professionals engage (Cf. Archer, Diaz-Loving, Gollwitzer, Davis, & Foushee, 1981; McClintock & Allison, 1989; De Dreu & Van Lange, 1995; Jackson, et al., 1996).

Several of the studies examined investigate values closely aligned to those of social work. Some examples include from Fagan (1996):

- Respect for the individual is desirable.
- Diversity (by gender, race, religion, culture, sexual orientation, etc.) is good.
- Counseling psychologists emphasize increasing a client’s ability to solve problems, make decisions, and cope more effectively with life’s major stressors and daily demands.

and from Ochsner (1996)

- Altruism—concern for the welfare of others.
Equality- having the same rights, privileges, or status.

Human Dignity- inherent worth and uniqueness of an individual.

Justice- upholding moral and legal principles.

Social workers sometimes act as if their professional values are exclusive. Jones (1996) sees social work as "distinguishing itself among professions for its unique and clear base that guides and informs practices, interventions, and stances on social policies and social issues" (p. 306). This is hardly the case. Popple affirms that when "push comes to shove," most social work authors writing about values will hedge on the idea of their uniqueness. He says,

Although social work scholars contend that social work values are in some ways unique, when they seriously discuss the issue, most back off a bit and admit that social work values are not entirely independent of major societal values, but are really extensions of those values. (1992, p. 148)

The connection between social work values and those of democracy was pointed out earlier in this chapter (Biestek and Gehrig, 1978; Howard, as cited by Biestek and Gehrig, 1978; NASW Code of Ethics, 1960). Aptekar (1967b) discusses five values he maintains are held by both the profession of Social work and the American society in general. Pumphrey, in the CSWE Curriculum Study, states, "Social work values are not in any way distinctive from
those any good person in our North American culture would hold" (p. 16). Earlier, Werner W. Boehm (1958), the director and coordinator of the CSWE Curriculum Study, gave somewhat of an overview of the Study, including his own listing of what he considered to be essential social work values, which he viewed as compatible with those held in the culture of the United States and Canada.

Abbott (1988) points out that "Societal values influence personal values, and both societal values and personal values influence professional values; thus, none of them is mutually exclusive." (p. 5) Compton and Galaway (as cited in Abbott, 1988, p. 5) point out that "The social work profession exists within a larger cultural context; it identifies and operationalizes value premises already existing in society and not held exclusively by the profession."

At the extreme, Meinert (1980, 1994) finds the idea of a unique social work value system to be a "myth and a hoax" (1980, p. 5). He asserts that values and value anchorages in societies change over time, and that those possessed by social workers are identical to those existing in the general population today. He also asserts, "If unique values are the chief link that binds members of a profession, they certainly do not seem to be part of the organized curriculum in schools of social work, where
professional socialization first takes place " (1980, p. 11). He concludes that social work education and practice should completely eliminate any public discourse on values and emphasize only the knowledge and skill components of the profession! (1980, p. 15)

Frankel (1969) holds that there are both continuities and discontinuities between social work values and professional values in general. Abbott adds, "It is important to note, however, that social work's values have not been identical with those of the larger society." (1988, p. 32)

Bringing balance to the argument, Pumphrey (1959) recognizes that social work does not have an exclusive hold on the values it professes, but that the profession has a special charge in carrying them out. She states,

These values are not unique to the profession concerned--in fact most members of society probably would affirm their desirability in varying degree--but while many other people may contribute to its realization, working toward the ideal is regarded as the special province of the profession. (pp. 8-9)

And, finally, Reamer (1995) asserts that "Social work is among the most value-based of all professions" (p. 3).

This writer concludes that, while social work values are not unique (there is certainly overlap with various other helping professions), the particular constellation of values is ours, and that there are not only both
continuities and discontinuities between social work and the other professions, as Frankel (1969) holds, but there are both continuities and discontinuities between social work and the greater society. It makes sense to champion social work values as the "idealized value vision of a democratic society" (this writer's term). Obviously, society as a whole, even any democratic society, is not there, yet. Social and economic injustice abound. Differences are feared. Humans perpetrate all manner of evil upon one another. If the larger society upheld these values, then perhaps this writer could agree with Meinert (1980) and call for an emphasis on the knowledge and skill components of the profession only. Too, there would be no need to measure adherence to social work values among individuals and groups, and this study would not be needed!

At the same time, enlightened citizens of various nations and societies do uphold some or other of these values to greater or lesser degree. Again, the uniqueness of social work's value orientation appears to lie in the constellation of values and in the extent to which they are upheld.

Another aspect which differentiates professional values (whether those of social work or other professions), in this writer's mind, is the fact that the
practitioner is called upon to defer his or her own desires or normal course of action, when necessary, to uphold a given value the profession deems important. This writer's view is consistent with the idea of a profession as being "normative," and makes the transmission of values through professional education an important issue, as will be discussed below.

**Values and education.**

The transmission of the profession's values is of extreme importance. "With respect to their own members, the professions seek to cultivate values and moral commitments considered significant to the profession and, in the process, to help define the kinds of relations that professionals establish with those outside the field" (Gellermann, Frankel, & Ladenson, 1990, p. 5). This is the professional socialization process, whose objective, according to Oar (1993), is to enhance the "modeling-imitating-habituating process" of the students. Abbott (1988) speaks of the "process by which individuals are influenced or molded to assimilate and reflect the value dimensions of a given profession" (p. 31).

In the first chapter of *The Teaching of Values and Ethics in Social Work Education*, volume 13 of the historic CSWE curriculum study, Pumphrey (1959) opines that in social work "perhaps even more than in other professions,
it is particularly essential that the idealistic underpinning as well as the scientific base in knowledge and acquired skills be communicated in the educational process." (p. 12) She adds in a later chapter, "The content of the curriculum and total school experience must provide for developing such patterns of thinking and acting in students so that professional social workers can be counted upon ordinarily to behave in these ways" (p. 79). Towle (1948) underscores the fact that among the demands placed upon the student is to accept social work values over personal (p. 23).

Social work educators view the transmission of professional values and ethics as singularly important (Noble and King, 1981). Benjamin Youngdahl, president of the American Association of Schools of Social Work in 1948, stated, "... a person getting a professional degree from one of our schools should have more than method and knowledge and research techniques. He should have sympathetic attitudes toward people, their needs and the causes for such need." (1948, p. 38). Noble and King emphasize that "Teaching appropriate values is an essential factor in designing professional curricula (p. 579), and Hokenstad (as cited in Abbott, 1988) affirms that "The values and principles that guide professional
social workers. . . should be manifest throughout every social work curriculum."

In addressing the teaching of values in BSW programs, Koerin (1977) relates the awesome responsibility placed upon the faculty members:

The educator must inform students on a cognitive level as to the nature of social work values, serve as a role model to young undergraduate students who have few other professional role models, enable students to consider social work values and their own from both cognitive and affective perspectives, and finally enable the students to make a choice. (p. 89)

Perlman (1976) likewise emphasizes the importance of the social work educator as role model in transmitting values.

The model of social work practice taught at the baccalaureate level is generalist practice. This "generic" practice model lends itself very well to students graduating with the BSW. The generalist practitioner must be flexible, knowledgeable, and have a wide range of skills (Kirst-Ashman & Hull, 1993) to prepare for any number of settings in which a large range of situations must be handled. Values should play a major role in preparing BSW students for generalist practice for as Kirst-Ashman and Hull maintain, "Along with knowledge and skills, professional values comprise the third basis for the foundation of generalist social work practice" (p. 22).
As cognitive processes are a major component in the formation and maintenance of values, it is only natural that cognitive processes underpin any conscious efforts to impart professional values to succeeding generations of practitioners. Furthermore, cognitive processes are more amenable to intervention and change than affective processes. Certainly the program of professional education is where this takes place in any formal way.

The enculturation of professional values should be accomplished using multiple strategies, incorporating experiential as well as didactic methods. Koerin (1977) as well as Noble and King (1981) suggest lecture, discussion, experience sharing, case analysis, role plays, simulations, decision-making games, and video tapes. Koerin also emphasizes the assessment of students' values relative to the core values of the profession. This can readily be done in an on-going manner through class discussions and experiential activities. Faculty modeling of professional values, both inside and outside the classroom is certainly important, as well.

But what about those situations in which students' values are not in alignment with the core values of the profession? As was noted earlier in this paper, values are relatively stable, but are not impossible to change (Grube, Mayton II, & Ball-Rokeach, 1994). This writer
believes such change is possible due to the cognitive underpinning of values. In fact, Rokeach (1973) developed an intervention method for value change, called "Value Self-Confrontation." It is based on the idea that the primary impetus for both the stability and the change of beliefs and behaviors is the need to maintain and enhance positive self-conceptions and self-presentations of morality and competence. Individuals, according to Belief System Theory (Rokeach, 1973) are continually in a self-evaluative mode, measuring themselves against their own ideal image, as well as the perceptions of others.

Value Self-Confrontation (Rokeach, 1973) provides individuals with feedback and interpretations concerning their own and significant others' values, attitudes, and behaviors. When the individual's utterances or actions are shown to be inconsistent either internally, or relative to a reference group (such as the profession), self-dissatisfaction, a negative affective state, is experienced. This motivates one to change in an attempt to align with the ideal. Conversely, when one is consistent with one's own ideal of the moral and competent self, or with the significant reference group, one experiences positive self-satisfaction, and a consequent reinforcement of the existing value system.
The above is reminiscent of Values Clarification, first formulated by Raths and his colleagues (Raths, Harmin, & Simon, 1966). Kinnier (1995) suggests that one reason for the decline of Values Clarification, in addition to a conservative political and religious backlash was a basic flaw in its formulation: it tended to examine values in an artificial, and even trivial way, and failed to provide clear operational definitions or clear measures. He provides a reconceptualization of Values Clarification, which he calls "Values Conflict Resolution," and which is very much in line with Rokeach’s formulation above.

Although many critics were concerned with what they saw as a danger of relativism in the earlier Values Clarification movement, it is appropriate for individuals to evaluate how their beliefs about what is good and appropriate compare with others in their environment, be that a small group to which they belong, their community, their nation, their religion, or their profession. Students, then, should have their values held up to the light of the core values espoused by the profession. These should be openly examined and compared in a caring, supportive environment. Any gap between the values expressed by the student and those commonly held by the profession should be gently, but firmly pointed out.
The above is one of the primary roles of social work education. The importance of inculcating the profession's values through social work education to succeeding generations of social workers is seen not only in the historic curriculum study (Pumphrey, 1959), and in the later writings by social work educators (Perlman, 1976; Koerin, 1977; Noble and King, 1981; Reamer and Abramson, 1982; Abbott, 1988), but it is also given a place of prominence in the current CSWE Curriculum Policy Statement. B3.2 of the statement indicates, "Social work education is based upon a specific body of knowledge, values, and professional skills. It is grounded in the profession's history and philosophy." (p. 96) "The purpose of professional social work education," according to B5.1 of the Curriculum Policy Statement, "is to enable students to integrate the knowledge, values, and skills of the social work profession into competent practice." (p. 98)

Social work values, along with ethics, are so important that their transmission is no longer being left up to chance by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). Prior to the curriculum statement of 1992 (CSWE, 1992) it was assumed that values and ethics would be transmitted along with the exposure to the content areas outlined in the 1982 curriculum policy statement: "Human
Behavior and the Social Environment," "Social Welfare Policy and Services," "Social Work Practice," "Research," and the "Field Practicum" (CSWE, 1982). At that time, Reamer (Reamer and Abramson, 1982) noted that while some schools offered courses with sections devoted to values and ethics, the number of courses devoted entirely to these subjects was relatively small. The 1992 curriculum policy statement strengthened the place of values and ethics in the curriculum, including them in their own content area, along side 8 other areas: "Social Work Values and Ethics," "Diversity," "Promotion of Social and Economic Justice," "Populations-at-Risk," "Human Behavior and the Social Environment," "Social Welfare Policy and Services," "Social Work Practice," "Research," and the "Field Practicum" (CSWE, 1992). Perhaps there was no accident in describing the "Social Work Values and Ethics" content area first in the curriculum statement. CSWE is adamant that, "Programs of social work education must provide specific knowledge about social work values and their ethical implications and must provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their application in professional practice." Furthermore, "Students must be assisted to develop an awareness of their personal values and to clarify conflicting values and ethical dilemmas." (B6.3, p. 100)
Ample evidence for the importance of professional values to the practice of social work and for the need for the inculcation of social work values through professional social work education is provided, in this writer's thinking, in the CSWE Curriculum Policy Statements, as well as the professional literature. The current study is based on an understanding that programs of social work education play an active role in the inculcation of social work values. To the extent that other explanations (e.g. student self-selection) can be ruled out, a comparison of different categories of programs is an examination of the level at which those categories of programs succeed in carrying out their role. Differences among categories of baccalaureate social work programs relative to the imparting of social work values to students may be due, among other reasons, to differences in the value foundation or orientation the programs select or are predicated upon, a topic examined next.

Potential Value Foundations for Social Work Practice

Several authors in the literature on values refer to "value orientations" (Kluckhohn, 1951; Kluckhohn & Stodtbeck, 1961; Meddin, 1975; Rokeach, 1973). Kluckhohn describes value orientation as "a set of propositions embracing both value and existential elements" (1951, p. 409). Rokeach believes that "philosophical orientation"
comes closer to what Kluckhohn, and later Kluckhohn & Stodtbeck describe. These authors suggest that there may be systems of related values influencing individuals to act as they do. A look at professions suggests that the same is true at that level. Much of the social work literature from the 1960's on, however, appears to reflect an assumption that there is one and only one underpinning for social work practice (Loewenberg, 1988).

**Humanistic orientation.**

The foundation of the profession of social work most pronounced in the literature of the last four decades can be described as a humanistic orientation (Howard, 1980; Howard & Flaitz, 1982; Moran, 1989). Howard (1980) states,

> These humanistic attitudes involve human consequences in terms of (1) the need for adequate resource distribution of power, resources, and goods to promote human development and equality, (2) awareness and respect for issues of civil rights, individual autonomy, freedom, and human rights, and (3) a positive orientation toward responsible social-action activities aimed at encouraging goals of equality and social justice. Such attitudes provide a philosophical basis for system manipulation and sociopolitical intervention on behalf of individual clients and client groups. (p. 3)

Howard & Flaitz (1982) maintain that humanistic concepts "provide the ideological basis for service delivery that is unbiased, nonstereotypical, and socially conscious" (p.11). Elsewhere, Howard (1980) contrasts the humanistic
and more conventional orientations, and ties the humanistic to Kohlberg’s postconventional perspective. She equates the more conventional reasoning to fixed authority, agency rules and norms, and conventional arrangements, while the humanistic perspective "grants a compelling priority to human consequences and implications when assessing sociopolitical alternatives" (p. 11). According to Bloom, "It represents a willingness to resist abstract theoretical justification for sociopolitical action which directs attention away from the needs and interests of the individuals affected by action (cited in Howard, 1980, p.11).

Keith-Lucas (1994) summarizes the major Humanistic Values (he uses the term Humanistic-Positivist-Utopian or HPU values) as:

1. The primary purpose of society is to fulfill human needs both material and emotional.

2. If these needs were fulfilled, then people would attain a state that is variously described, according to the vocabulary used in the specific HPU system, as that of goodness, maturity, adjustment, or productivity, in which most of their and society’s problems would be solved.

3. What hampers them from attaining this state is external circumstances, not in general under their individual control. These circumstances, in various HPU systems, have been ascribed to lack of education, economic factors, childhood experiences, religious training, and social environment.
4. These circumstances can be compensated for by those possessed of sufficient technical and scientific knowledge.

5. Humans and society are therefore perfectible. (pp. 161-162)

Siporin (1982, 1983) has been critical of the libertarian extremes which he has observed in the profession. He writes,

The predominant moral philosophy in use by social workers today thus has a libertarian moral orientation. This involves a cult of individualism that gives primacy to individual self-determination and self-fulfillment. It includes a mental health ethic, with its emphasis on psychological determination and the need for self-realization. It expresses a moral relativism that gives primacy to pluralistic values, all of which are of equal validity, so that one should not impose one's own values and should avoid making moral judgment of behavior or people. (1983, pp. 14-15)

He sees certain consequences of the profession's predominant orientation. These include: (1) inability to help social work clients; (2) encourages flight from personal responsibility; (3) inability to deal constructively with anxiety or guilt feelings and their resolution; and (4) weakened ability on the part of social workers to deal with the many moral/ethical dilemmas inherent in social work practice (Siporin, 1982, 1983).

These and other perceived weaknesses have led a number of writers to call for a strengthening of the moral underpinnings of social work (Billups, 1992; Clark and

a set of values, attitudes, norms, standards, and principles about right and wrong conduct. It thus refers to conceptions and precepts of preferable behaviors and objects of action that a society considers beneficial for the well-being or welfare of its people. (1983, p. 11)

Reid and Popple (1992) prefer the concept "morality" over "values" and "ethics" which are prone to relativism. They state,

One of the unfortunate developments of late twentieth century culture has been a decline in the use of the language and concepts of morality. These concepts, sacred or secular, have been replaced and diminished by the inherently relativistic notion of "values" or the construct of "ethics" applied to particular social situations. The more inclusive and absolutist language of morality, especially in the context of social problems and policy, has become the nearly exclusive province of political conservatism. (p. ix)

Reid (1992) goes on to state that "...it is necessary to consider the social functions of the profession and the moral assumptions upon which such a foundation is founded," though that kind of consideration leads in a direction different from that taken by the bulk of the social work literature (p. 48). It should be noted that the aforementioned authors (with the probable exception of Keith-Lucas) do not level their criticisms at the
humanistic orientation on a broad scale; rather they view certain elements of that orientation as having been taken to an extreme. When they call for a strengthening of the moral basis for social work, they do not necessarily mean in a religious sense (Siporin, 1982, 1983), nor do they necessarily exclude the religious sense (Reid and Popple, 1992; Keith-Lucas, 1992).

Religious or spiritual orientation.

Many social work practitioners and students come from primary orientations other than the humanistic orientation discussed above. This is especially true for social workers and students who are either affiliated with formal religious bodies, or come from strongly religious family backgrounds. The degree of overlap, or lack thereof, with the humanistic orientation differs from tradition to tradition.

Various religious traditions also differ in the degree to which they are future or other-worldly oriented vs present-oriented, the degree to which they focus on the well-being of others, and the degree to which they are socially aware and motivated. Religious traditions may be categorized on a conservative-liberal continuum, both socio-politically and theologically. The Readiness for Ministry project of the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada (Schuller, Strommen, and
Brekke, 1980) sponsored a large in-depth survey of 47 religious denominations in the United States and Canada, to ascertain what their ministers and laity viewed as important components of ministry. The editors state that over 12,000 people participated in the project, which involved the rating of 444 items which formed 64 clusters of criteria that describe dimensions of ministry. The editors maintain that the 64 core clusters provide the most comprehensive answer to the question, "What is it people are looking for in their ministers?" (Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke, 1980, p. 92) Ministers also rated the importance of the items. Though not the original purpose, that study also gives insight into the important religious views of the respondents. Core clusters which have relevance for the present study include: "Initiative in Development of Community Services," "Promotion of Understanding of Issues" (theological, sociological, and psychological), "Support of Community Causes," "Active Concern for the Oppressed," "Aggressive Political Leadership" (working actively to protest and change social wrongs), "Coministry to the Alienated," "Affirmation of Conservative Biblical Faith," "Valuing Diversity," and "Support of Unpopular Causes." One of these clusters will form the basis for dividing religiously-affiliated programs into categories in the current study. Narvaez,
Getz, Rest, and Thoma (1997) report that religious ideology (degree of fundamentalism), political ideology (liberalism/conservatism), and moral judgement in a multiple regression strongly predict individual's positions on social issues such as abortion, euthanasia, and gay rights.

The world populations of the five major religions are Christians: 1,955,229,000; Muslims: 1,126,325,000; Hindus: 793,075,000; Buddhists: 325,275,000, and Jews: 13,866,000. There are 255,542,000 Christians in North America, including 75,398,000 Roman Catholics and 121,361,000 Protestants. In the United States, Roman Catholics make up the largest organized religious body (60,280,454), and Southern Baptists are the largest non-Catholic denomination (15,663,296). There are three Jewish groups with a total of 4,300,000; 5,100,000 Muslims; 4,711,500 Latter Day Saints (with an additional 177,779 in the reorganized church); and 780,000 Buddhists. The North American total for Hindus is 1,365,000. Major African American denominations include the National Baptist Convention in the USA (8,200,000), African Methodist Episcopal (3,500,000), and African Methodist Episcopal Zion (1,230,892). (World Almanac, 1998, pp. 651,654) Canada (1997) notes that there are no figures available on the religious preferences of social workers and their
clients but he suspects that they reflect the diversity of the larger population. Of the 405 fully accredited BSW programs listed in the 1997 Directory of Colleges and Universities with Accredited Social Work Degree Programs, 125 are reported by the 1998 Higher Education Directory to be religiously sponsored. These represent 22 denominations, all within the Christian tradition.

The broad social work literature has generally ignored religiously-based practice (Joseph, 1987). Where it does speak, it equivocates on the extent to which social work’s history and practice is tied to the practice of faith. "Social work developed in the contemporary world as a secular profession" (Scheel, 1996/1997, p. 60), yet "a profession that emerged out of a socio-religious ethos with a goal of helping society’s vulnerable people [and] has promoted values that generally reflect a more compassionate stance than that of many other professional groups" (Van Wormer, 1997, p. 32). Clark (1994) acknowledges that the Judeo-Christian tradition contributed to the value systems of the profession, and Jones (1996) notes that some of the preprofessional history is rooted in religious perspectives which tended to view the poor as morally weak, deficient, and responsible for their circumstances. In fact, the religious roots of the profession are well documented.

The degree of compatibility between religious belief and social work practice (Constable, 1983; Garland, 1997; Jones, 1996; Joseph, 1987, 1988; Judah, 1985; Keith-Lucas, 1994; Loewenberg, 1988; Marty, 1980; Niebuhr, 1932; Parr, 1996; Sherwood, 1997) and whether or not religious issues should be addressed in the social work educational setting (Amato-von Hemert, 1994; Canada, 1989; Clark, 1994; Dudley and Helfgott, 1990; Netting, Thibault, and Ellor, 1990; Sheridan, Wilmer, and Atcheson, 1994) are also contested. Some writers have begun to issue a call for an emphasis on general spirituality, whether religious or not, and for spiritually-sensitive practice (Canada, 1988a, 1988b, 1997; Constable, 1990; Dudley and Helfgott, 1990; Siporin, 1990).

Reinhold Niebuhr, a leading American Protestant Theologian of this century, who was socially sensitive, a friend of labor, and a leader in the social gospel movement, delivered the Forbes Lectures at the New York School of Social Work in 1930 on "The Contribution of Religion to Social Work" (Niebuhr, 1932). After tracing historically the "secularization of social work," he reminded the audience that religion remains a useful
resource, not only for clients, but for social workers, themselves. Martin E. Marty, Professor of the History of Modern Christianity in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, and then member of the Editorial Advisory Committee of the Social Service Review, noted for his audience in the 1980 Social Service Review Lecture that "secular social services" is a rather recent occurrence. He states, "Had we a booklet recounting the story of welfare work that dutifully proportioned its space to match the ages of recorded history, only the last page of a fifty-page booklet would treat of this emergence." (Marty, 1980, p. 463)

Keith-Lucas (1994) provides a contrast between what he terms "Humanist-Positivist-Utopian Values" (HPU) and "Judeo-Christian (or Theistic) Values" (JC). He summarizes the latter value viewpoint as:

1. Humans are created beings, one of whose problems is that they act as if they were not and try to be autonomous.

2. Human beings are fallible, but at the same time sometimes capable of transcending themselves and showing great courage or unselfishness.

3. The difference between "good" and "bad" people is insignificant compared with the standard demanded by their maker, and consequently people have no right to judge each other.
4. People’s chief good is in their relationship with one another and their creator.

5. The purpose of government and society is to ensure justice and opportunity for everyone to live as abundant a life as possible. (p. 163)

Parr (1996) points out that "every social worker has a worldview that defines the nature of reality, truth, and justice" (p 299). This worldview or ideology is the lens through which all information and experience is filtered. More often in the social work literature, however, such is described as a values conflict between personal and professional values (Scheel, 1996/1997; Levy, 1976b; Loewenberg, 1988). Sherwood (1997) emphasizes that worldview does make a difference, stating, "Social work values, practice theories, assessments, intervention decisions, and action strategies are all shaped by our worldview assumptions and our beliefs" (p. 115). He goes on to state his belief that the Christian worldview provides an interpretive framework solidly supporting and informing commonly held social work values. He cites the Quaker philosopher, Elton Trueblood as describing ours as a "cut-flower" generation, and uses that analogy to suggest that

...as it is possible to cut a rose from the bush, put it in a vase, and admire its fresh loveliness and fragrance for a short while, it is possible to maintain the dignity and value of every human life while denying the existence or
significance of God as the source of that value. But the cut rose is already dead, regardless of the deceptive beauty which lingers for awhile. (p. 118)

Constable (1983) also sees social work values, such as individual worth and dignity and reciprocal obligations of individual and society, as concepts which have been primarily derived from a religious perspective on the human condition (p. 29). And Judah (1985) refers to a spirituality of professional service, "... grounded in the knowledge of God's presence in our efforts to serve our brothers and sisters, and that God's love for us is the primary and essential fact of our existence." (p. 25)

Keith-Lucas acknowledges that the Humanistic-Positivist-Utopian orientation has brought a certain amount of enlightenment, and at many points has a better record of helping others than the Christian tradition, though perhaps not better than the Jewish (p. 169). In the final analysis, though, he finds the HPU orientation lacking. First of all, he finds that HPU overestimates the nature of human beings in terms of goodness. Although, he finds the American Puritan/Capitalist tradition to have a skewed view of humankind (underestimating in terms of goodness), he finds the traditional Judaeo-Christian view to be balanced, as it holds that humans are fallible, but are able to transcend themselves. He also sees in the
Judaeo-Christian tradition emphases on choice, relationship, nonjudgementalism, acknowledgement of both personal and societal problems, and feelings. Finally, there is the understanding of pride, the desire to act as a master rather than a servant (others state the creator rather than the creature), considered the primary sin. Keith-Lucas believes the profession needs this orientation, though not necessarily as "believers" (pp. 169-171).

**Social work value precepts found in world religions.**

Value statements compatible with certain social work values can be found in the major world religions. Ogilbee (1960), for example, selects eight social work values for discussion, linking them to Hebrew and Christian scriptures. Hebrew terms for justice are found throughout the Torah and Old Testament. Justice, along with charity and loving kindness are precepts of Judaism codified in the Talmud (Day, 1997). The adherents are commanded to be charitable to the sick, the old (e.g., Leviticus 19:32), the handicapped (e.g. Leviticus 19:13-14), the stranger (e.g., Leviticus 19:33-34), the widow (e.g., Deuteronomy 25:5), and the poor (e.g., Deuteronomy 15:7-8), as well as to respect one’s neighbor (e.g., Leviticus 19:13 & 18).

Furthermore, specific practices to aid the poor were placed into Jewish law. Exodus 23:10-11 commands the
owners of farm land to let the field go fallow every seven years, to give it its Sabbath (time of rest). This was not only a wise ecological practice; it gave the poor a ready food supply, for invariably the previous crops would reseed the field to some extent, as was expected. Additionally, harvesters were instructed to refrain from harvesting all the grain, and to leave some in the fields for the poor (Leviticus 19:9-10). The beautiful story of Ruth and Boaz (Ruth Chapter 2), centers upon this practice. Finally, Amos 5:11 records the anger of God over injustice toward the poor.

The Christian scriptures state that believers are required to demonstrate love, aid the poor, and renounce materialism. One of the ministries assigned in the early church was to care for orphans and widows (1 Timothy 5:3-16, James 1:27). In fact, James 1:27 suggests that part of the essence of true religion is care for others.

The central figure of the New Testament is Jesus of Nazareth, called the Christ, the Messiah by those who profess Christianity. In a powerful passage found in Matthew 25:34-46, Jesus’ vision of the final judgement centers on the individual’s relationship to and care for others:

Then the ones who pleased the Lord will ask, 'When did we give you something to eat or drink? When did we welcome you as a stranger or give
you clothes to wear or visit you while you were sick or in jail?' The king will answer, 'Whenever you did it for any of my people, no matter how unimportant they seemed, you did it for me.' (Matthew 25: 37-40, Contemporary English Version)

Benevolence toward the needy is also called for in Islam. In 650 A.D. the followers of the prophet Mohammed were told they had an obligation to help the poor through a purification tax, which was then used for aid (Barker, 1995). In fact, almsgiving is one of the Five Pillars of Islam (Trattner, 1984). The Koran instructs the believers to show charity to widows, orphans, wayfarers, and other unfortunate people (Trattner, 1984).

While the caste system in Hinduism is rigid and fatalistic, care for others, responsibility, and duty are incorporated in the concept of dharma, the good way of life (Day, 1997). And altruism is primary to Buddhist belief, provided through the ethical virtues of loving-kindness and compassion (Fellows, 1979). Buddhism teaches that "all other forms of righteousness ‘are not worth the sixteenth part of the emancipation of the heart through love and charity.'" (Trattner, 1984, p. 1)

Similarities, differences, compatibility, and conflict.

It is obvious that there are both similarities and differences between the currently dominant orientation in social work, the humanistic orientation, and the historic
orientation: the religious. Few studies, however, have empirically examined the similarities and differences between these two social work orientations. Eckardt (cited by Loewenberg, 1988) found only minor differences between the professional practice of religious and secular social workers. Baum, Loewenberg, and Portowitz (reported by Loewenberg, 1988) did find practice areas where religious values make a difference. These tend to be in those areas of client or worker behavior which violate strongly held religious beliefs, including abortion, homosexuality, and euthanasia. In other practice areas, according to Loewenberg, religious social workers apparently are influenced more by professional or secular values and norms than by religious values (p. 84). Even so, "...almost half of the religious social worker respondents were willing to help a client obtain an abortion, even though such a request appeared to be contrary to religious precepts," perhaps affirming the value of client self-determination, despite their own personal views (p. 85).

Perhaps the uneasy relationship between the values of professional social work and those espoused by organized religions has more to do with sectarianism and fundamentalism, than with the values per se. Sectarianism is a form of prejudice that is religion-based...
(Van Wormer, 1997). Fundamentalism is religion in the extreme. Van Wormer (1997) characterizes religious fundamentalism as involving the interpretation of sacred texts in only the most literal manner, zealotry in pronouncing one’s beliefs, exclusion of all outsiders (who are doomed), exclusive ownership of the truth, disallowance of diversity or dissent, and patriarchal authority. D’Antonio (1983) suggests that fundamentalists "concretize" their values into normative terms. Denton (1990) discusses the difficulty of working with clients who hold fundamentalist worldviews. Religious fundamentalism is behind much of the extremist politics in the world today.

Religiously-oriented social work practitioners, then find themselves attempting to give allegiance to value orientations which are sometimes overlapping, sometimes at odds. An example of the former would be helping an unemployed person to secure employment, very much in keeping with the traditional American Protestant work ethic. The belief that the client is deserving of the social worker’s service because of the client’s intrinsic worth is also very much in keeping with the Judaeo-Christian view of humans being created in the image of God. On the other hand, struggling with the decision to provide a client information on abortion counseling when
one's religious teachings forbid abortion under any circumstance represents the latter. Advocating for rights for gays and lesbians may also be problematic for some social workers, based on their religious convictions. Levy indicates:

The strain is all the greater when the practitioner feels duty-bound to represent values about which he is doubtful, or which he is reluctant to espouse. If his personal values coincide with those of his client, and conflict with those of his profession, he is in the precarious position of being professionally obliged to contradict values with which he himself is primarily identified. (Levy, 1976b, p.112)

Proponents of either social work orientation need not view those holding the other as totally unreasonable, though. Jones (1996) sums up the matter in this way: "Social work is not a religious enterprise, although its commitment to non-discrimination, social change, and social justice for all is highly congruent with the faiths and spiritual belief systems of many social workers" (p. 308). Clark (1994) affirms that "being religious and a social worker [have] never been mutually exclusive" (p. 15). And Keith-Lucas (1992) believes he sees hope for coexistence, because dialogue with religious thinkers is more common.

Loewenberg (1988) concludes that there is no unitary ideology at work in social work today. Other authors see
this as a healthy possibility. Marty (1980) ends the
Social Service Review Lecture, stating,

... I am emboldened to conclude that the
polarities inherited from the age of Billy
Sunday do not serve us well in an America that
has since grown both more secular and more
religious, an America that in its wild pluralism
allows more options than before in attempts to
understand humans, their needs, and the
instruments for serving them. And a second
conclusion urges that in the spirit of Eugene
Goodheart we look at the variety of traditions
that stand behind "the secularization of social
work." Then we can entertain the possibility
that where we do not possess the traditions,
young "still possess us," and deserve to be
kept alive "as a kind of repository of options."
(p. 479)

And Constable (1983) echoes,

True pluralism cannot be achieved by denying
differences but by recognizing differences and
their relation to the professional values we
hold in common; it is only in this way that
there can be discovery of what these common
values are, for our heritage of values is still
bound by slender threads to a recognition of the
sources of beliefs about people, in religious
belief. (p. 39)

Siporin (1992) charges the reader to accept differing
foundation traditions and look for an underlying
commonality. In his words,

Whatever the merits in this controversy, we need
to accept that there are, and will continue to
be, social workers who are religious in both
theistic and nontheistic terms, as well as those
who are nonreligious and even anti-religious. We
need moral theories and rationales that are
credible and useful to all social workers.
(p. 91)
Moral Reasoning

Perlman (1976) writes, "A value has small worth except as it is moved, or is moveable, from believing into doing, from verbal affirmation into action." (p. 381) The mechanism by which that transformation takes place is moral reasoning. Moral reasoning is analogous to a bridge between one’s values and ethics on the one hand, and one’s actions on the other. Moral judgments are the cognitive processes individuals use to give meaning to their experience (Fleck-Henderson, 1991; Rest, 1986). Moral judgment incorporates problem-solving strategies used to organize moral dilemmas and make choices among courses of action (Rest, 1986).

The more popular models of moral development are based on a cognitive-developmental approach, which posits levels of moral thought as a progression of steps through a hierarchy of stages. Most current theories pay homage to Kohlberg. Kohlberg (1976) outlines the assumptions of the cognitive-developmental approach:

1. Moral development has a basic cognitive structural or moral judgment base.

2. The basic motivation for morality is a generalized motivation for acceptance, competence, self-esteem, or self-realization.

3. Major aspects of moral development are culturally universal, because all cultures have common sources of interaction, role
taking, and social conflict, which require moral integration.

4. Basic moral norms and principles are structures arising through experiences of social interaction, rather than through internalization of rules that exist as external structures; moral stages are not defined by internalized rules, but by structures of interaction between the self and others.

5. Environmental influences in moral development are defined by the general quality and extent of cognitive and social stimulation throughout the child's development, rather than by specific experiences with parents or experiences of discipline, punishment, and reward. (p. 48)

Kohlberg built his model upon the work of Piaget, positing six hierarchical stages representing succeeding levels of integration of justice based concepts. This focus gives priority to decisions based on beliefs in fairness and equity (Kohlberg, 1978).

Kohlberg's (1976) six stages (three general and three substages are:

1. Preconventional
   A. Fear of punishment
   B. Seeking rewards

2. Conventional
   A. Seeking approval from family and friends
   B. Obeying the rules and laws of society
3. Postconventional
   A. Concern with individual rights and social contracts.
   B. Concern with the universal good through consistent, comprehensive ethical principles

Kohlberg believes that earlier stages of moral development are characterized by decisions based on self-interest, while later stages represent decisions based on internalized ethical principles. Most children below the age of nine are seen to be in the preconventional level. Some adolescents and adult criminal offenders fall within this level as well. The conventional level is the level of most adolescents and adults in our society. Only a minority of adults reach the postconventional level, and usually only after they are beyond the age of twenty. (Kohlberg, 1976)

Kohlberg has been criticized at a number of points (Kurtines & Grief; Gilligan, 1982; Rest, 1986; Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, and Thoma, 1997). Some criticisms focus on Kohlberg’s assertion that the hierarchies are formed on an invariant sequence, that there is stage unity, and that individuals can be assessed independently of context. Gilligan (1982) levels charges that Kohlberg, and Piaget before him, are guilty of defining moral judgement from an
exclusively masculine perspective. She maintains that women are more inclined to a contextual, narrative, and relationship type of thinking when it comes to moral dilemmas. Gilligan, in turn has been criticized for biased generalizations (Gould, 1988). Nevertheless, Gilligan convinced Kohlberg to reformulate his position. Specifically, he redefined Stage 6 to be "Respect for Persons," which includes the principle of "benevolence" as well as that of "justice" (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, and Thoma, 1997).

Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, and Thoma (1997) provide a broader criticism of Kohlberg, and consider three main problems with his work: a) He overextended Piaget's model of psychological development, adopting the idea of invariate stages of development; he relies too heavily on one type of theory of normative ethics, primarily that based on the thinking of Kant, Rawls, and Habermass, though he later modified his stance, following his dialogue with Gilligan, to include feminist thinking; and c) his research has produced too little evidence for moral thinking in the Postconventional Stage.

Rest (1979) reformulated Kohlberg's six stages of moral development. He contends that it is not enough to ask the question, "What stage is a person in?", as it does not adequately address the concept of moral development.
A more appropriate question is "To what extent and under what conditions does a person manifest the various types of organizations of thinking?" (p. 63) Rather than an invariable sequence of stages, Rest (1979) proposes a continuum in which patterns of judgment interact and overlap with infinite combinations. He also believes that developmental assessment should be probabilistic as developmental processes themselves are relative in nature.

The list below represents points along the continuum:

1. The morality of obedience-- "Do what you are told."

2. The morality of instrumental egoism and simple exchange-- "Let's make a deal."

3. The morality of interpersonal concordance-- "Be considerate, nice, and kind, and you'll get along with people."

4. The morality of law and duty to the social order-- "Everyone in society is obligated and protected by the law."

5. The morality of societal consensus-- "You are obligated by whatever arrangements are agreed to by due process procedures."

6. The morality of non-arbitrary social cooperation-- "How rational and impartial people would organize cooperation is moral." (Rest, 1979, pp. 22-23)

Rest, then, postulates developmental schemas instead of stages with distinct justice operations, and makes "much weaker claims for [that] developmental framework than Kohlberg did for his sequence" (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, and
Thoma, 1997, p. 21). Through factor analysis performed on the ratings of 72 items on his Defining Issues Test (DIT, Rest, 1979), Rest and his colleagues (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, and Thoma, 1997) have reduced their postulated schemas to three "stage groups," and show linkages to Kohlberg's six stages. The stage groups and the Kohlberg stages related to them are: "Personal Interests" = Kohlberg Stages 2 and 3; "Maintaining Norms" = Kohlberg Stage 4; and "Post Conventional" = Kohlberg Stage 5 and 6 (p. 27). They conclude that their approach is "neo-Kohlbergian" for the core ideas are Kohlberg's. Their approach, however, goes beyond that of Kohlberg in that, while it follows Piaget for the cognitive developmental approach, it avoids the pitfalls of rigid stages defined in terms of "justice operations;" rather than centered on one approach to normative ethics, it is compatible with multiple approaches including deontological, utilitarian, communitarian, feminist, and Christian; and in the actual assessment of individuals using the DIT, more evidence is provided for postconventional thinking, for the DIT is not as dependent upon verbal expressivity as is the instrument developed by Kohlberg.

Rest (1984) further postulates a decision-making paradigm that is composed of four steps, each of which
includes cognitive, affective, and behavioral elements. He maintains that the process is not necessarily linear.

1. Moral sensitivity-- the first moment of anticipation of moral behavior.

2. Moral judgment-- the implementation of problem-solving strategies to organize and decide what ought to be done in a given situation.

3. Moral intent-- the decision-making stage, in which a person selects between the competing values and ideals to choose a particular course of action.

4. Moral behavior-- the actual carrying out of the plan of action, including working out the sequence of concrete actions, working around impediments, overcoming fatigue and frustration, resisting distractions, and keeping sight of the goal (Rest, 1984, p. 26).

For the purposes of this research, the model developed by Rest is selected. It incorporates the balance called for by Gilligan (1982) and others. It sees moral development as not necessarily linear and lockstep, and Rest sees ethical decision-making as having cognitive, affective, and behavioral elements, which is in keeping with the tripartite view of values and attitudes presented elsewhere in this review. Finally, the Rest model is born out of the DIT (Rest, 1979), which is the most frequently used instrument of moral judgement in use today (Rest, 1984; Moon, 1986).
So far, this review has covered 1) the nature of values and their relationship to the related concepts of attitudes, opinions, and ethics, 2) social work values placed in historical, professional, and educational contexts, 3) potential value foundations for social work practice, and 4) moral reasoning. One final area which bears on the current research needs to be examined in this literature review: attitudinal research related to social workers.

**Social Workers and Attitudinal Research**

Attitudes are closely related to values (Ball-Rokeach, Rokeach, & Grube, 1984; Grube, Mayton II, & Ball-Rokeach, 1994; Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey, 1962; Meddin, 1975; Rokeach, 1973). Grube, Mayton II, & Ball-Rokeach (1994) see attitudes as less central than values in the primary belief subsystems. They are relatively enduring, evaluative, prescriptive or postscriptive, and motivational, but are directed toward specific objects in the social environment, whereas values are more general. Meddin (1975) describes the connection of values and attitudes in a similar fashion: "Attitudes are considered ... to be more specific than values, in that they are directed toward relatively concrete referents or 'objects' in the environment while values are concerned with more abstract referents or classes of 'objects.'" (p. 890)
Meddin further views attitudes as specific expressions of the more general value premises, and that each value can serve as an organizing theme for a large number of attitudes (p. 890).

Meddin (1975) holds that attitudes have the same tripartite structure as values; they are composed of cognition, affect, and conation. Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey (1962) likewise describe the individual attitude as "an enduring system of positive or negative evaluations, emotional feelings, and pro or con tendencies with respect to a social object." (p. 177) The above formulations, though fairly consistent in the attitude literature, are more theory-based than empirically-based.

There is some disagreement in the literature as to the relationship between attitudes and opinions. Rokeach (1968) defines opinions as simply an attitude verbally expressed. This amounts to equating the two, with the former being simply an outward communication of the latter. Cooper and McGaugh (1968) hold that opinions are purely cognitive, intellectual affirmations, but do not contain the affective component of attitudes. For example, someone can hold the opinion that "the least government is the best government" without having strong emotional investment in that assertion. For Cooper and McGaugh, the attitude carries some emotional investment. Meddin (1975)
sees an opinion as more specific, more concrete, but really a subcategory of "attitude." "For example," Meddin writes, "one may have attitudes toward the federal government in general, but one holds opinions toward specific government programs or legislative acts, such as Medicare or prohibition." (p. 890) For the purposes of the current research, those expressed positive or negative evaluations, emotional feelings, and leanings toward "pro" or "con" with respect to an object in the social environment will be referred to as "attitudes" (as opposed to "opinions").

A good deal of research has been carried out to examine the attitudes of social workers in various settings and toward various referents. As has been previously noted, some of the studies conducted on social work values have crossed over into attitudes, sometimes intentionally, sometimes not (Cf. Abbott, 1988; Cooper, 1993/1994; Howard, 1980; Howard and Flaitz, 1982; Sharwell, 1974). Other studies have examined the attitudes of social workers toward homosexuality (Berkman and Zinberg, 1997; O’Hare, Williams, and Ezoviski, 1996; Wiener & Siegel, 1990), AIDS and HIV (Dhooper, Royse, & Tran, 1987-88; O’Hare, Williams, and Ezoviski, 1996; Shi, Samuels, and Richter, 1993; Soliman and Miah, 1998; Zagumny and Deckbar, 1995), models of treatment (Burke and...

While there has been more research conducted on social workers and social work students regarding their attitudes than has been conducted on the more abstract social work values, there are still relatively few studies that really inform the current study. Only a couple of those specifically examine the connection between religious affiliation or religiosity and attitudes. One section of Cooper's (1993/1994) dissertation study involves a two-way analysis between religious students (those endorsing "Jewish," "Roman Catholic," or "Protestant") and nonreligious students (those endorsing "no preference" or "none") at the beginning and ending level of their course work, but the study's methodology limits the conclusions which can be drawn. Berkman and Zinberg (1997) link religiosity with higher levels of
homophobia and heterosexism, but are reluctant to speculate on the nature of that association.

Few studies have engaged in a broad-based survey of attitudes among social work practitioners and students. Rather, they have tended to measure a narrow sampling of attitudes, such as attitudes toward the poor, or toward gays and lesbians. The exceptions are the Abbott and Cooper studies which used the Professional Opinion Scale (POS; Abbott, 1988), which has 121 survey items that elicit attitudes and opinions that are then purported to measure four value dimensions.

Studies which might be used to inform the hypotheses of the current study were limited in other ways as well. These included results which contradicted one another (Cf. Colon & Asen, 1989; Guttman & Cohen, 1992; Sharwell, 1974; Smith, 1997, 1998; Swanson & Wodarski, 1982), limited samples which make generalizing problematic (Grimm & Orten, 1973; Guttman & Cohen, 1992; Sharwell, 1974; Smith, 1997, 1998; Soliman & Miah, 1998), and the mixing of values and attitudes (Abbott, 1988; Cooper, 1993/1994).

Examples of findings in the pertinent research literature on social workers' attitudes which appear to contradict one another are as follows. Smith (1997) found more favorable attitudes toward the poor on the part of BSW students in his university than the students of two
other university departments, yet Guttmann and Cohen (1992) found little difference between Israeli social work students and other university students in this regard. Sharwell (1974) found significant differences between social work students at the undergraduate level, the beginning graduate level, and the ending graduated level as to their orientation toward public dependency, with each level increasingly more positive. Smith (1998), however, found no significant change in attitudes toward the poor between the time students begin the BSW program and their completion of course work. Cooper (1993/1994), purporting to examine the values of BSW students, saw significant increases in Respect for basic rights, Sense of social responsibility, and Commitment to individual freedom between beginning and ending students. As has been noted elsewhere in this chapter, the underlying items on the instrument Cooper used appear to be attitudinal.

What the above, seemingly contradictory, results may be pointing to, and what additional research appears to bear out, is that social work students and practitioners vary widely among themselves on their attitudes and opinions. Furthermore, some of those attitudes run counter to the profession's cherished values. More examples of this variance follow.
The first area of social work research given further examination is that of students' and practitioners' attitudes toward the poor. While the number of social work students who recognize structural reasons for poverty has increased over the last several decades (Reeser & Epstein, 1987), and they tend to be more likely to endorse structural causes for poverty than students in other disciplines (Hendrickson & Axelson, 1985), they do not differ from the general population in their belief in the work ethic (Littrell & Magel, cited in Littrell & Diwan, 1998), which has been correlated with lack of support for public welfare, even among those social work students who believe poverty is caused by structural factors (Littrell & Magel). Apparently, professional exposure to individuals who are poor does not change social work students' belief in the work ethic (Hendrickson & Axelson, 1985), a finding which might be partially explained by Swanson and Wodarski's (1982) failure to find a change in attitudinal rigidity among social work students at various points in the educational process.

Grimm and Orten (1973), examining master's level social work students, found students who had undergraduate degrees in social work or sociology had more positive attitudes toward the poor than those students entering graduate social work programs from other disciplines;
those who came from undergraduate institutions outside the South had more positive attitudes toward the poor than those from the South; and those students from families with higher socioeconomic status tended to have more positive attitudes toward the poor. On the other hand, Grimm and Orten found previous work experience in a welfare agency (presumably due to bureaucratic conflicts and general disillusionment), age, and marriage all negatively correlated with positive attitudes toward the poor. It should be noted, however, these findings are now over 25 years old.

Littrell and Diwan (1998) report that 79 percent of undergraduate social work students surveyed favor some form of guaranteed income that requires parents to work over the former Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). In that same study, the researchers explored negative attitudes toward welfare recipients. Negative stereotypic views correlated positively and significantly with lesser attributing of poverty to structural factors, higher Protestant Work Ethic, and lesser concern with the widening gap between the rich and the poor. Greater favorability toward AFDC was positively correlated with belief that poverty is caused by structural factors and concern about the widening gap between the rich and the poor. In a second study of social service professionals
(67.2% social workers), Littrell and Diwan report greater admiration given to the mother who was depicted as working in the guaranteed income program than the mother depicted as on AFDC.

A second area of social work research that reflects a wide range of attitudes and even ambivalence on the part of social work students and practitioners is in the area of attitudes toward homosexuality and persons with AIDS (PWA). A 1998 study by Soliman and Miah, though a cross cultural comparison, indicates that the level of students' exposure to PWA varies greatly from region to region. Their findings also indicate that students with higher exposure to PWA exhibit a higher tolerance toward PWA. That study also discovered a wide range of opinions about mandatory AIDS/HIV testing, and about how government funds should be spent in combating AIDS. The range of attitudes toward PWA is not exhibited by students alone. Dhooper, Royse, and Tran (1987-88) report a high prevalence of social work practitioners who indicate their reluctance to work with PWA.

While the existence of homophobia among social workers was documented some time ago (Wiener & Siegel, 1990), Berkman and Zinberg (1997) put the level at 10 percent. They found male social workers to be more homophobic than women, though the differences are not
statistically significant. They also report the majority of their social work sample to be heterosexist, with the males being significantly higher than the females in heterosexist attitudes. Their findings suggest that homophobia and heterosexism are negatively correlated with the amount of social contact with homosexual men and women, and with having been in psychotherapy. While age and education on topics related to homosexuality are not correlated with homophobia and heterosexism, religiosity is associated with higher levels of the two, though the researchers believe they could not fully explicate the nature of this association.

The review of the research, while limited in its ability to inform the present study, has pointed out the degree to which social work students and practitioners vary in the attitudes which they hold toward those with whom they work. Some of those expressed attitudes are inconsistent with the espoused values of the profession. Religious affiliation or religiosity may have an influenced on the attitudes expressed by those in the social work profession, but the research has been too limited to make any kind of definitive assertion in that regard.

A research design which surveys a variety of attitudes (as do the items on the POS) and defines those
variables as attitudes would clearly be useful. Social
workers and social work students hold a range of attitudes
and opinions toward the issues with which they deal. In
addition to, and in spite of how they are taught they
ought to feel, they are either personally drawn to or put
off by the people with which they will potentially work.
And, based on past experience, education, and attitudes
espoused by others in their environments, students have
opinions about the best ways in which to help others, and
about the services with which the social work profession
is associated. Furthermore, a comparison of subgroups of
social workers or social work students, based on such
criteria as educational background, geographic region, or
religious affiliation, would be of interest. Any such
study should use a sample of adequate size and diversity
so as to produce adequate external validity
(generalizability). One of the components of the current
research draws upon these suggestions.

Conceptual Framework

From the literature review, the following conceptual
framework has arisen. Values are deep, enduring
psychological structures which have cognitive, affective,
and behavioral components relative to what is desirable.
Values permeate the individual's personal, social, and,
for the social work practitioner or student, professional
worlds. Values are grounded in even deeper structures, variously called value orientations or philosophical orientations.

Attitudes and opinions are closer to the "surface" of the personality, and are directed toward specific objects. While attitudes are influenced by the underlying values, they are not entirely under the control of the values, and are shaped by additional factors. This explains how one can have at the same time seemingly incompatible attitudes toward different attitude objects.

The above suggests that two individuals can hold very similar values, yet have vastly different attitudes toward the same objects. It is conceivable, then, that two professional social workers can have divergent opinions on, or attitudes toward social issues, while operating out of the same professional value system. It is also within reason to speculate that different value (philosophical) orientations could produce identical or nearly identical value systems, as long as the orientations have some degree of compatibility with one another.

Moral reasoning is intimately tied to this conceptual framework. Moral reasoning is the cognitive process by which one decides which action to take, based on one’s values, one’s system of ethics, and the attitudes one holds. It is truly a bridge between one’s belief system
and one's behavior. As such, it is more closely tied to the specific situation than are the other concepts. At the same time, in this researcher's view, moral reasoning also influences those beliefs and preferences of higher orders of abstraction from which it flows.

Finally, behavior is the most concrete and specific component in this framework. It is what is seen by others in one's environment. Behavior is the output of one's value orientations, values, ethics, attitudes, opinions, and moral reasoning (as well as other psychological concepts that fall outside this discussion). It, too, has a reciprocal relationship with the other, more abstract components of personality, in that it is influenced by them and in turn influences them.

Abbott (1988) and Rice (1994/1995) have both developed schema adapted from Meddin (1975). It is useful for this researcher to do the same. Figure 1 diagrams the relationships of the concepts presented in this chapter.

It makes sense, then, in comparing differences between groups relative to aspects of their belief systems, to examine clusters of related factors. This study focuses on values, levels of moral reasoning, and attitudes as a means of comparing BSW social work students in differing educational programs.
Research Questions

Primary questions.

This research study is guided by the following questions.

1. Are there differences between baccalaureate social work students in public institutions of higher education and those in religiously-affiliated schools relative to adherence to social work values, levels of moral reasoning, and attitudes toward selected social issues?

2. Do students in religiously-affiliated institutions vary among themselves on these dimensions?
3. If the first two questions can be answered in the affirmative, are some religiously-affiliated schools similar to state schools on the measured dimensions?

Secondary questions.

1. How sensitive is the Social Work Values Inventory (SWVI) in terms of its ability to discriminate between groups of social work students by type of educational institution and/or program?

2. How sensitive is the SWVI in terms of its ability to discriminate between levels of baccalaureate social work education (beginning and end)?

3. Can findings of evidence of concurrent validity with the Defining Issues Test (DIT) be replicated?
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study used self-report measures and survey instruments to examine the differences between two categories of baccalaureate-level social work students, those in state-supported programs and those in religiously-affiliated programs, on their adherence to social work values, their level of moral reasoning, and their attitudes on selected issues. The sample of BSW students enrolled in religiously-affiliated institutions was also broken into subgroups for further comparison.

This design was chosen for its ability to address the research questions with a reasonable trade-off in resource expenditure as opposed to interviews. Rubin and Babbie (1993) note that operationally defining and measuring variables using existing self-report scales saves time and money compared to designing new measures, and provides the researcher an option which has been successfully used in the past. Their comments on the use of survey research are appropriate here, as well, for self-reported measures used in a survey-like design are useful in describing the characteristics of a large population, and make large
samples feasible. They also are flexible in terms of topics considered and the number of variables that can be examined.

Given the methods for data collection and analysis to be used, this study can best be classified as a nonexperimental two-way comparison group design. Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) term such a design as causal-comparative. "The major advantage of the causal-comparative method is that it allows us to study cause-and-effect relationships under conditions where experimental manipulation is difficult or impossible" (p. 383). The primary independent variable in the study is the type of affiliation of the baccalaureate social work program's parent institution. Three dependent variables are examined: (a) adherence to social work values, (b) level of moral reasoning, and (c) attitudes on selected social issues. While expected results of the study may imply to a limited extent a causal relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variables, it does not achieve the control of an experiment. Nor has the independent variable been manipulated by the researcher. Therefore this is nonexperimental, ex post facto research.

Data on additional variables, listed in the definition section below, have been collected. Many of these variables, most of which are demographic in nature, are
potentially confounding to the study. Rubin and Babbie (1993) explain that extraneous variables, as these variables are usually called (primarily in the case of experimental design), are those which represent alternative explanations for relationships that are observed between independent and dependent variables (p. 120). Three variables, (a) number of social work courses completed, (b) whether the student has enrolled in a social work values and ethics course, and (c) whether the student has enrolled in an ethics course in another discipline, are classified as intervening variables. When such variables influence the predictive ability of the independent variable upon the dependent variable, they are referred to as moderator variables (Gall, Borg, & Gall, p. 763).

The remainder of this chapter will describe the operationalizing of the variables listed above, diagram a causal model, outline the research design, and discuss the properties of the instruments to be used. The three instruments are the Social Work Values Inventory (Pike, 1994), the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1979), and a locally developed survey of social attitudes (Social Issues Survey). The chapter will conclude with a discussion of the data analyses used.
Operational Definitions of Key Variables

**Dependent variables.**

1. Adherence to social work values - Subscale scores on the Social Work Values Inventory (Pike, 1994, 1996). Subscales are
   a) Confidentiality.
   b) Self-determination.
   c) Social justice.


3. Attitudes toward selected social issues - Scores on a locally constructed attitude survey, the Social Issues Survey (SIS).

**Independent variable.**

1. Type of affiliation of the baccalaureate social work program's parent institution - institutions have been classified as
   a) public - state or locally supported through tax dollars.
   b) religious, theologically conservative - determined through an existing scale used for the Readiness for Ministry Project (Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke, 1980). The use of this scale will be described later in this chapter.
c) religious, theologically moderate - determined through the Readiness for Ministry Project scale.
d) religious, theologically liberal - determined through the Readiness for Ministry Project scale.

Demographic and other measured variables.

A. Potentially Confounding, Extraneous Variables

1. Age.
2. Gender.
3. Race/Ethnicity.
4. Religious affiliation.
5. Religiosity.
6. Political affiliation.
7. Socioeconomic status.

B. Intervening Variables

8. Number of social work courses completed.
9. Whether or not a course in social work values and ethics has been taken.
10. Whether or not any other course in ethics outside social work has been taken.

Heuristic Device

Figure 2 presents a heuristic device depicting the possible relationships among the variables in this study. $Y_1$ represents the one independent variable, affiliation of the baccalaureate social work program's parent institution. $Y_2$-$Y_7$ represent the three dependent variables.
Figure 2. A heuristic device: Possible relationships among the study’s variables.
measured by the three instruments. Variables $X_1$-$X_7$ and $Y_2$-$Y_4$ represent other variables under consideration, which may mitigate the effects of the independent variable on the dependent variable, but may in actuality have a causal relationship to the dependent variables, and may give an alternative explanation for any results observed, thus confounding the study. This researcher is categorizing these latter variables as potentially extraneous or intervening, based on their temporal relationship to the independent and dependent variables. The potentially extraneous variables ($X_1$-$X_7$), generally demographic in nature, occur before the student has selected a BSW program. The intervening variables ($Y_2$-$Y_4$) occur after the student has selected a BSW program. They, too, could prove to be confounding variables.

Research Hypotheses

The literature search conducted at the beginning of this study suggests the following research hypotheses. Though specific and focused, they are a little exploratory in nature, as the literature did not yield strong, consistent evidence to hypothesize in which direction differences might occur. A pilot study conducted earlier compared only two programs, and cannot help in this regard, either. Therefore all statistical tests of the hypotheses were two-tailed.
H$_1$: When controlling for possibly extraneous variables, there will be a slight, though significant difference between the students of baccalaureate social work programs in public institutions of higher education and those in religiously-affiliated institutions with regard to adherence to social work values.

H$_2$: There will be a slight, though significant difference between the students of baccalaureate social work programs in public institutions of higher education and those in religiously-affiliated institutions with regard to level of moral reasoning.

Hypotheses 3 and 4 explore the potential differences between students in state-supported and religiously-affiliated programs on adherence to social work values and level of moral reasoning further, by subgrouping the religiously-affiliated programs based on the degree of theological conservatism or liberalism of their institution's parent religious body.

H$_3$: There will be a difference among the three categories of religiously-affiliated institutions with regard to their baccalaureate social work students' adherence to social work values and levels of moral reasoning.

H$_4$: Differences in adherence to social work values and levels of moral reasoning will be most pronounced
between public institutions and religiously-affiliated, conservative institutions.

Hypothesis 5 relates to the effects of the two main groups, as well as the subgroups, on the third dependent variable, attitudes on selected social issues. Hypothesis 6 considers the three dependent variables together as a whole.

Hs: Differences in attitudes toward selected social issues, as measured by the individual items on the SIS, will show a high degree of variability between social work students at public institutions and religiously-affiliated institutions, and among the students of the three categories of religiously-affiliated institutions. Some SIS items will indicate a larger difference among the groups, while others will show little or no difference.

Hf: There will be a difference between baccalaureate social work students at public institutions and those at religiously-affiliated institutions on adherence to social work values, level of moral reasoning, and selected social issues, all taken as a whole. This difference will be most pronounced between public institutions and religiously-affiliated, conservative institutions.
Instrumentation Hypotheses

\(H_7\): The Social Work Values Inventory will demonstrate an ability to discriminate between different groups of baccalaureate social work students.

\(H_8\): The Social Work Values Inventory will continue to show a moderately positive correlation to the Defining Issues Test.

Sampling Logic

A nested samples strategy was used, in which samples were drawn from state institutions, from institutions sponsored by theologically conservative religious bodies, from institutions sponsored by theologically moderate religious bodies, and from institutions sponsored by theologically liberal religious bodies. Samples of students enrolled in either beginning social work courses or in the final courses and/or field placement were chosen by contacts at each institution.

The first level of sampling was conducted as follows: Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) accredited baccalaureate programs served as the sampling frame. Specifically, those BSW programs in the fifty states and District of Columbia which are listed as fully accredited programs in the 1997 Directory of Colleges and Universities with Accredited Social Work Degree Programs were used. This list was first divided into public institutions and
religiously-affiliated institutions. This was ascertained with the aid of the 1998 Higher Education Directory, which lists institutions and their affiliations: state, local, religious, and private-independent. For the purposes of this study, local (there are relatively few with BSW programs) were included with the state programs, as they are also publicly funded through governmental auspices. While a comparison of the category "private, independent" would be of interest as well, the interpretation of those results would not be as clear, and was not undertaken. This is because within that one category can be found both institutions which are totally independent of outside control and those which are indirectly affiliated with religious bodies through self-perpetuating boards as well as administrators drawn from the ranks of professional clergy of given denominations.

The religiously-affiliated schools were also divided into three subgroups according to the religious bodies with which they are affiliated: theologically conservative, theologically moderate, and theologically liberal. This was accomplished using standard scores on the Readiness for Ministry Project Core Cluster 31: Affirmation of Conservative Biblical Faith (a biblically based faith, and a firm belief in the Bible as final authority) (Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke, 1980, pp. 154-155). Although the
purpose of the Readiness for Ministry Project was to study the attitudes of both clergy and laity toward their ministers, it provides an indirect look at the members' own beliefs. There is precedence for using this particular item to categorize religious denominations and organizations in this way (Narvaez, Getz, Rest, and Thoma, 1997).

All 123 religiously-affiliated schools in the fifty states and District of Columbia which have fully accredited BSW programs fall within the Christian tradition. The Readiness for Ministry Project (Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke, 1980) covered the denominations with which all but two of these programs are affiliated. Those two programs are in universities affiliated with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (Mormon), which did not participate in the Readiness for Ministry Project. Those two programs were not included in the study. Where the Project divided Roman Catholicism into two groups, Order and Diocesan, this study placed all Catholic programs in one denominational category, and used the Project scores of the Diocesan category for theological grouping, as it is believed those more closely represent the larger Roman Catholic lay population (C. Winbery, personal communication, August 13, 1998).

A non-proportionate stratified random sample was then drawn from the religiously-affiliated institutions, with
six baccalaureate social work programs in each category, for a total of 18 religiously-affiliated programs. Eight baccalaureate social work programs were drawn randomly from the public institutions. It is believed that this should yield enough students to fulfill the sample size guidelines for both causal-comparative and survey research (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996), as well as yield sample institutions from varying geographic regions.

The second level of sampling occurred within the programs. Students in introductory social work courses and students in their final social work courses (usually the last field seminar) were invited to participate in the study. A target population which approaches the ideal population in each program is desirable. By restricting the measurement points (beginning and end of program), and inviting all students in those courses to participate, each sample had the potential of approximating the institution level target population. The program directors of each of the randomly drawn programs were asked to consider administering the surveys within the classroom setting, but were also given the option to distribute them for completion outside the classroom.

One major threat to internal and external validity allowed by this design has to do with selection. Randomization at the individual student level across
institutions would have reduced this threat, but was not feasible without receipt of rosters of enrolled students. Random sampling of students within institutions could have conceivably reduced the threat, but this would have placed a sizable burden on the program directors or other liaisons, reducing the likelihood of their agreeing to participate. Given the nonexperimental nature of the study's design, this threat can best be controlled during the analysis of the results. The possibility of students differing on the studied dimensions at the outset of their programs was examined through a comparison of beginning students as well as ending students. Other variables listed in the definition section that posed a potential threat to internal validity were examined as well. One variable, "previous social work experience," occurred at a lower frequency at the baccalaureate level as compared to higher educational levels in one recent sample (Rice, 1994/1995), and did not appear to significantly affect the outcome. The frequency of previous social work experience among the current sample was monitored.

Selection as a threat to external validity, the generalizability of results, continues to be worrisome. The voluntary nature of the participants, both at the institutional and at the individual level, could produce samples whose characteristics are greatly dissimilar from
the populations it is hoped they represent. Volunteers have been shown to differ from non-volunteers (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1975). While nesting the sampling of individuals in a random selection of institutions could ameliorate some potential harm, it will not neutralize all of it.

A customary way to control for this threat is to study a sample of the non-volunteers to ascertain the degree to which they differ from the volunteers in the sample. Again, this would prove difficult in the present study, as the researcher did not have student rosters, and there were no identifying features on the surveys themselves. Nor were program directors asked to gather data on non-participants.

An attempt was made to estimate the threat of selection to external validity through an analysis of the demographic characteristics of the respondents relative to the known demographic characteristics of each given social work program. Program demographic information was obtained from each program director.

Procedures for Survey Distribution

Following the drawing of the state institution sample and the three religiously-affiliated institution samples, program directors were contacted by letter, soliciting their participation in the study, with follow-ups by telephone, facsimile, and electronic mail. A form to acknowledge their agreement to participate, as well as
provide the name of the contact person(s) who would administer the data collection and the number of student packets needed was included with the letter for return. Names of additional institutions were drawn at random to replace those programs whose administrators or faculty chose not to participate. Three additional schools, two state and one religious, were drawn to replace those whose administrators declined at the point of initial contact. Samples of individual students were optimized by requesting that the surveys be administered in class, although programs were allowed alternative administration procedures, so as to avoid discouraging program directors and faculty who otherwise would participate.

Packets were mailed to the program directors or contact persons who agreed to participate. Included in each program's materials were (a) a cover letter, (b) procedural instructions, including the date by which to return the materials, (c) an institution identification and demographic data sheet to include with the returned instruments, (d) an appropriate number of cover letters with informed consent forms and instructions for the students, (e) an appropriate number of copies of the SWVI, (f) an appropriate number of copies of the DIT, (g) an appropriate number of copies of the SIS, (h) an appropriate number of copies of the student demographic sheet, (i) an
appropriate number of computer-scored answer sheets, (j) a return post card acknowledging receipt of the materials, and (k) one or more return envelopes with postage affixed.

Program directors or other contact persons were instructed to distribute the materials to students in introductory social work classes and to students in the senior field seminar or other senior level classes. The researcher preferred that the materials be distributed for completion in a class room setting, as he believed this would yield a larger response rate. The length of the surveys at times, however, necessitated their completion after class. Additionally, some faculty were reluctant to utilize class time for the research. Therefore voluntary take home assignments were acceptable as well. Students were informed as to the voluntary nature of their participation, as will be described in fuller detail in the section on protection of human subjects below. Student survey materials were pre-coded to reflect the school and program category (state, religious conservative, religious moderate, or religious liberal), and whether the student was at the beginning level or senior level, but individuals could not be identified. Program directors or their designated contacts were given a date by which time to have the survey instruments and data sheets completed and
returned. Reminders were given by telephone and electronic mail, both before, and, when necessary, after this date. **Instrumentation**

Instrumentation consisted of three survey instruments: the *Social Work Values Inventory*, the *Defining Issues Test*, and the *Social Issues Survey*, plus a background data sheet. To expedite scoring and data analysis, the computer-scored version of the Defining Issues Test was selected, and the other instruments were adapted for use with a computer-scored answer sheet. This necessitated only minor modifications of the instructions. No survey items were modified.

*Social Work Values Inventory.* A relatively recent addition to self-report inventories in the areas of values and ethics, the Social Work Values Inventory (Pike, 1994, 1996) assesses the extent to which respondents adhere to, or uphold social work values. This is measured through three subscales, which are defined as follows:

(a) confidentiality - Keeping information that is obtained through work with clients private.

(b) self-determination - Supporting the rights of individuals to make independent decisions about their lives.

(c) social justice - Supporting and advocating clients' rights to basic life necessities, supporting
equality of treatment within the law, and advocating change at individual and societal levels to meet social needs. (Pike, 1994, p.52)

The instrument was designed to overcome the problem of inconsistent results found in earlier studies of social work values which used general measures of values or value scales developed specifically for other professions (Pike, 1994), as well as methodological weaknesses of other instruments developed for social work (Pike, 1994, 1996; Rice, 1994/1995).

Respondents are presented 48 vignettes (see Appendix A for examples) representing value dilemmas and are asked to indicate in each case the extent to which they believe the social worker should be oriented toward one of two alternative responses. Responses are marked on a Likert-scale. The inventory takes approximately 30 minutes to complete (Pike, 1994), and is scored by "using a five-point scale with a graduated continuum of extreme positions on the value in question. A score of 5 indicates the extreme position in upholding the value in question, whereas a 1 represents the extreme position of violating the value. The midpoint of the scale represents no commitment to either of the extreme positions at the ends of the scale." (Pike, 1996, p. 342)
Reported estimates of reliability (internal consistency) using Cronbach's alpha have been termed "moderate," ranging from .53 to .84 in Pike's pilot tests (Pike, 1994, 1996), with the largest sample (n = 192) yielding alphas of .54 for the Confidentiality subscale, .54 for the Self-Determination subscale, and .53 for the Social Justice subscale. She speculates that the results, which she calls "disappointing," may be attributable to a highly homogeneous sample of mostly female, Democratic members of the National Association of Social Workers, who generally hold MSW degrees. Rice, using a larger sample (n = 243) of baccalaureate and master's social work and business students obtained coefficient alphas of Confidentiality, .60; Self-Determination, .65; and Social Justice, .78.

The instrument's validity has been measured in several ways. Pike (1994, 1996) reports on the distinctiveness of the individual subscales, based on a retranslation task which yielded inner-respondent agreement of 70%. She also reports that the individual inventory items load consistently, for the most part, on their conceptualized scales, using a principal factors analysis and promax procedure.

Rice (1994/1995) reports discriminant construct validity of the inventory, having first correlated it with
the DIT, and obtained Pearson coefficients of Confidentiality, .30; Self-Determination, .14; and Social Justice, .25. She interprets the results to suggest that the DIT and SWVI subscales are measuring related, but discrete constructs. Rice (1994/1995) also reports the instrument's ability to discriminate between social work and non-social work (business) students, obtaining probabilities from Wilks' Lambda of .0000 for Confidentiality, .0008 for Self-Determination, and .0010 for Social Justice; and its ability to discriminate among social work students by educational level, obtaining significant ANOVA results (p<.0001, p<.0025, p<.0001, respectively).

**Defining Issues Test.** The Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1979) is the most frequently used instrument in the measurement of moral judgment development (Rest, 1984; Moon, 1986), and after 20 years of research, continues to stand up to most challenges (Rest, Edwards, & Thoma, 1997). It has proven useful for measuring moral judgment development in late adolescents, traditional college-aged students, and other adults (Rest, 1979, 1986). It finds frequent use in studies of moral reasoning and ethical judgement within the professions (Cf. Sheehan, et al., 1981, cited in Rest, 1984; Elm & Nichols, 1993; Nof, 1994/1995; Rest & Narvaez, 1994) and within professional

According to Rest and Narvaez (1998),

The DIT is a paper-and-pencil measure of moral judgment derived from Kohlberg’s theory (Kohlberg, 1986). Instead of scoring free-responses to hypothetical moral dilemmas in an interview (as in the Kohlberg procedure), the DIT presents 12 issues after a hypothetical dilemma for a subject to rate and rank in terms of their importance. Hence the DIT data consist of ratings and rankings instead of interview responses that are then scored by a trained judge according to a scoring manual. Instead of envisioning the scoring process as classifying responses into Kohlberg’s six stages, the DIT analyzes responses as activating three schemas. The scores represent the degree to which a subject uses the Personal Interest, Maintaining Norms, or Postconventional Schema. The schemas have a close relation to Kohlberg’s stages, yet they are different. As with Kohlberg’s theory, the schema scores purport to measure developmental adequacy—in particular, how people conceptualize how it is possible to organize cooperation in a society. In short, the DIT is a measure of the development of concepts of social justice. (p. 27)

The standard length DIT contains six vignettes. Shorter versions may be administered (see Appendix B), with three or four vignettes normally used (Rest, 1990). The current study incorporated the shorter form with the three vignettes recommended by Rest for the three-vignette version. The use of the shorter form was due to time constraints in administering the data collection instruments within classroom settings. Additionally, the researcher believed that administration of the longer form
in addition to the other instruments would discourage students from completing the surveys.

The most frequently used index is the "p-score" (Rest, 1986, 1990, 1993; Rest & Narvaez, 1998), which indicates the relative importance a participant gives to stage five and six postconventional moral reasoning (Rest & Narvaez, 1998; Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1997). The reliability and validity characteristics of the DIT are well established. It is usually reported as a percentage (Rest, 1990, 1993; Rest & Narvaez, 1998). Numerous studies report test-retest and internal consistency reliabilities ranging .70 to .80 (Davison & Robbins, 1978; Elm & Nichols, 1993; Rest, 1979, 1986; Rest & Narvaez, 1998). Test-retest reliability for the short form has been found to range from .58 to .77, and Crombach's Alpha for internal consistency has been reported at .71 (Rest, 1990). Convergent-divergent correlations have been reported, among others, with educational achievement and age (Rest 1986; Rest & Narvaez, 1998; Rest & Thoma, 1985; Walker, Rowland, & Boyes, 1991); with Kohlberg's (Colby, et al., 1987) Moral Judgment Interview (Mcgraw & Bloomfield, 1987; Rest, 1986; Rest & Narvaez, 1998), political attitudes and political choices (Rest & Narvaez, 1998), verbal intelligence (Rest, 1986; Sanders, Lubinski, & Benbow, 1995), locus of control (Murk & Addleman, 1992) and personality measures (Rest, 1986).
Thoma (1986) answered Gilligan's (1982) charge of sex bias in measures of moral reasoning, reporting after meta- and secondary analyses that gender accounts for less than 1% of the variance in DIT scores. Finally, Moon (1986) and Gielen and Markoulis (1994) note good "cross-cultural validity" of the DIT in cultures outside the United States.

**Social Issues Survey.** The Social Issues Survey is a locally constructed instrument adapted from a survey (Grenier, 1996) used in classes in the Louisiana State University School of Social Work. The original survey was constructed as a learning tool to give students an understanding of the conservative-liberal-radical continuum as defined by the authors of their course text (Popple & Leighninger, 1993). The SIS uses a Likert-scale format, in which respondents indicate where they "stand" on 20 current social issues and social programs, at least some on which the National Association of Social Workers has taken official positions, or has otherwise spoken to in its newspaper. Each item contains six choice positions, forcing respondents to determine if they are more "for" or more "against"; there is no neutral position (see Appendix C). Survey responses can be converted into a single summated score (after some of the items are reversed for scoring) for comparing groups of respondents. On both the individual items (after reversing appropriate items for scoring) and
on the total score, higher scores reflect a more liberal response. Data on the psychometric properties of this inventory were unavailable prior to the pilot for the current study.

In that pilot (Tyler, 1998), scores on the SIS (a 19-item version) were correlated with subscale scores and total score on the SWVI for construct and convergent validities. Correlations generally fell in the "slight" to "low" ranges ($r = .025$ to $r = .235$, $n = 69$). The highest correlation occurred between scores on SIS and those on SWVI Social Justice subscale score, $r = .235$, $p = .057$. The low correlations to the SWVI are not particularly surprising given the variety of issues covered on the SIS. An overall theme of the items on the SIS could be viewed as "social justice," as indicated by the higher correlation to the Social Justice subscale score of the SWVI. Test/retest reliabilities were in the .80's, due to the rather straight-forward way in which the SIS elicits respondents' opinions.

One additional item was added to the SIS and modifications were made in two other items prior to the current study. Therefore test/retest reliabilities were again measured, using a locally-drawn sample that did not participate in the main study. Test-retest reliability for SIS Total Score was .91, with the reliabilities for
individual items on the instrument ranging from .41 to .89. Internal reliability was also computed on the later version of the SIS, which yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .70.

**Demographic Data Sheet.** Demographic variables were measured using a demographic data sheet composed by the researcher and comprised of 17 questions (see Appendix D). Fourteen questions have been constructed by the researcher, two of which parallel the Hollingshead Two-Factor Index of Social Position as a measure of socioeconomic status (Miller, 1991). One question on ethnicity was adapted from the Baccalaureate Social Work Education Assessment Package (Buchan, Hull, Pike, Ray, Rodenshiser, Rogers, and Smith, 1998) currently in development. An additional question, constructed by Pike (1994), was used to obtain a simple measure of religiosity.

**Data Analysis**

The first step undertaken to analyze the data was to conduct an exploratory data analysis on each dependent variable. Exploratory data analysis allows one to discover patterns in a set of scores (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). SPSS, a commonly used statistical package, programmatically runs tests of skewness and kurtosis to determine the degree to which the data meet assumptions underlying parametric tests. Another means used to examine the nature of the data was the stem-and-leaf display, which provides a visual
presentation of the individual scores on each measure (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).

The research questions and specific hypotheses suggested a number of analytic procedures. As has already been stated, all tests were two-tail as the literature reviewed did not yield strong, consistent evidence as to the direction differences were likely to occur. A central question was, "If there is a difference between baccalaureate social work students in state schools and religiously-affiliated schools, is that difference due to some aspect within the settings or to self-selection?" The degree of similarity between beginning level social work students in the different programs was therefore examined, using t-tests to compare the mean scores on the DIT, the 3 subscales of the SWVI, and the SIS. For this determination, all of the religiously-affiliated schools were combined.

Overall differences (the dependent variables taken as a whole) among the groups were examined by means of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). This was computed on the DIT, the 3 subscales of the SWVI, and the SIS. The examination was conducted among the state-affiliated institutions as one group and the 3 categories of religiously-affiliated institutions as separate groups. Wilks' Lambda was used to compute statistical significance (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).
Hypotheses 1 - 5 were tested using analysis of variance (ANOVA). These statistics were computed separately on the results of the DIT, the 3 subscales of the SWVI, and on the SIS. Comparisons were made among the students enrolled in state schools and the 3 categories of religiously-affiliated institutions treated separately. As specific hypotheses were constructed concerning differences between state schools and religiously-affiliated schools taken as a whole, and between state schools and the schools sponsored by more conservative religious bodies, it was determined that t-tests would be computed for these particular comparisons regardless of whether significance was achieved on the above ANOVAs or not (see Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 392).

The influences of three demographic variables on the scores on SWVI were looked at. A three-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine the independent variables socioeconomic status (5 social classes), religiosity (low, medium, high), and political affiliation (Democrat, Republican, Independent). Rice (1994/1995) examined religious and political affiliation, and obtained significant findings only for the main effects of political affiliation.

Two instrumentation hypotheses were also examined. The ability of the SWVI to discriminate between groups of
baccalaureate social work students ($H_t$) was explored as follows: (a) a one-way ANOVA was computed on each SWVI subscale by two levels of social work student, beginning and ending (scale score x program level), a partial replication of that conducted by Rice (1994/1995); and (b) discriminant analysis utilizing Wilks' Lambda to compare the state school and 3 categories of religious school students. Finally, as a partial replication of Rice (1994/1995), the degree of correlation between the short form of the DIT and the 3 subscales of the SWVI was computed using the Pearson product moment correlation coefficient.

Protection of Human Subjects

This study was conducted within the guidelines of the Louisiana State University Office of Sponsored Research Institutional Review Board (IRB). The research was conducted in established (college and university) educational settings, utilized survey-type procedures, and did not involve minors or vulnerable populations. No participants were placed at risk.

Informed consent was obtained through forms which meet guidelines. Participants were informed of the nature and purpose of the study, the time commitment they would be giving, and assured of the confidentiality of their responses. Potential participants were given the
opportunity to decline prior to or at any point in the study, with no negative consequences. The study involved no subterfuge.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the differences between two categories of baccalaureate-level social work students, those in state-supported programs and those in religiously-affiliated programs, on three dependent variables: (a) adherence to social work values, (b) level of moral reasoning, and (c) attitudes on selected social issues. These differences were examined in two ways: (a) between state-supported programs and religiously-affiliated programs taken as a whole, and (b) with the sample of BSW students enrolled in religiously-affiliated institutions broken into three subgroups as determined by the degree of theological conservatism or liberalism of their parent religious body.

Four self-report and survey instruments were chosen to measure the dependent and demographic variables involved in the study. These were:

1. The Social Work Values Inventory (SWVI; Pike, 1994, 1996) yielded subscale scores on adherence to three core social work values: (a) confidentiality, (b) self-determination, and (c) social justice. The three subscale scores were also added together to yield a total score for
the instrument. The total score was used to compare students on the core social work values as a whole. Instructions and administration procedures for this instrument were adapted by the researcher for optical scanning and computer scoring.

2. The Defining Issues Test (DIT; Rest, 1979) was used to obtain measures of moral reasoning. The P-score, the most widely used of the instrument’s measures (Rest, 1986, 1990, 1993; Rest & Narvaez, 1998), measures the relative importance a participant gives to stage five and six postconventional moral reasoning (Rest & Narvaez, 1998; Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1997). The DIT protocols were sent to the Center for the Study of Ethical Development, University of Minnesota, for computer scoring. Included in the DIT data returned to the researcher was the U-score. This "Utilizer" score represents the degree to which a subject uses concepts of justice in making moral judgments. It is a newer index that is considered more experimental and tentative than the other DIT indexes (Rest, 1993). While originally there were no hypotheses using the U-score formulated for this study, its potential usefulness was readily seen. In describing the Utilizer index, Rest (1993) asserts that some people use criteria other than concepts of justice for deciding what is morally right. He especially notes
religious doctrine as one alternative to justice that is used. It was decided that the opportunity to examine social work students relative to the use of a concept of justice (as opposed to religious doctrine) in moral reasoning favored including the additional variable late in the study. Therefore several comparisons were made between the state-supported and religiously-affiliated programs using the index.

3. Social work students' opinions on 20 social issues and social programs were garnered using the locally developed Social Issues Survey (SIS). This survey instrument was adapted by the researcher from materials currently in use (Grenier, 1996).

4. Demographic information was collected by a demographic sheet developed by the researcher. These two latter instruments were bundled with the SWVI for optical scanning and computer scoring.

Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS Version 7.1. This chapter will outline the results of those analyses and relate them to the research hypotheses. The first sections will describe the research sample and the BSW programs from which it was drawn.

Description of the Sample

A random sample of CSWE accredited, religiously-affiliated BSW social work programs was drawn from each of
the three categories designated "theologically liberal," "theologically moderate," and "theologically conservative." Programs were also drawn at random from the state-supported category. In all cases, names of programs continued to be drawn and program directors contacted until the numbers agreeing to participate equaled the number desired for each category: eight state supported and six from each of the three categories of religiously-affiliated programs.

Four programs, one state-supported and three religiously-affiliated, did not return data after initially agreeing to participate. It was learned that one of those in the religiously-affiliated category was disallowed participation by its research oversight committee. Of the 947 survey packets distributed to the remaining 22 schools, 571 usable packets were returned, yielding a return rate of 60.30%. Individual program returns ranged from 8.33% to 94.74%. Among the state-supported schools, the range was 26.83% to 73.33%, with two larger programs sending back over 72% (55/76 and 66/90) of the surveys sent to them. Among the religiously-affiliated schools, the return rate ranged from 8.33% to 94.74%, with seven schools (two fairly large: 60/77 and 30/40) returning at least 75% of the surveys sent to them. Table 1 gives the breakdown of the sample into the program
types with the numbers and percentages of beginning and ending students in each.

Table 1

BSW Students in the Sample by Program Type and Program Standing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State-supported</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religiously-affiliated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>571</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the survey packets were returned, two limitations to the data became readily apparent. First of all, the survey packet was lengthy, as evidenced by the fact that 12.26% did not complete all three of the self-report instruments which measured the dependent variable, and 15.76% did not complete the demographic data sheet. Several respondents, faculty members and program directors sent comments regarding this, as well. Still, the number that completed the entire data package was very encouraging. Procedures for handling missing data will be described later in the chapter.
The second limitation involved two items of demographic data. As space on the demographic data sheet was at a premium, and the optical scan forms provided places to code birth date and gender, the researcher placed within the written instructions to the students a request to respond to these items on the scan sheet, along with coding-in an assigned group identifier number. Items for birth date (or age) and gender were not placed on the demographic data sheet. Unfortunately, many students failed to code in this information. It should be noted, however, that compilation of descriptive statistics on those who did respond to these two items yielded percentages that closely reflect the individual program percentages supplied by the program directors and the national percentages provided by CSWE (Lennon, 1998).

Table 2 provides details of the demographic features of the sample. A descriptive overview is presented below, along with some characteristics not given in Table 2. The overwhelming majority of the respondents were female (87.2%), with the percentage higher in religiously-affiliated schools (90.1%) than in state-supported (83.8%). Over two-thirds of the students in either type of program were white (72.2% in religiously-affiliated, 67.8% in state-supported).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics of the Sample</th>
<th>Religiously-affiliated</th>
<th>State-supported</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>227 (90.1)</td>
<td>181 (83.8)</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25 (9.9)</td>
<td>35 (16.2)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>2 (0.8)</td>
<td>2 (1.9)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 19</td>
<td>50 (20.7)</td>
<td>14 (13.6)</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 21</td>
<td>95 (39.4)</td>
<td>27 (26.2)</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 - 23</td>
<td>36 (14.9)</td>
<td>23 (22.3)</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 - 25</td>
<td>16 (6.6)</td>
<td>4 (3.9)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 27</td>
<td>7 (2.9)</td>
<td>5 (4.9)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 - 30</td>
<td>4 (1.7)</td>
<td>7 (6.8)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>8 (3.3)</td>
<td>8 (7.8)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>9 (3.7)</td>
<td>4 (3.9)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and older</td>
<td>14 (5.8)</td>
<td>9 (8.7)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>24 (8.5)</td>
<td>11 (5.5)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American (not Hispanic)</td>
<td>22 (7.8)</td>
<td>19 (9.5)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Island</td>
<td>5 (1.8)</td>
<td>12 (6.0)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Mexican</td>
<td>9 (3.2)</td>
<td>8 (4.0)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>1 (0.4)</td>
<td>1 (0.5)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanic/Latino/a</td>
<td>6 (2.1)</td>
<td>6 (3.0)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (not Hispanic)</td>
<td>203 (72.2)</td>
<td>135 (67.8)</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11 (3.9)</td>
<td>7 (3.5)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>216 (76.6)</td>
<td>143 (71.9)</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>44 (15.6)</td>
<td>28 (14.1)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnered</td>
<td>10 (3.5)</td>
<td>13 (6.5)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>12 (4.3)</td>
<td>15 (7.5)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Region in which Student was Raised</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>45 (16.0)</td>
<td>62 (31.5)</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>105 (37.4)</td>
<td>66 (33.5)</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>12 (4.3)</td>
<td>37 (18.8)</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>37 (13.2)</td>
<td>11 (5.6)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>54 (19.2)</td>
<td>4 (2.0)</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>17 (6.0)</td>
<td>13 (6.6)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not US</td>
<td>11 (3.9)</td>
<td>4 (2.0)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>80 (28.6)</td>
<td>95 (48.2)</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>77 (27.5)</td>
<td>37 (18.8)</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>39 (13.9)</td>
<td>19 (9.6)</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10 (3.6)</td>
<td>5 (2.5)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>72 (25.7)</td>
<td>40 (20.3)</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 2 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious affiliation of Student</th>
<th>Religiously-affiliated n(%)</th>
<th>State-supported n(%)</th>
<th>Total Sample %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>44(15.8)</td>
<td>60(30.6)</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>135(48.4)</td>
<td>48(24.5)</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormon</td>
<td>2 (0.7)</td>
<td>4 (2.0)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1 (0.4)</td>
<td>7 (3.6)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian</td>
<td>2 (0.7)</td>
<td>1 (0.5)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>3 (1.1)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation of Islam</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>1 (0.5)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>86(30.8)</td>
<td>66(33.7)</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic/Atheist</td>
<td>6 (2.2)</td>
<td>9 (4.6)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic status</th>
<th>Religiously-affiliated n(%)</th>
<th>State-supported n(%)</th>
<th>Total Sample %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>30(11.1)</td>
<td>12 (6.4)</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle, upper</td>
<td>108(40.0)</td>
<td>57(30.3)</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>69(25.6)</td>
<td>53(28.2)</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle, lower</td>
<td>54(20.0)</td>
<td>54(28.7)</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>9 (3.3)</td>
<td>12 (6.4)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family income</th>
<th>Religiously-affiliated n(%)</th>
<th>State-supported n(%)</th>
<th>Total Sample %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $10,000</td>
<td>8 (3.0)</td>
<td>10 (5.3)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-20,000</td>
<td>14 (5.2)</td>
<td>25(13.3)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001-40,000</td>
<td>73 (27.3)</td>
<td>43(22.9)</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001-60,000</td>
<td>82(30.7)</td>
<td>60(31.9)</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,001-80,000</td>
<td>40(15.0)</td>
<td>30(16.0)</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,001-100,000</td>
<td>26 (9.7)</td>
<td>9 (4.8)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $100,000</td>
<td>24 (9.0)</td>
<td>11 (5.9)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Variable totals differ due to missing data.

The mean age (of those reporting) for the entire sample was 24.80, with that of the state-supported programs at 25.90 and that of the religiously-affiliated 23.91. The median age for the entire sample was 21 (state 22, religious 21.) Nearly three-quarters of the sample were single, with the religiously-affiliated group percentage slightly higher, and the state-supported group slightly lower.
Larger portions of students in both the state-supported schools and the religiously-affiliated schools reported coming from the Midwest (state 33.5%, religious 37.4%) than from any of the other six geographic regions of the United States. The second largest group of state-supported program students hailed from the Northeast (31.5%), while the second largest group of students in religiously-affiliated programs came from the South. Students from countries other than the United States represented 3.9% of the students in the religiously-affiliated programs and 2.0% in the state-supported programs. Over 56% of the students in state-supported programs reported coming from an urban setting, while in religiously-affiliated programs the ratio was nearly 50-50.

Few BSW students in the sample had experienced previous social work employment. The percentage who responded negatively to that item was 82.2 for the state-supported students and 87.2 for the religiously-affiliated. A higher percentage of Democrats could be found in the state schools while students in the private, religious schools were more balanced between the two main parties. Finally, Catholics comprised the largest percentage of named religious groups in the state schools and Protestants predominated in the private, religious
schools. Interestingly enough, a large number of students in both types of programs responded, "other," which could indicate a refusal to be categorized religiously, a lack of understanding of the two major Christian heritages, or the narrow definition some non-Catholic Christian groups give to the term "Protestant." Not surprisingly, 80.7% of the respondents in the religiously-affiliated schools responded that their religion is either "very useful" or "moderately useful" in their daily life. In the state-supported schools, those two responses garnered 64.4%.

The sample favorably reflects BSW social work programs for the United States as a whole, as reported by CSWE (Lennon, 1998). The percentage of females in the sample is within one percentage point of the national percentage for 1997, the most recent figure compiled. The percentage of white students in the sample is 2.3% higher than that reported for the nation in 1997. African Americans are underrepresented by the sample, while other minorities, especially Native Americans, are overrepresented. The sample reflects favorably the demographic make-up of the programs as reported by the program directors.

**Description of the Participating Programs**

Twenty-two of the 26 programs that agreed to participate returned completed survey packets. Six of
these were state-supported and 16 were religiously-affiliated. All six geographic regions of the United States were represented. Table 3 compares the size of the programs, the size of their colleges or universities, and provides an ethnic breakdown of the programs. The state-supported programs, ranging in size from 54 - 300 BSW students, tended to be larger than their religiously-affiliated counterparts, which ranged from 23 - 100 students. The median number of students for the two program types was 120 and 51.5, respectively. Not surprisingly, the state-supported universities were

Table 3
Demographic Characteristics of the Participating BSW Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Religiously-affiliated</th>
<th>State-supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BSW Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 - 150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 1000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 - 5000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5001 - 10,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Range (Median)</td>
<td>Range (Median)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0% - 100% (94%)</td>
<td>58% - 99% (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0% - 68% (4.5%)</td>
<td>1% - 28% (17.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0% - 28% (1%)</td>
<td>0% - 14% (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0% - 8% (0%)</td>
<td>0% - 4% (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
generally larger, although the three largest religiously-affiliated universities housing BSW programs were as large or larger than the three smallest state schools. The largest religiously-affiliated university had approximately 9,000 students, while the largest state-supported university had approximately 30,000 students.

Three of the state programs were BSW only, and three were combined programs (BSW and MSW). All sixteen of the religiously-affiliated programs were BSW only. Faculty size varied with the type of program, number of students, and whether or not there were advanced degree programs. In the state programs BSW faculty numbers ranged from 3 - 13, with a median number of five. Total faculty in those universities with advanced degree programs ranged from 13 - 30. Among the private, religious schools the faculty number ranged from 2 - 4, with a median number of 2.25.

The percentage of female students attending the state-supported programs ranged from 76 - 94, with the median of 87% very close to the total percentage for the United States (Lennon, 1998). Populations of female students in the religiously-affiliated programs were a little higher, with the range 78% - 100%, with a median of 91%. White students were overrepresented and minorities underrepresented at both the state-supported and the religiously-affiliated programs when compared to the
national figures. Again, the percentage of white students in the sample itself was very close to the national figure, even though white students were overrepresented in the programs compared to the national figure. Table 3 gives more details of the breakdown of the programs by ethnicity.

**Procedures for Handling Missing Data**

It is evident that the length of the survey materials caused some students to run out of time or lose interest. Fully 12.26% did not complete all three of the self-report instruments which measured the dependent variables, and 15.76% did not complete the demographic data sheet. Furthermore, about 3.5% failed to respond to isolated items on the SWVI and SIS. A number of acceptable procedures for handling missing data have been developed by researchers (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996; Rubin & Babbie, 1993). Listwise case deletion, the removal of each and every case with missing data appeared too radical for this study given the percentage of incomplete data packets. In most instances the researcher chose several standardized procedures that, while attempting to avoid the introduction of bias, retained the greatest amount of data and statistical power. Different procedures reflecting those characteristics were chosen for different situations, as described below.
1. Some missing data was due to the participant failing to respond to isolated items on the SWVI or the SIS. It is likely that the participant struggled with the response choices, and perhaps even intended to return to answer the item. This situation was handled through imputing values in one of two ways: The SWVI contains an odd number of choices for each item. The missing value was imputed by assigning the midpoint of the scale, which is always a value of four, whether the item is scored forward or backward. In developing the SIS, the researcher consciously chose to "force the issue" with the respondent, and designed the inventory with no middle value. In imputing a missing value, the researcher chose to assume that the item was skipped because of a conflict between the respondent's personal opinion and the respondent's understanding of the stance of the profession on the issue. The assigned value, then, was three, which on each item of the SIS indicates an opinion that is leaning toward the more conservative side, as opposed to the liberal (and social work) side.

2. There were a few instances in which program directors reported a page missing from the data packet. In each of these instances the director was not informed of the missing page until the completed surveys were returned to them. There was no way to determine the identity of the
respondent(s) in order to get the missing data completed. All of the instances involved a page missing from the SWVI section. Imputing mid-range values on several items would very likely change the results of one of the SWVI subscales and the total score as well. In these instances, a mean for the existing responses was computed, and that value was assigned to the missing responses. Thus the subscale score was numerically equivalent to what it would have been had the existing responses comprised the entire subscale. In other words, the imputed values did not move the subscale score in either direction.

3. When entire subscales or total scores on an instrument were missing, pairwise deletion was used. This essentially allows the scores that are available to be used. For example, if a given respondent completed the items on the Confidentiality and Self-determination subscales on the SWVI, but stopped after three items on the Social Justice subscale, the scores on the first two subscales could be entered into calculating the group means and subsequent comparisons of means on those subscales, but the Social Justice subscale and the Total Score would not be used.

In the case of the DIT, scoring programs used at the Center for the Study of Ethical Development determine levels of missing data and response inconsistencies that
invoke listwise deletion of cases. Although it is possible to have those cases reinstated in the statistical analysis, Rest (1990, 1993) cautions that past research has indicated that more meaningful trends are observed using the purged file returned to the investigator. Therefore the purged file was used.

Listwise case deletion was used only when correlation coefficients were calculated between one or more of the dependent variables and a demographic variable, or a demographic variable was used to determine group membership. The effects on \( n \) of the DIT scoring process, of pairwise deletion of means on the subscales and total score of the SWVI, the SIS, and the few instances of listwise deletion, can be seen in a number of tables in this chapter.

Results Related to the Research Hypotheses

The six research hypotheses of this study predicted differences between two categories of baccalaureate-level social work students, those in state-supported programs and those in religiously-affiliated programs, on three dependent variables: (a) adherence to social work values, (b) level of moral reasoning, and (c) attitudes on selected social issues. Differences were examined between state-supported programs and religiously-affiliated programs taken as a whole, and also with the sample of BSW
students enrolled in religiously-affiliated institutions broken into three subgroups: liberal, moderate, and conservative.

Prior to inferential statistical analysis, the data was examined to assure that the assumptions of parametric testing were met. This involved frequency distributions of item responses, examination of extreme values, analysis of skewness and kurtosis, and stem-and-leaf displays. Additionally, Levene's Test for Equality of Variances was run programmatically. Pertinent findings that affected the analysis will be noted in the appropriate discussions.

Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics for ending BSW social work students in the two main types (state-supported and religiously-affiliated) and three religious subtypes of programs. The results from inferential statistics presented in the remainder of this chapter will be based, for the most part, on the descriptive statistics put forth in Table 4, and the reader should refer back to that table. Where there are exceptions, either the related discussions will refer to additional tables or the bases for the inferential analyses will be otherwise noted. Regarding the SIS Total Score, the reader should note that higher scores indicate more liberal responses, and lower scores indicate more conservative responses.
Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Ending BSW Students by Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>SWVI C M</th>
<th>SWVI C SD</th>
<th>SWVI SJ M</th>
<th>SWVI SJ SD</th>
<th>SWVI Total M</th>
<th>SWVI Total SD</th>
<th>DIT P M</th>
<th>DIT P SD</th>
<th>DIT U M</th>
<th>DIT U SD</th>
<th>SIS M</th>
<th>SIS SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>71.09</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>83.81</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>219.48</td>
<td>24.27</td>
<td>38.48</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>93.14</td>
<td>11.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(122)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(120)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig.</td>
<td>71.46</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>86.14</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>222.17</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>43.85</td>
<td>18.38</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>91.83</td>
<td>12.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(79)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib.</td>
<td>71.75</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>86.97</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>224.54</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>42.27</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>90.38</td>
<td>14.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>71.15</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>85.31</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>219.79</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>45.72</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>93.28</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>67.02</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>83.15</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>210.11</td>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>37.96</td>
<td>15.98</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Main Program types: State, Religious (Relig.); Subgroups: Liberal (Lib.), Moderate (Mod.), Conservative (Con.)
Measures: Social Work Values Inventory (SWVI) - Confidentiality (C), Self-determination (SD), Social Justice (SJ), SWVI Total Score (Total); Defining Issues Test (DIT) - P (percentage of postconventional moral reasoning), Utilizer score (U); Social Issues Survey, Total Score (SIS) (higher score = more liberal); M = mean; SD = standard deviation.

N values differ due to either missing data or purge following DIT consistency check.
Differences between BSW students (ending) on the dependent variables examined individually.

To test the hypotheses that there would be differences between ending students in state-supported BSW programs and those in religiously-affiliated programs with regard to core social work values, level of moral reasoning, and opinions on selected social issues, the religiously-affiliated program samples were first aggregated and t-tests for independent means computed for each of the dependent variables. Table 5 presents these results. As noted in that table, Levene's Test for Equality of Variances reached significance for two variables, requiring t-tests for unequal variances. Establishing the minimum threshold at which results would be accepted as significant with an alpha level of .05, Table 5 indicates that no significant differences were found between the two groups on the dependent variables measured by the SWVI, the DIT, or the SIS. A significant difference did show up, however, on the Utilizer score, t(122.00) = 2.67, p = .009. The group mean for the religiously-affiliated programs, M = 0.92, SD = 2.43, is significantly lower than the group mean for the state-supported programs, M = 2.49, SD = 4.14. This indicates that the students in the religiously-affiliated programs do not use a concept of justice in their moral
decision-making to the extent that their counterparts in state-supported schools do.

Table 5

Comparison of Scores on the Subscales and Total Scores of the Social Work Values Inventory, the Defining Issues Test, and the Social Issues Survey by Program Type: State-Supported vs. Religiously-Affiliated (Ending Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Values Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>147.26*</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWVI Total Score</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining Issues Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (% Postconventional)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U (Utilizer score)</td>
<td>122.00*</td>
<td>2.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Issues Survey</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *t-test for unequal variances.  
*P < .01.

To look further at research hypotheses 1 and 2, which predicted differences between students in state-supported programs and those in religiously-affiliated programs on social work values and level of moral reasoning, and to look at differences when the religiously-affiliated programs were broken into liberal, moderate, and conservative categories, a one-way analysis of variance among the four groups was computed. These results can be found in Table 6. (See Table 4 for group means.)

One finds a significant difference on the SIS $F(3, 228) = 4.886, p = .0026$, not seen between the ending students when the religiously-affiliated programs were aggregated. The significant difference established among
Table 6

Analysis of Variance of Scores on the Subscales and Total Scores of the Social Work Values Inventory, the Defining Issues Test, and the Social Issues Survey by Program Type (Ending Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Work Values Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>677.55</td>
<td>225.85</td>
<td>1.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>29293.56</td>
<td>120.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>850.40</td>
<td>283.47</td>
<td>2.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>26170.53</td>
<td>107.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>404.01</td>
<td>134.67</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>33797.81</td>
<td>140.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWVI Total Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4839.38</td>
<td>1613.13</td>
<td>2.725*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>142074.43</td>
<td>591.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defining Issues Test</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (% Postconventional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1129.68</td>
<td>376.56</td>
<td>1.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>47755.35</td>
<td>314.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U (Utilizer score)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.05</td>
<td>25.02</td>
<td>1.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1990.20</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Issues Survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2196.10</td>
<td>732.03</td>
<td>4.886**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>34160.86</td>
<td>149.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p = .000.

the groups on the SIS was followed up by a Scheffe test (p < .05). That test indicates that the significant difference actually falls between the state program ending students and the religiously-affiliated, conservative program ending students. Although the results of the ANOVA reached significance on the SWVI Total Score, F(3, 240) = 2.725, p = .0449, as well, the Scheffe test failed to
reveal any actual significant differences between any of the four program types.

At this point the null hypothesis cannot be rejected relative to hypothesis 1 (adherence to social work values), hypothesis 2 (level of moral reasoning), or hypothesis 3 (differences among the religiously-affiliated subgroups on social work values and level of moral reasoning). The significant results which were seen on the SIS total score, however, anticipate hypothesis 5 (differences in attitudes as measured on individual items of the SIS). Results on a number of the individual items were indeed significant, as will be discussed later in this chapter.

Because of the specific hypothesis predicting differences between the group means of ending students in state-supported programs and the group means of the programs affiliated with the most theologically conservative religious denominations, further comparisons of these two groups were made using t-tests. These results can be found in Table 7. (See Table 4 for group means.)

When the students enrolled in state-supported programs and those in programs under the auspices of theologically conservative religious bodies are compared head-on, significant differences do emerge. These are found in Confidentiality, $t(166) = 2.26, p = .025$;
Table 7

Comparison of Scores on the Subscales and Total Scores of the Social Work Values Inventory, the Defining Issues Test, and the Social Issues Survey by Program Type: State-Supported vs. Conservative Religiously-Affiliated (Ending Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Values Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWVI Total Score</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining Issues Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (% Postconventional)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U (Utilizer score)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Issues Survey</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.74***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p = .000.

Self-determination, t(166) = 2.53, p = .012; SWVI Total Score, t(164) = 2.20, p = .029; and the SIS, t(152) = 3.74, p = .000. This gives partial support to hypothesis 4 (differences will be most pronounced between public institutions and religiously-affiliated, conservative institutions).

As was hypothesized in the fifth research hypothesis, differences between the groups on the individual items of the SIS varied considerably. The comparison between the state-supported institutions and the aggregated religiously-affiliated institutions is shown in Table 8.

The SIS was scored in such a way that higher scores on individual items and on the total score indicate a more liberal attitude toward the issue or social program and lower scores indicate a more conservative attitude.
Table 8

Comparison of Responses of Ending Students in State-Supported and Religiously-Affiliated Programs on Individual Items on the Social Issues Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIS Item</th>
<th>(M_s)</th>
<th>(M_r)</th>
<th>(M_s - M_r)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prayer in schools</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>3.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-choice (abortion)</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut welfare programs</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>221.26*</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National health care system</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex education-- children</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun control</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger labor unions</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2.96**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condoms-- elementary grades</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>211.76*</td>
<td>2.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food stamp program</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil rights for homosexuals</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>217.95*</td>
<td>2.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same-sex marriage</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>228.31*</td>
<td>4.84***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum wage</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals on Wheels</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help the homeless</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>142.96*</td>
<td>3.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politically correct speech</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action, jobs</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action, schools</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death penalty</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>229.30*</td>
<td>2.99**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Mean of state schools minus mean of religiously-affiliated schools. A positive value in the difference between means indicates students in the state schools gave the more liberal response as a group; a negative value indicates students in the religiously-affiliated schools gave the more liberal response as a group.

*\(t\)-test for unequal variances.

\*\(p < .05.\) **\(p < .01.\) ***\(p = .000.\)

Table 8 presents group means, differences between the means, and \(t\)-tests. As the individual item means of the religiously-affiliated programs' students were subtracted from those of the state-supported institutions' students, a positive value indicates the mean of the students in the state-supported institutions was higher (more liberal), and a negative value indicates that the mean of the...
students in the religiously-affiliated institutions was higher (more liberal).

There were significant differences on 10 items, eight of which the state program students had the higher (more liberal) means. The items on which the state students scored significantly higher were Prayer in schools (meaning they were less likely to support), \( t(230) = 3.02, p = .003 \); Pro-choice (abortion), \( t(229.71) = 2.72, p = .007 \); Stronger labor unions, \( t(230) = 2.96, p = .003 \); Condoms in elementary school grades, \( t(211.76) = 2.25, p = .026 \); Civil rights for homosexuals, \( t(217.95) = 2.63, p = .009 \); Same-sex marriage, \( t(228.31) = 4.84, p = .000 \); Affirmative Action (jobs), \( t(230) = 2.33, p = .021 \); and Affirmative Action (schools), \( t(230) = 2.32, p = .021 \). The items on which the religiously-affiliated program students scored significantly higher were Help the homeless, \( t(142.96) = 3.21, p = .002 \); and Death penalty (meaning the students of religiously-affiliated programs were less likely to support the death penalty), \( t(229.30) = 2.99, p = .003 \). Table 8 indicates on which item means \( t \)-tests for unequal variances were used.

To further examine the differences between the responses of students in the various categories of programs, one-way analysis of variance was computed on the individual items with the religiously-affiliated programs
divided into liberal, moderate, and conservative. The results are presented in Table 9. In an effort to cut down on repetitious data, only significant results are presented in Table 9. Table 10 shows where the actual differences lie, and also gives the group means.

Table 9

Significant Results of Analysis of Variance of Responses to Individual Items on the Social Issues Survey by Four Program Types (Ending Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prayer in schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups*</td>
<td>59.34</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td>5.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>759.45</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-choice (abortion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>56.91</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>4.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>923.02</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger labor unions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>3.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>454.56</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil rights for homosexuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>46.93</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>8.55***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>417.37</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same-sex marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>156.52</td>
<td>52.17</td>
<td>14.55***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>817.79</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help the homeless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>3.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>85.68</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death penalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>43.92</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>4.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>724.68</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *df = 3.  
**df = 228.  
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p = .0000.
Table 10
Scheffe Test Results of Significant Differences Between Four Program Types (Ending Students) on Individual Items on the Social Issues Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>RLE</td>
<td>RME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer in schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>RLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>RME</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>RCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-choice (abortion)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>RLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>RME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>RCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger labor unions</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>RLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>RME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>RCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil rights for homosexuals</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>RLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>RME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>RCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same-sex marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>RLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>RME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>RCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help the homelessb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death penalty</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>RLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>RME</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>RCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 10 continued)

**Note.** SE = state ending; RLE = religious liberal ending; RME = religious moderate ending; RCE = religious conservative ending.

*Item score range is 1-6; increasing mean values indicate increasingly liberal mean responses.

b Scheffe test indicated no significant difference between groups. The software does not give means when there are no significant differences.

*p < .05.

One sees that when the religious programs are divided into subgroups, with smaller n's, the differences on three items, Condoms in elementary school grades and the two items on Affirmative Action fall out. The remaining differences and where the actual significant differences fall are as follows: Prayer in schools, \( F(3, 228) = 5.94, p = .0006 \); both the state students and those in the schools of theologically moderate religious bodies differ significantly from the students in the theologically conservative schools. Pro-choice (abortion), \( F(3, 228) = 4.69, p = .0034 \); state school BSW students differ from those in the theologically conservative schools. Stronger labor unions, \( F(3, 228) = 3.64, p = .0136 \); students in state schools differ significantly from their counterparts in the theologically liberal schools. Interestingly, the more conservative the religious body under whose auspices the institution operates, the more likely the students are to support stronger labor unions. Civil rights for homosexuals, \( F(3, 228) = 8.55, p = .0000 \); students in
theologically conservative schools scored significantly lower than students in all other groups, including the other two religious groups. Group means ascend in the order that would be in keeping with hypothesis 4. Same-sex marriage, $F(3, 228) = 14.55$, $p = .0000$; again, those in religiously conservative schools scored significantly lower than the other three groups, and the means ascended in the same order as on the homosexual rights item. Help the homeless, $F(3, 228) = 3.80$, $p = .0110$; the Scheffe test failed to reveal any actual significant difference between any of the groups. Death penalty, $F(3, 228) = 4.61$, $p = .0038$; state-supported program students had the lowest mean (indicating most likely to support), and the difference reaching significance occurred between the theologically moderate schools and the state-supported schools. Hypothesis 5 received strong support both from the comparison of state-supported programs and religiously-affiliated programs taken as a whole, and from the comparison with the religiously-affiliated programs divided into liberal, moderate, and conservative subgroups.

Differences between ending BSW students on the dependent variables taken collectively.

Hypothesis 6 addresses the dependent variables collectively. It suggests that when all the dependent
variables are considered together, there will be a difference between the students in the state-supported BSW programs and the students in the religiously-affiliated programs. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) is used to determine when groups differ on more than one dependent variable. In a MANOVA all the dependent variables are represented by one mathematical expression, called a vector. The mean of all the vector scores is calculated for each group. The mean vector score is called a centroid. The purpose of the MANOVA is to determine whether there are statistically significant differences among the centroids of the different groups (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).

A MANOVA was calculated between the responses of the students in state-supported BSW programs and those in religiously-affiliated BSW programs separated into theologically liberal, moderate, and conservative. The dependent variables under consideration were the SWVI subscales Confidentiality, Self-determination, and Social Justice, along with the total score on the SIS and the P-score on the DIT. The SWVI total score was not included as it is calculated from the subscales and would be redundant. In fact in a correlational analysis conducted by the researcher, Confidentiality, Self-determination, and Social Justice all loaded rather heavily on the SWVI
total score, as one would hope, but did not load particularly heavily on one another. Likewise, the U-score on the DIT was not used because this experimental measure appears to be a moderator variable that increases the predictability of the P-score (Rest, 1993).

Table 11 summarizes the results of the MANOVA. As can be seen, students in state-supported BSW programs and students in religiously-affiliated programs do indeed differ when the aforementioned dependent variables are considered as a unit.

Table 11

Multivariate and Univariate Analysis of Variance Summary for Ending BSW Students by Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Univariate ANOVA (a)</th>
<th>Multivariate ANOVA (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>1.914*</td>
<td>3.909*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. C = confidentiality score; SD = self-determination score; SJ = social justice score; SIS = Social Issues Survey, total score; P = percentage of postconventional moral reasoning.

* \(df = 15, 353.75\).

\(a\) \(df = 1, 134\).

\(b\) \(p < .05. **p < .01\).

Table 11 further indicates that the significant MANOVA result, Wilks' Lambda = .80624, \(F(15, 353.75) = 1.914, p = .021\), is accounted for by the SWVI subscales Confidentiality, \(F(1, 134) = 3.909, p = .010\), and Self-
determination, $F(1, 134) = 2.706, p = .048$, and the SIS total score, $F(1, 134) = 4.149, p = .008$.

**An examination of self-selection as a potential factor.**

Of major importance to the interpretation of any findings of significant differences among the program types is the question of self-selection. To determine the likelihood of there being differences at the outset between state-supported and religiously-affiliated programs due to the personal make-up of students who choose those programs, a comparison was made of entering students in the two main program types. The main dependent variables, as measured by the SWVI subscale scores (Confidentiality, Self-determination, Social Justice) the SWVI Total Score, the SIS Total Score, and the P-sore on the DIT were examined, using $t$-tests for independent means. Table 12 presents the descriptive statistics for the beginning BSW social work students in the two main types (state-supported and religiously-affiliated) and three religious subtypes of programs. The results of the $t$-tests are found in Table 13. There was one statistically significant finding: SIS, $t(267) = 3.57, p = .000$. The mean of the students in the religiously-affiliated programs, $M = 85.44$, indicates that they are significantly more conservative, socially, than the students in the state-supported programs, $M = 91.42$. This suggests that
Table 12
Descriptive Statistics for Beginning BSW Students by Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>SWVI C M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SWVI SJ M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SWVI Total M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DIT P M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DIT U M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SIS M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>66.61</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>79.27</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>207.28</td>
<td>27.52</td>
<td>34.61</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>91.42</td>
<td>14.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(116)</td>
<td>(108)</td>
<td>(104)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(104)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(69)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(102)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig.</td>
<td>66.73</td>
<td>12.43</td>
<td>79.13</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>205.29</td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td>34.18</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>85.44</td>
<td>12.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(176)</td>
<td>(175)</td>
<td>(173)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(173)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(103)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(103)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(167)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib.</td>
<td>66.61</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>76.65</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>203.43</td>
<td>24.73</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>84.08</td>
<td>12.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(77)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>67.20</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>81.63</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>207.88</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>36.26</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>86.89</td>
<td>13.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con.</td>
<td>66.14</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>79.80</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>204.51</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>34.20</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>85.72</td>
<td>11.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Main Program types: State, Religious (Relig.); Subgroups: Liberal (Lib.), Moderate (Mod.), Conservative (Con.). Measures: Social Work Values Inventory (SWVI)- Confidentiality (C), Self-determination (SD), Social Justice (SJ), SWVI Total Score (Total); Defining Issues Test (DIT)- P (percentage of postconventional moral reasoning), Utilizer score (U); Social Issues Survey, Total Score (SIS) (higher score = more liberal); M = mean; SD = standard deviation. n values differ due to either missing data or purge following DIT consistency check.
Table 13

Comparison of Scores on the Subscales and Total Scores of the Social Work Values Inventory, the Defining Issues Test, and the Social Issues Survey by Program Type: State-Supported vs. Religiously-Affiliated (Beginning Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Values Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWVI Total Score</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining Issues Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (% Postconventional)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U (Utilizer score)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Issues Survey</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>3.57*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. p = .000.

self-selection does not play a major role in any differences between the two groups on core social work values, nor on level of moral reasoning, but may explain differences between the two groups in opinions expressed on selected social issues, as well as opinions about social programs. Interestingly, when the religiously-affiliated programs were aggregated, a significant difference was found between the students in the two main groups at the beginning level, but not at the ending level. A possible explanation for this will be examined in the next chapter.

Results Related to the Relationships Between Variables

Because a model of causation suggesting possible relationships between the key variables was hypothesized, a number of analyses were conducted to explore some of
those possible relationships. It should be noted once again, however, that the design of this study is nonexperimental causal-comparative, so that causation cannot be determined to the degree that it can be in an experiment. Still, it was informative to explore several of the relationships, as is discussed below. The variables involved in the analyses were age, political affiliation, religiosity, socioeconomic status, number of social work courses taken, and whether a course in either social work values and ethics or ethics in another discipline was taken.

Two of the sociodemographic variables thought at the outset to be capable of influencing the dependent variables in the study are students' age and socioeconomic status of the students' families of origin. The relationship between these two variables (analyzed separately) and each of the dependent variables was explored by computing the correlations between them. Table 14 indicates that age is significantly correlated with Social Justice, $r(319) = .1149, p = .040$, the P-score, $r(200) = .1968, p = .005$, and the SIS total score, $r(308) = .1276, p = .025$. Though significant, none of these correlations are especially high. No correlation between socioeconomic status and the dependent variables was significant. Interestingly, though, the correlations which
were established between SES and the dependent variables were negative in the case of the SWVI subscale scores and total score, as well as the SIS.

Table 14
Correlations Between Age, Socioeconomic Status (SES) and the Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>SES*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>.0346 (326)</td>
<td>-.0506 (283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>.0073 (322)</td>
<td>-.0955 (283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>.1149 (319)*</td>
<td>-.0360 (283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWVI total score</td>
<td>.0696 (319)</td>
<td>-.0787 (283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.1968 (200)**</td>
<td>.0600 (174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>.0656 (200)</td>
<td>.0131 (174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>.1276 (308)*</td>
<td>-.0902 (281)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *SES values derived through a procedure modeled after the Hollingshead Two Factor index. **p < .01. **p < .001.

To further check the potential influence age might play on differences between the types of programs, especially on Social Justice, P-score, and SIS, an analysis of covariance was run, controlling for age. As can be seen in Table 15, age had a significant effect only on social justice, $F(1, 128) = 7.523, p = .007$. Even so, the main effect of program type was not significant. Since the comparison of students by program type, with the religiously-affiliated schools aggregated had failed to yield significant differences prior to controlling for age (independent t-tests), the researcher decided to run an ANCOVA between beginning and ending students, as well.
Table 15

Analysis of Covariance of Ending Students' Scores (State-Supported vs. Religiou...
students (this will be shown in a later comparison), and
effects of age, if there were any, would be seen more
easily. Yet, as Table 16 shows, age once again only

Table 16

Analysis of Covariance of Beginning and Ending Students’
Scores on the Social Work Values Inventory, the Defining
Issues Test, and the Social Issues Survey, with Age as a
Covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidentiality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate (Age)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>146.09</td>
<td>146.09</td>
<td>0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect (Begin vs. End)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>559.80</td>
<td>559.80</td>
<td>3.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>705.90</td>
<td>352.95</td>
<td>2.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>49159.84</td>
<td>148.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-determination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate (Age)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect (Begin vs. End)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>598.48</td>
<td>598.48</td>
<td>4.823*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>598.94</td>
<td>299.47</td>
<td>2.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>41196.79</td>
<td>124.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate (Age)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>902.56</td>
<td>902.56</td>
<td>6.172*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect (Begin vs. End)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1852.82</td>
<td>1852.82</td>
<td>12.671**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2755.38</td>
<td>1377.69</td>
<td>9.422**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>48546.86</td>
<td>146.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate (Age)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1718.40</td>
<td>1718.40</td>
<td>2.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect (Begin vs. End)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8311.69</td>
<td>8311.69</td>
<td>12.193*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10030.09</td>
<td>5015.05</td>
<td>7.357*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>226314.75</td>
<td>681.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P (% Postconventional)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate (Age)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>943.17</td>
<td>943.17</td>
<td>3.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect (Begin vs. End)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1343.87</td>
<td>1343.87</td>
<td>4.916*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2287.03</td>
<td>1143.52</td>
<td>4.183*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>51397.87</td>
<td>273.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U (Utilizer)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate (Age)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect (Begin vs. End)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2004.19</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covariate (Age)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>458.17</td>
<td>458.17</td>
<td>2.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effect (Begin vs. End)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>407.76</td>
<td>407.76</td>
<td>2.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>865.93</td>
<td>432.97</td>
<td>2.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>30833.53</td>
<td>164.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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significantly affected Social Justice, $F(1, 332) = 6.172, p = .013$, although there were significant results in regard to the main effect of point-in-the program (beginning vs. end) on some of the other dependent variables.

Socioeconomic status, the effects of which were examined independently in relation to the dependent variables in an earlier comparison, was viewed in interaction with two other sociodemographic variables, political affiliation, and religiosity. For this comparison, five levels of socioeconomic status were obtained by weighting responses to parental education level and job type (in the fashion of the Hollingshead two-factor index). Political affiliation response choices were (a) Democrat, (b) Republican, (c) Independent, (d) other, and (e) none. A simple measure of religiosity was used: "How useful is your religion to you in decision-making in your daily life?" The five choices, "Very useful," "Moderately useful," "Only slightly useful", "Not at all useful," and "Do not practice any religion" were reduced to four categories, by combining "Only slightly useful" and "Not at all useful."
Table 17 shows the results of this three-way ANOVA.

As can be seen, the three sociodemographic variables together significantly influence Confidentiality, \( F(11, 436) = 2.176, p = .015 \), with religiosity, \( F(3, 436) = 2.640, p = .049 \), contributing significantly to that influence. Likewise, religiosity contributes

### Table 17

Analysis of Variance of the Subscale and Total Scores of the Social Work Values Inventory, the Defining Issues Test, and the Social Issues Survey by Religiosity, Political Affiliation, and Socioeconomic Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Work Values Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3279.14</td>
<td>298.10</td>
<td>2.176*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1085.16</td>
<td>361.72</td>
<td>2.640*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1105.99</td>
<td>276.50</td>
<td>2.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>279.83</td>
<td>69.96</td>
<td>0.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3279.14</td>
<td>298.10</td>
<td>2.176*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>59728.93</td>
<td>136.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-determination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4304.02</td>
<td>391.27</td>
<td>3.606***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2273.45</td>
<td>757.82</td>
<td>6.983***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>622.41</td>
<td>155.60</td>
<td>1.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>457.01</td>
<td>114.25</td>
<td>1.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4304.02</td>
<td>391.27</td>
<td>3.606***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>47312.98</td>
<td>108.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5812.03</td>
<td>528.37</td>
<td>3.638***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>367.03</td>
<td>122.35</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4743.25</td>
<td>1185.81</td>
<td>8.166***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>310.46</td>
<td>77.61</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5812.03</td>
<td>528.37</td>
<td>3.638***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>63316.39</td>
<td>145.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWVI Total Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30770.03</td>
<td>2797.28</td>
<td>4.308***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5746.70</td>
<td>1915.57</td>
<td>2.950*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15114.43</td>
<td>3778.61</td>
<td>5.819***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2080.04</td>
<td>520.01</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30770.03</td>
<td>2797.28</td>
<td>4.308***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>283135.72</td>
<td>649.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Table 17 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defining Issues Test</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (% Postconventional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2651.54</td>
<td>241.05</td>
<td>0.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1395.32</td>
<td>465.11</td>
<td>1.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1402.19</td>
<td>350.55</td>
<td>1.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>657.69</td>
<td>164.42</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2651.54</td>
<td>241.05</td>
<td>0.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>76526.27</td>
<td>294.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U (Utilizer)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>128.47</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.38</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>1.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.57</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>1.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45.42</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>1.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>128.47</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>2639.94</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Issues Survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23410.28</td>
<td>2128.21</td>
<td>17.437**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3108.15</td>
<td>1036.05</td>
<td>8.489***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13919.98</td>
<td>3480.00</td>
<td>28.513**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>552.24</td>
<td>138.06</td>
<td>1.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23410.28</td>
<td>2128.21</td>
<td>17.437**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>53214.36</td>
<td>122.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** *p < .05. **p = .00. ***p = .000.

significantly, $F(3, 436) = 6.983, p = .000,$ to the main effects, $F(11, 436) = 3.606, p = .000,$ on Self-determination. Other dependent variables to which religiosity contributed to the main effects were SWVI Total Score, $F(11, 436) = 4.308, p = .000,$ religiosity, $F(3, 436) = 2.950, p = .032;$ and SIS, $F(11, 436) = 17.437, p = .000,$ religiosity, $F(3, 436) = 8.489, p = .000.$

Political affiliation also significantly contributed to the main effects on two of the dependent variables, Social Justice, $F(11, 436) = 3.638, p = .000,$ political affiliation, $F(4, 436) = 8.166, p = .000;$ and SWVI Total
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Score, $F(11, 436) = 4.308, p = .000$, political affiliation, $F(4, 436) = 5.819, p = .000$. As can be seen, socioeconomic status did not contribute significantly to the main effects on any of the dependent variables, and there was no significant influence at all upon the DIT. The SPSS program suppressed calculation of three-way interactions due to empty cells in the matrix.

Two of the variables thought to potentially moderate the effects of the independent variable (program type) upon the dependent variables occur within the social work programs. These are (a) number of social work courses taken and (b) whether or not a course in either social work values and ethics or an ethics course in another discipline has been taken. When the entire sample is considered, the distribution of courses taken is bimodal. To examine the effects of number of courses, the sample was divided between the two bimodal peaks and a two-way analysis of variance (program type x number of courses taken) computed. The two levels of courses were low: 0 - 3, and high: 10 and above. Table 18 shows the results. As that table indicates, in every case except the DIT P-score, the variable, number of courses, had a significant impact on the dependent variable: on Confidentiality, $F(1, 371) = 15.190, p = .000$; on Self-determination, $F(1, 371) = 10.585, p = .001$; on Social Justice, $F(1, 371) = 25.782,$
p = .000; on SWVI Total Score, F(1, 371) = 30.278, p = .000; and on SIS, F(1, 371) = 7.560, p = .006. Program type showed a significant influence on Self-determination, F(1, 371) = 4.769, p = .030; and on SIS, F(1, 371) = 13.953, p = .000. The two-way interactions (Program x Number of Courses), however showed no significant effect.

Table 18

Analysis of Variance of the Subscale and Total Scores of the Social Work Values Inventory, the Defining Issues Test, and the Social Issues Survey by Program Type (State-supported vs. Religiously-affiliated) and Number of Social Work Courses Taken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Values Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2311.21</td>
<td>1155.61</td>
<td>8.261***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.61</td>
<td>34.61</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2124.80</td>
<td>2124.80</td>
<td>15.190***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program x Number of Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2313.41</td>
<td>771.14</td>
<td>5.513**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>51895.74</td>
<td>139.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2010.71</td>
<td>1005.35</td>
<td>9.092***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>527.31</td>
<td>527.31</td>
<td>4.769*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1170.45</td>
<td>1170.45</td>
<td>10.585**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program x Number of Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.61</td>
<td>67.61</td>
<td>0.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2078.32</td>
<td>692.77</td>
<td>6.265***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>41024.39</td>
<td>110.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3969.62</td>
<td>1984.81</td>
<td>13.261***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>424.41</td>
<td>424.41</td>
<td>2.836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3858.87</td>
<td>3858.87</td>
<td>25.782***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program x Number of Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.56</td>
<td>26.56</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3996.19</td>
<td>1332.06</td>
<td>8.900***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>55528.49</td>
<td>149.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWVI Total Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21316.98</td>
<td>10658.49</td>
<td>15.909***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.97</td>
<td>67.97</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20285.51</td>
<td>20285.51</td>
<td>30.278***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program x Number of Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21337.71</td>
<td>7112.57</td>
<td>10.616***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>248561.51</td>
<td>669.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 18 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining Issues Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (% Postconventional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>503.78</td>
<td>251.89</td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>488.53</td>
<td>488.53</td>
<td>1.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program x Number of Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>505.17</td>
<td>168.06</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>60007.49</td>
<td>274.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Issues Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4211.55</td>
<td>2105.78</td>
<td>12.793***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2296.72</td>
<td>2296.72</td>
<td>13.953***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1244.48</td>
<td>1244.48</td>
<td>7.560***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program x Number of Courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>221.28</td>
<td>221.28</td>
<td>1.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4432.83</td>
<td>1477.61</td>
<td>8.977***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>61069.57</td>
<td>164.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p = .000.

To examine the influence of either a course in social work values and ethics or an ethics course in another academic discipline, students were asked (a) whether they had taken a social work course in which social work values and/or ethics was at least 50% of the course content, and (b) whether they had taken a course in ethics in any area other than social work. Rice (1995) had attempted to examine this relationship earlier, but determined that the question was flawed and the results uninterpretable. This researcher (Tyler, 1998) sought in the pilot for the current study to improve upon the wording of the question, but to no avail. Numerous students in that pilot answered "yes" to the question of a social work values course, when the programs under study did not have such a course. For the current study, the researcher tried to enlist the aid
of the faculty members administering the surveys by instructing them to inform the students if their program had a course meeting the researcher's criteria.

The results, reported in Table 19, are questionable.

Table 19

Comparison of Social Work Values Inventory Results of Ending Students in All Programs Who Have Taken at Least One Course in Values or Ethics and Those Who Have Not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>$M_w$</th>
<th>$M_o$</th>
<th>$M_w - M_o$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>69.99</td>
<td>71.86</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>62.71</td>
<td>65.12</td>
<td>-2.41</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>85.04</td>
<td>84.16</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWVI Total Score</td>
<td>217.85</td>
<td>221.14</td>
<td>-3.29</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $M_w$ = Mean of students with a social work course in values and ethics or an ethics course in another discipline; $M_o$ = Mean of students without such a course. Mean of scores of students who have taken either a social work values and ethics course or a course of ethics in another discipline minus mean of students who have not taken either. A positive value indicates the mean of those who have taken such a course is higher; a negative value indicates the mean of those who have not taken such a course is higher.

Although only seven of the program directors or faculty members assigned to coordinate the administration of the survey reported their program has a course fitting the criteria, numerous students at other programs reported having had such a course, sometimes in percentages that indicated that they were instructed to select the affirmative choice. Furthermore, the researcher requested the names of the courses that the survey coordinators considered meeting the criteria. Several of these were
practice courses or field instruction seminars. Although these should carry a good deal of content on values and ethics, it is questionable that they meet the 50% criterium. One appeared to be a cultural diversity course; two were integrative or senior capstone seminars, and one program had one course entitled "Social Work Values and Ethics" as well as a capstone course with "values" in the title.

As Table 19 shows, the results were not significant. Possible explanations will be considered in the next chapter. Again, the results should not be accepted uncritically.

Results Related to Instrumentation Hypotheses

The Social Work Values Inventory is barely five years old, and only a small amount of data has been collected upon it. Two instrumentation hypotheses were formulated to see if the SWVI would perform at the level that was seen earlier. Rice (1995) used the instrument to compare BSW students with business students and to compare social work students at the beginning of their BSW program, the end of their BSW program, at the beginning of the MSW, and at the end of the MSW. Although she performed discriminant analysis on the SWVI by academic major, she did not perform the analysis by educational level. Furthermore, Rice used only the SWVI subscale scores in her work. This
researcher took the additional step of including the sum of the subscale scores for a SWVI Total Score.

The results of two discriminant analyses can be found in Tables 20 and 21. Table 20 examines the ability of the SWVI to discriminate between two similar groups of students (ending BSW). As is indicated in that table, such a discrimination is too fine for the SWVI to make. In the analysis, Wilks’ Lambda results were not significant, and only 28.98% of the grouped cases could be correctly classified. With four groups, this is only slightly better than what would be expected by chance.

Table 20

Discriminant Analysis for the Subscales and Total Score of the Social Work Values Inventory by Program Type (Ending Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>0.9243</td>
<td>.4288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>2.5710</td>
<td>.0535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>0.8939</td>
<td>.4441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWVI Total Score</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>1.1643</td>
<td>.3228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *df = 3, 517.

Discriminant analysis was also performed on the subscale scores and total score of the SWVI by education level. In this case of beginning students versus ending students, significant differences had already been found, as was seen in Table 14, and indirectly in Table 15. One more comparison of beginning and ending students was made prior to conducting the discriminant analysis, however,
using \( t \)-tests for independent means. This gave a direct comparison of beginning and ending students without controlling for age. Table 21 presents these results.

(Means for ending students by program are found in Table 4; means for beginning students are found in Table 12.)

Table 21

Comparison of Beginning Students (All Programs) and Ending Students (All Programs) on the Subscales and Total Score of the Social Work Values Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>( M_{\text{beg}} )</th>
<th>( M_{\text{end}} )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( t )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>66.68</td>
<td>70.45</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>3.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>59.88</td>
<td>63.64</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>4.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>79.18</td>
<td>84.43</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>4.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWVI Total Score</td>
<td>206.04</td>
<td>218.57</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>5.55*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* \( *p* = .000."

The results were highly significant, with Confidentiality yielding \( F(537) = 3.66, p = .000 \); Self-determination yielding \( F(528) = 4.09, p = .000 \); Social Justice yielding \( F(519) = 4.84, p = .000 \); and the SWVI Total Score yielding \( F(519) = 5.55, p = .000 \). It was therefore believed that a discriminant analysis of the SWVI by education level should produce significant results, as found in Table 22.

Highly significant results were obtained on all scores of the SWVI by student educational level, confirming that the SWVI can indeed discriminate between beginning and ending levels of BSW students. Wilks’ Lambdas ranged from .976, \( F(1, 519), p = .0004 \) for Confidentiality to .944, \( F(1, 519), p = .0000 \) for the SWVI.
Total Score. With results this significant, 61.23% of the grouped cases were correctly classified.

Table 22

Discriminant Analysis for the Subscales and Total Score of the Social Work Values Inventory by Student Educational Level (Beginning vs. Ending Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Wilks' Lambda*</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>12.7031</td>
<td>.0004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>14.7969</td>
<td>.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>23.4115</td>
<td>.0000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWVI Total Score</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>30.8412</td>
<td>.0000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *df = 1, 519
*p = .000. **p = .0000.

Finally, the scores on the SWVI were correlated with the P-Score of the Defining Issues Test. Rice (1995) examined the correlations between the subscale scores of the SWVI and the P-Score on the full-length version of the DIT. This researcher wished to see how those correlations held up when a shorter form of the DIT was used. This study also computed correlations using the SWVI Total Score. These results are found in Table 23.

Table 23

Correlations Between the Subscales and Total Score of the Social Work Values Inventory and the P-Score of the Defining Issues Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>.1526</td>
<td>(200)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>.2006</td>
<td>(199)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>.2085</td>
<td>(196)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWVI Total Score</td>
<td>.2402</td>
<td>(196)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01.
All four of the SWVI scores correlated positively and significantly with the P-score of the short version of the DIT used in the study. These results were Confidentiality, \( r(200) = .1526, p = .031 \); Self-determination, \( r(199) = .2006, p = .004 \); Social Justice, \( r(196) = .2085, p = .003 \); and SWVI Total Score, \( r(196) = .2402, p = .001 \).

Summary of Major Results

This chapter has presented a rather large amount of analysis over the spread of numerous pages. It would be beneficial to the reader to summarize the major findings of the study before moving to the discussion chapter. This summary is presented in Table 24 and discussed below.

Table 24

Summary of the Study’s Major Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale or Item</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>With Religious Programs</th>
<th>With Religious Programs</th>
<th>State vs. Religious Programs</th>
<th>Beginning vs. Ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SWVI</td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-determination</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWVI Total</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIT</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS Total Score</td>
<td>**b</td>
<td>**c</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prayer, schools</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**d</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-choice</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**d</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cut welfare</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nat. h-care</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex education</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gun control</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor unions</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Table 24 continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale or Item</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Religious Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggregated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condoms, elem.</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food stamps</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil rights, homosexuals</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same-sex mar.</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. wage</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals on wheels</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help homeless</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.C. speech</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Aff. Act.</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Aff. Act.</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death Penalty</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Var.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a whole</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discriminant ability of SWVI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>SES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidential.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determ.</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWVI Total Score</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Scheffe test failed to reveal significant difference between groups.
Beginning students only.
Significant difference lies between state and religious conservative.
See Table 10 for location of the significant differences.
*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p = .000. ****p = .0000. - = not significant.
Noteworthy results found in Table 24 include:

1. Differences in core social work values fall mostly between (a) students in state-affiliated programs and students in those religiously-affiliated programs that are connected to theologically conservative religious bodies, and (b) between beginning and ending students across programs.

2. There are differences between state-affiliated programs and those that are connected to theologically conservative religious bodies relative to the foundation for ethical/moral decision-making. The difference is seen when state and religiously conservative programs alone are compared, but does not show up when the comparison is made between the state and all religiously-affiliated programs with the religiously-affiliated programs separated into subgroups. It does appear to be strong enough to show a significant difference when religiously-affiliated programs are aggregated and compared with state-supported programs, however.

3. Differences among the programs really show up in attitudes toward social issues and social programs, as measured by individual items on the SIS. When religiously-affiliated programs are aggregated for comparison, their means indicate a more liberal response compared to that of the state program students for items on helping the
homeless and (less) support for the death penalty (along with two other items which did not produce significant results). State school students gave the more liberal response on the other 16 items of the SIS, with significant differences indicated on items having to do with prayer in schools (less supportive), Pro-choice, stronger labor unions, condoms in elementary school grades, civil rights for homosexuals, same-sex marriage, and Affirmative Action, both in jobs and in schools.

When the religiously-affiliated programs are separated into theologically liberal, moderate, and conservative groups, there are significant differences between the state school students and the students in those schools connected to the theologically conservative religious bodies on prayer in schools, Pro-choice, civil rights for homosexuals, and same-sex marriage. There is also a difference between the religiously-affiliated, religiously moderate program students and the religiously-affiliated, religiously conservative program students on the prayer in schools item, and the students of the theologically liberal and theologically moderate programs differ significantly from their counterparts in the theologically conservative programs on both the issue of civil rights for homosexuals and same-sex marriage. On the latter two items, the group means line up in descending
order, with the state program students giving the most liberal responses, down through progressively more conservative religiously-affiliated programs, as the research hypothesis would suggest. Additionally, theologically moderate program students differ significantly from the state-supported program students in their (lower) support for labor unions (with degree of support lessening as one moves from conservative to liberal theologically), and they differ significantly from the theologically liberal program students in their disagreement with the death penalty. On the issue of the death penalty, the state program students are the most likely to support it, followed (in order) by the theologically conservative students, the theologically liberal students, with the theologically moderate program the least likely to support it.

4. The SWVI showed a significant ability to discriminate between BSW students at the beginning and ending level of their programs, but not between students of the four program types.

5. The subscale scores and total score of the SWVI all correlate positively and significantly with the P-score on the DIT.

6. Age correlates positively and significantly with Social Justice, the DIT P-score, and SIS Total Score.
Additional results not found in Table 24 include the following:

7. In addition to correlating significantly with the dependent variables listed in (f) above, the influence of age on Social Justice showed significance on both the ANOVA comparing beginning and ending students and the one comparing program types.

8. Religiosity had a significant influence on the dependent variables Confidentiality, Self-determination, SWVI Total Score, and the SIS Total Score.

9. Political affiliation had a significant influence on the dependent variables Social Justice, SWVI Total Score, and the SIS Total Score.

10. Number of courses (high vs. low) influenced all of the SWVI scores and the SIS Total Score, but not the DIT’s P-score. Program type (state-supported vs. religiously-affiliated) influenced Self-determination and the SIS Total Score. Two-way interactions (program type x number of courses) were not significant, however.

Variables that are notable for their lack of significant influence include SES, both individually and in conjunction with other variables, and a social work values and ethics course or a course in ethics in another discipline. It should be remembered that the results on the latter are somewhat questionable, however.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The results reported in Chapter IV provide evidence in support of a number of conclusions about the differences among students in the various categories of BSW programs. Some are derived from analyses conducted between the students in state-supported institutions and those in religiously-affiliated institutions aggregated together, while others are drawn when the religiously-affiliated programs are separated into subgroups based on the theological characteristics of their parent religious bodies. Additional conclusions may be drawn about the relationships among some of the key variables in the hypothesized causal model, and about the characteristics of the Social Work Values Inventory. These conclusions will be discussed in this chapter. First, conclusions and implications for the specific results reported in Chapter IV will be discussed in the initial section of the chapter. Next, the discussion will be broadened to encompass conclusions and implications for the study as a whole. The final sections will examine strengths and limitations of the study and give suggestions for future research.
Discussion of Specific Results

The discussion of the specific results is divided into a discussion related to the research hypotheses, one related to the causal model, and one related to the instrumentation hypotheses.

Discussion of results related to the research hypotheses.

In the initial part of the data analysis for the study, there appeared to be no significant differences between BSW students in state-supported institutions and students in religiously-affiliated institutions as to adherence to core social work values. It was only when students in colleges and universities connected to more conservative theological traditions were separated out and compared to their state school counterparts that differences emerged. As it is with many personal attributes, social work students' adherence to social work values fall on a continuum, and there is no clear demarcation between adherence to social work values and nonadherence to those values. This is evidenced by the failure to reject the null hypothesis for research hypotheses 1 (a difference between state-supported and aggregated religiously-affiliated programs) and 3 (differences among religiously-affiliated programs), while the null hypothesis was rejected for hypothesis 4 (state
vs. religious conservative programs). Furthermore, differences, as measured by the SWVI, do not lie uniformly across the core values, as evidenced by the fact that no significant difference was ever revealed on Social Justice. This suggests that to stereotype BSW students based upon whether they are enrolled in religiously-affiliated programs or enrolled in state-supported programs, or to assume that all religiously-affiliated programs are the same, does both the students and the programs disservice.

No differences among students of any of the program types ever emerged regarding levels of moral reasoning (DIT P-score), although the mean of the aggregated religiously-affiliated programs group was higher than that of the state programs group, and slightly higher than the mean reported by Rest (1986) for college students. Previous research conducted by others (Cf. Narvaez, Getz, Rest, & Thoma, 1997; Rest, 1986; Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, Thoma, 1997), suggests that religious fundamentalist individuals tend to score lower on the DIT. While the mean of the theologically conservative program group was the lowest of the four groups, it was not significantly lower. Perhaps the educational level of participants in the sample countered that trend (see Rest & Thoma, 1985), or
perhaps the more extremely fundamentalist individuals do not choose social work as a profession.

On the other hand, significant differences were found between students in state-supported programs and those in religiously-affiliated programs, aggregated, as well as when the state-supported program students were compared with those from schools in the religious conservative tradition, on the experimental DIT U-score. This indicates that while the students across the entire sample were relatively similar in their levels of moral reasoning, the foundations which they used to make moral/ethical decisions were quite different. It could be surmised that the students in the religiously-affiliated schools tended to use religious doctrine more than concepts of justice as the foundation for their ethical decisions. It seems, though, that because there are sometimes competing concepts within religious doctrine, further analysis of it as a foundation for ethical decision making would have to be made. For example, in the Judaeo-Christian tradition, there is the sometimes competing notions of the righteousness/judgement/wrath of God, on the one hand, and God's mercy/grace/steadfast-love on the other. Some people using religious doctrine for making ethical decisions might be inclined to emphasize the judgement side, while
others might incorporate the concepts related to mercy and love.

Where the groups of students differed the most was on certain of the individual items of the SIS, which measured attitudes toward current social issues and social programs. There was also a high degree of fluctuation evidenced, for on some items there was very little difference at all. It is gratifying to see that BSW social work students across the sample uniformly endorse traditional social programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, minimum wage, and Meals on Wheels (which, not surprisingly, received the highest level of endorsement for the sample as a whole). BSW social work students across the sample also endorsed the idea of a national health care program, resisted the idea of cutting welfare, and were strongly in favor of sex education in the schools. (The item on condoms deliberately stated "in elementary grades" so that it would be a good discriminator. Although it did differentiate between the two main groups, both means were on the conservative side.) Even though there were significant differences on the two Affirmative Action items when the religiously-affiliated schools were aggregated, both the state and the religious school means were on the more liberal side.
Religiously-affiliated program students produced the higher (more liberal) means on helping the homeless and on the issue of the death penalty. The response on helping the homeless is not particularly surprising, as this is very much in line with traditional religious missions endeavors. The response on the death penalty is a little more surprising, as interpretations from two Judaeo-Christian traditions could be seen to be in conflict in the issue: (a) "an eye for an eye" and (b) murder is wrong, therefore putting a person to death for murder is wrong. Specific teachings and pronouncements by religious leaders tend to move the opinions of their followers toward one pole or the other. A recent Associated Press article (after these data were collected) chronicled Pope John Paul II's condemnation of capital punishment in the United States (Lieblich, 1999).

The state-supported program students scored significantly higher (more liberal) than the religiously-affiliated program students on the items on prayer in schools, Pro-choice, stronger labor unions, condoms in elementary school grades, civil rights for homosexuals, same-sex marriage, and on both Affirmative Action items. As has already been noted, both main groups were fairly supportive of Affirmative Action, though the state students scored significantly higher, indicating that the
state-supported program students are likely to hold out longer in their support for these programs in the face of the anti-Affirmative Action backlash. Likewise, both main groups scored quite conservatively on the condoms item. On the prayer in schools item, the state-supported program students scored only slightly on the liberal side (mean of 3.41 on a scale of 1 - 6) and the religiously-affiliated students leaned slightly conservatively (mean of 2.67). When the religiously-affiliated programs were separated into liberal, moderate, and conservative, the students of the moderate subgroup scored on the liberal side (mean of 3.28).

On the issue of stronger labor unions, the means of the students in the programs connected to more conservative religious traditions were closer to the means of their state school counterparts than they were on other items. The students in the theologically moderate programs group were less supportive of stronger labor unions, and the students in the theologically liberal programs group were the least supportive. The more liberal theological traditions tend to be peopled by individuals and families of higher socioeconomic status, and perhaps are more identified with owners and managers in business and industry.
The three items that generated the largest differences between students in state-supported and religiously-affiliated programs represent three of today's "red flag" issues: abortion (Pro-choice vs. Pro-life), civil rights for homosexuals, and same-sex marriage. It is in these areas that religious bodies and leaders have made strongly negative pronouncements (albeit there have also been pronouncements of support for, and the performance of marriage ceremonies for gay and lesbian couples in some of the more liberal religious congregations). An example of a negative pronouncement comes from an article circulated by Baptist Press (1999) under the headline: "Homosexuality not natural, not part of God’s plan, Southern Baptist prof says." An example directly from the field of social work comes from the firing of a lesbian worker by Kentucky Baptist Homes for Children after a photo of her and her partner appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal newspaper. In the aftermath, her supervisor and four other employees resigned, and two schools of social work withdrew their field placement agreements ("Gay Worker’s Firing," 1999).

Arguably the most divisive issue in the United States today is that of abortion. The rhetoric from both the Pro-life and the Pro-choice camps is often inflammatory. Several religious bodies have made official pronouncements
(either from a single authority or by the vote of messengers and delegates to national conventions) against currently legally sanctioned abortion. This researcher believed that the issue would prove to be a watershed, separating the students in the religiously-affiliated programs from those in the state-supported programs. Even so, the results, in some ways, were surprising. On the Pro-choice item, the means of all four groups indicated support for Pro-choice (liberal), although the conservative religious group mean was barely so. When the religiously-affiliated programs were separated into liberal, moderate, and conservative subgroups, the only significant difference was between state-affiliated program students and the students of the theologically conservative programs. When the religiously-affiliated programs were aggregated and compared to the state-supported programs' students, the difference was also significant. Still, the mean for the students in the religiously-affiliated programs leaned to the liberal side (3.66 on a scale of 1 - 6).

On the issue of rights for homosexuals, even the students in the programs affiliated with conservative religious traditions were definitely on the liberal side, and the students in the programs connected to the moderate and liberal religious traditions were strongly in support
of civil rights for homosexuals. Even so, when the religiously-affiliated programs were aggregated, their student's mean was 4.87 compared to that of 5.35 for the state program students, indicating a significant difference between the groups. With the religiously-affiliated programs separated into subgroups, the means moved from less liberal for the conservative group to more liberal for the moderate group to the most liberal for the liberal group (which was still less liberal than the state group). The mean of the students in the theologically conservative group was significantly different from the mean of all three of the other groups.

All groups were less supportive of same-sex marriage than they were for civil rights for homosexuals. The theologically conservative group moved very solidly to the conservative side of the range (mean of 2.22). The evidence suggests that many students who are against what they perceive to be discriminatory practices and civil rights violations cannot bring themselves to support the act of marriage between gay and lesbian couples. Again, the mean of the programs associated with conservative religious bodies was significantly different from all other means, including the other two religious program groups. It should be noted that the responses of the state program students were not significantly different from the
students in the programs of the two less conservative religious traditions on either this or the civil rights item. Again, the means ascended from the most conservative religious programs, through the moderate and the liberal programs, to the state programs.

The results on the two SIS items dealing with homosexuality are very much in keeping with how the religiously-affiliated programs were divided. The criteria by which those programs were divided was the Readiness for Ministry Project Core Cluster 31: Affirmation of Conservative Biblical Faith (a biblically based faith, and a firm belief in the Bible as final authority) (Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke, 1980, pp. 154-155). Chances are that individuals most strongly affirming this item would tend to hold to the most literal of interpretations of Biblical passages. Even though some theologians contend that the Bible condemns only promiscuous or cultic homosexual practices (Baptist Press, 1999), the strongest adherents to a conservative Biblical faith reject such arguments, with some saying that, "The Bible says what it means and means what it says." Passages which are often cited to support an anti-homosexual view are Genesis 19:1-11, Leviticus 20:13, Romans 1:24-28, 1 Corinthians 6:9-11, 1 Timothy 1:8-10, and Jude 7. More theologically liberal traditions tend to take less literal approaches to certain
of the Biblical passages, use literary criticism to try to determine where passages have changed over time, as well as the oral traditions behind the passages, distinguish between what they view as lasting truth and mere reflections of ancient world views, and allow room for divergent interpretations. Therefore, some individuals of more liberal traditions exercise greater acceptance of homosexuality.

The fact that significant differences were more consistently evidenced on the individual items of the SIS than on the SWVI supports the conceptual framework diagrammed in Figure 1, Chapter II. Attitudes are less abstract than values and much less so than value orientations. Attitudes are closer to the "surface" of the personality, and relate to objects in the environment. One can give verbal affirmation to the value of social justice without necessarily seeing the implication in the area of civil rights for homosexuals. One can believe strongly in the value of self-determination, yet find that value at odds with her reaction when she believes a potential life is at stake (in fact, the strongly Pro-life individual would see that life as already existing and possessing rights). Two or more values held by an individual can coexist rather peaceably in the abstract, only to come into conflict with one another in the specific instance,
when embodied in an attitude, or when acted out in the behaviors of everyday life. If such conflict occurs, does that mean that the individual does not hold the underlying values? This researcher does not think it means that at all. It suggests, rather that values and attitudes make up different layers of the personality, and though it is desirable for them to be congruent, this is not always the case.

Getz (cited by Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, and Thoma, 1997) constructed an Attitudes Towards Human Rights Inventory to measure discrepancies between stated attitudes toward rights (rights-in-the-abstract) and demonstrated attitudes in particular instances (rights-in-the-particular). She found that the size of the discrepancy was negatively correlated with the DIT’s P-score. In other words, the higher one’s P-score, the smaller the discrepancy between advocacy of rights-in-the-abstract and rights-in-the-particular. This researcher suspects, however, that total congruence between abstract values and object-oriented attitudes is never fully realized. Therefore we can find two social workers (or social work students) affirming the same core values to a similar degree, yet holding quite different attitudes on social issues, as measured by the individual items on the SIS.
Discussion of results related to the relationships between variables.

The possible influences of several demographic and moderating variables on the dependent variables were examined, as these could produce a large enough effect to confound the results of the study. While age correlated significantly and positively with the SWVI Social Justice subscale score, DIT P-score, and the SIS Total Score, none of the correlations were particularly high. The correlation between the P-score and age had been examined in other settings (Rest. 1986; Rest & Narvaez, 1998; Rest & Thoma, 1985; Walker, Rowland & Boyes, 1991). Apart from a significant influence on Social Justice, age did not appear that active when examined by the two ANCOVAs.

Political affiliation had a significant influence on several of the dependent variables: Social Justice, SWVI Total Score, and the SIS Total Score. Religiosity influenced Confidentiality, Self-determination, SWVI Total Score, and the SIS Total Score. Number of social work courses taken (high vs. low) exercised an influence on all the SWVI scores and the SIS Total Score, as would be expected, but there were no significant two-way interactions between it and program type. Socioeconomic status did not appear to wield any appreciable influence.
What could actually be occurring with some of these variables that did not seem to have a significant influence on the survey scores is the presence of another variable (or variables) moderating their effects. For example, socioeconomic status, which did not appear to significantly influence any of the scores directly, might be influencing political affiliation, which does have a significant impact on several of the dependent variables. There could be a similar connection between age and the dependent variables. Future research, discussed later in this chapter, is needed to test these hypotheses.

Considerable effort was expended to examine the connection between a course in social work values and ethics, or a course in ethics from another discipline, and the dependent variables. No significant results were obtained. Furthermore, the data may have been contaminated by misunderstandings about what courses fit the researcher's criteria.

If the results relative to the values and ethics courses question are valid, they could be quite worrisome, as there were no significant differences between those stating they had taken such a course and those who said they had not. One should remember, however, that all social work programs accredited by CSWE are now required to have social work values and ethics content infused
throughout the curriculum, even in those cases where a discrete values and ethics course is taught. What this item would have measured, then, is whether a discrete values and ethics course contributes significantly more to adherence to social work values and the other dependent variables, than the level of adherence obtained by the infused content. If the results from this portion of the study are valid, then it appears that discrete courses are not significantly more beneficial. The earlier cautions, however should be reiterated: (a) Only seven of the 22 programs reported having a course meeting the 50% content criteria, and (b) the confusion among students, faculty, and administrators as to whether they had a course meeting that criteria, leave the results suspect. It must remain for future research to get an accurate reading on this issue.

The examination of these demographic, moderating, and potentially confounding variables yielded mixed results. Some appeared to have little or no influence on the dependent variables. Some had significant, but not sizable influences, and for others the effect size could not be determined. On the face of it, there does not appear to be extreme influence by any of the variables, but the study methodology does not allow for any certainty at this point. Future research could look at this issue in more
detail, as will be discussed in a later section in this chapter.

**Discussion of results related to instrumentation hypotheses.**

At the time of this writing, the Social Work Values Inventory is barely five years old. It is beginning to enjoy increasing popularity, even though it has yet to be commercially produced, as it has been made a part of the Baccalaureate Program Directors (BPD) outcomes measures project, and is being developed as part of the Baccalaureate Social Work Education Assessment Package (Buchan, Hull, Pike, Ray, Rodenhiser, Rogers, & Smith 1998). This study has shown the instrument to be capable of making discriminations between beginning and ending BSW social work students. While it was not capable of discriminating between the students in state-supported and religiously-affiliated programs in this study, it had earlier been shown to discriminate between social work students and students in another discipline (Rice, 1995).

Correlations between the scores of the SWVI and the P-score of a short version of the DIT P-score were both positive and significant. The correlations were fairly comparable with those obtained by Rice (1995), who used the full length version of the DIT. Though the correlation between Confidentiality and the P-score in the current
study was much lower than that in the earlier study, the
P-score correlation with Self-determination was higher in
the current study, and the correlation between Social
Justice and the P-score was fairly close in the two
studies. The current study also obtained a significant,
positive correlation between the P-score and the SWVI
Total Score, which was not computed by Rice. Though all
four correlations were significant in the current study,
as were the three correlations in the previous study, none
of them were especially strong. This points out the
difference between "statistical significance" and
"practical significance."

More research of this nature can help further define
the capabilities and limits of the SWVI. Nothing in this
study suggests the instrument should not continue in
development.

Discussion of the Results and Implications of the Study as
a Whole

At the outset of this study, considerable attention
was given to establishing the importance of social work
education in the inculcation of social work's professional
values to succeeding generations of social workers (see
the section, "Values and education," Chapter II). Evidence
for the belief that the transmission of professional
values is a central role of social work education was
provided from the historic literature, current writers, and, most importantly, CSWE's Curriculum Policy Statement.

So important is the imparting of social work values as a part of social work education, that certain elements of the process were described in Chapter II. These involve both cognitive and affective processes (Koerin, 1977), and should include both didactic and experiential methods (Noble & King, 1981). Often it involves what Rokeach (1973) termed "Value Self-Confrontation," in which individuals are encouraged to examine their own values in light of the values held by the reference group (in this case the social work profession). In the final analysis, however, the student is given the opportunity to choose whether or not to accept the values of the profession (Koerin, 1977).

The focus of this study was on the outcome of that process: Do BSW students in state-supported institutions and students in religiously-affiliated institutions differ in their adherence to core social work values, on their level of moral reasoning, and on critical attitudes toward current social issues and social programs? As was pointed out in the section on "Values and education," Chapter II, "To the extent that other explanations (e.g. student self-selection) can be ruled out, a comparison of different categories of programs is an examination of the level at
which those categories of programs succeed in carrying out their role."

The results of the study do provide evidence that, on the whole, BSW programs are indeed carrying out their role of inculcating social work values to the next generation of social work practitioners. This is evidenced by the significant difference that is seen between the students in the sample at the ending level and those at the beginning level. If programs are making a difference as far as their students accepting the values of the profession and incorporating them into their critical thinking processes, one would expect to see the means on the SWVI rise between the students' entry point and their graduation. This was, in fact, the case between the two points at which the students in the study were examined.

Second, evidence that the religiously-affiliated programs (as a whole) are making a difference in the expressed attitudes of their students is seen in the change in SIS scores. At the beginning of the data analysis, beginning students in the state-supported programs and in the aggregated religiously-affiliated programs were compared to determine if self-selection might be a factor in any differences between the two main groups of students. In fact, the SIS Total Score was different between the two groups of beginning students.
While significant differences on the SIS emerged among ending students when the religiously-affiliated programs were separated into subgroups, when they were aggregated and their students compared to the state-supported students, there were no significant differences on the SIS. This suggests that something happens in the intervening period. Now that "something" could be simply maturation or history (the passing of time), but if either of those is the case, it is occurring at a differential rate between the state-supported and religiously-affiliated programs. The change suggests, rather, that there is intervention through education at work.

Further evidence that the inculcation of social work values is occurring at least somewhat uniformly across the programs is provided by the fact that there were no significant differences found on the subscales nor SWVI Total Score when the ending students of state-supported programs and those of the aggregated religiously-affiliated programs were compared. Nor were there significant differences evidenced when the religiously-affiliated programs were separated into theologically liberal, moderate, and conservative subgroups. (Significance was indicated on the SWVI Total Score, but the follow-up Scheffe test failed to point out a significant difference between any two groups.)
The evidence in support of the efficacy of programs across the sample in inculcating social work values is bounded by the fact that significant differences are seen in Confidentiality, Self-determination, and the SWVI Total Score when the students in programs tied to theologically conservative religious bodies are separated out and compared to the students in the state-supported programs. Still, it was only in this comparison between the students in the theologically conservative programs and those in the state programs that the null hypothesis could be rejected regarding core social work values. The effects of self-selection cannot be totally ruled out at this point, for although a comparison was made among the beginning students, it was done so with the religiously-affiliated programs combined; there was no comparison between the theologically conservative program beginning students alone and the state-supported students. It could be that there is an even greater value discrepancy between the beginning students of these two programs.

When the dependent variables were taken as a whole and the four program groups compared using multivariate analysis of variance, a significant difference was found. In analyzing results using MANOVA, differences can be established, but pinpointing the groups between which the differences lie is not possible. The fact that the
univariate analyses associated with the MANOVA showed significance on Confidentiality, Self-determination, and SWVI Total Score, as well as the SIS Total Score, suggests that the MANOVA was picking up the differences between the state program students and the theologically conservative program students, as the results were parallel for the two comparisons. The results of the SIS appeared to influence the MANOVA as they did a number of the other comparisons.

It is in the expressed attitudes toward selected social issues, as measured by individual items on the SIS, that similarities among the programs break down even further. This is in keeping with research hypothesis 5. Again, the differences appear to lie, for the most part, between the students in the state-supported programs and the students in the theologically conservative, religiously-affiliated programs, and at that, the major differences lie on just three "hot button" issues. On two of these, the two items relating to homosexuality, the students in the theologically conservative programs even differed from their counterparts in the other two groups of religiously-affiliated programs. As was discussed in the previous section, the more abstract social work values can be affirmed, and there still be conflict between individuals expressing different attitudes on these sensitive issues. It is at this point that the greatest
differences between programs occur, and those differences are mainly between the state school BSW students and the theologically conservative program students.

The question remains, "What should one make of those differences?" There are those who believe that some programs, particularly those whose parent institutions fail to affirm nondiscrimination based on sexual orientation, should be denied CSWE accreditation (Jones, 1996; Van Soest, 1996). One possible underlying assumption of such a stance is that such programs differ on their loyalties to the social work profession. Others find all religiously-affiliated schools of social work suspect. As this study has shown, to lump all religiously-affiliated programs into one category and then single them out as being any less identified with the social work profession, is to do them a great disservice.

To suggest (even in the face of the significant differences uncovered between state and theologically conservative programs) that students emerging from religiously-affiliated programs cannot hold the values of the profession is to deny the liberating effects of higher education. Again, a significant difference was shown between beginning and ending students across the sample, suggesting value change brought on by education. Furthermore, on only two of the SIS items did the students
in the aggregated religiously-affiliated programs fail to score, on average, on the liberal side of the issue: on prayer in schools and condoms in elementary grades. Both main groups scored conservatively, on average, on the condoms issue, and on one other issue, the death penalty, the state school mean was on the conservative side while the religiously-affiliated school mean was on the liberal side. On even the three heated issues, Pro-choice, civil rights for homosexuals, and same-sex marriage, the religiously-affiliated program students remained on the liberal side when the programs were aggregated. It was only when the religiously-affiliated programs were separated did the students in the theologically conservative programs appear on the conservative side, and then it was only on one of the three heated issues: same-sex marriage.

Higher education is a powerful influence. In a lecture delivered at the annual meeting of the Association of Southern Baptist Colleges and Schools, Pepperdine University church historian Richard Hughes (1998) asked, "Can Christian Faith Sustain the Life of the Mind?" In that lecture, he traces the educational models emanating from the Roman Catholic tradition, the Reformed (Calvinistic) tradition, the Anabaptist/Mennonite tradition, and the Lutheran tradition. Despite the dangers
of rigid dogma, he shows how all the models embrace academic freedom, natural inquiry, diversity, and care for others. Social work programs within these institutions are the recipients of the positive qualities of those models as much as they are the potential inheritors of rigid dogma. In this researcher's experience, the members of the religiously-affiliated educational community are less conservative than the constituents of their parent religious bodies. This researcher suspects that the students in the BSW programs of those religiously-affiliated institutions are less conservative than their educational community as a whole.

"But, what if," one might argue, "even allowing for political expediencies and the power of education, BSW students in some programs are very different from the more mainstream BSW students? After all, significant differences were found between the students in state-supported programs and students in theologically conservative, religiously-affiliated programs on core values, as well as on attitudes toward selected social issues." The answer is, the profession's system of education is then faced with a dilemma. It is a boundary dilemma, similar to other boundary dilemmas the profession faces. These other boundary issues are illustrated by the questions: "What practice methods are uniquely social
work?" "What practice areas are the province of social work?" "Are both emphases on social justice and psychotherapy social work?" Likewise, there is a boundary issue regarding the values/ethical dimension.

On the one hand, there must be a point at which one's values and ethics proscribes one out of the profession of social work. Students are presented the values espoused by the profession. They are encouraged to examine their personal values in the light of the profession's values. They grapple with value conflicts. In the end, the choice to what degree they will accept the profession's values and to what degree they will modify their own personal values is theirs alone to make. At that point, some students should be compassionately asked if they would not be more comfortable in another profession.

Conceivably, there are groups of students whose value stances should proscribe them from the profession. Yet, in this researcher's mind, value self-examination and value choices are a highly individual matter, and therefore any counseling-in or counseling-out of the profession must be done with individuals, not groups. There is also the question of the accreditation of programs whose students differ significantly from the mainstream on adherence to social work values. Currently, apart from its Curriculum Policy Statement and standards relative to the teaching of
social work values, and the interpretation by the site teams and commissioners of how well those are carried out, CSWE has no test for determining if a program meets an appropriate level of inculcating social work values in its students. Any such test would be worrisome to this researcher.

On the other side of the issue of value differences among social work students (and social work practitioners, for that matter), the profession needs to come to terms with how inclusive it can be. To demand narrowly-defined value allegiance will tear the profession apart. Strains already appear, as evidenced by some of the inflammatory rhetoric appearing recently in the Letters to the Editor section of NASW News. One marvels that a profession that holds up the ideals of self-determination, diversity, acceptance, nonjudgemental attitude, respect for individual and group differences, equal opportunity, inclusiveness, and the like, could potentially splinter because members do not practice those values in their dealings with one another within the profession. It would appear that valuing diversity in the value orientations that motivate one to do social work (e.g. humanism vs. religious belief, the one interpreting the worth and dignity of the individual as coming from the fact that the person is human, the other from seeing the individual as
created in the Image of God), diversity in viewpoints on the moral imperatives which underlie the profession, and diversity in the translation of the profession's core values into potentially different stances on social issues, should also be a value. That is not to say that the profession should turn a blind eye toward intolerance, judgementalism, or paternalism. It does say, however, that one should be allowed a certain amount of value and attitude "leeway," within ethical limits, and still be called a social worker; that one should be able to present an opposing viewpoint and be heard respectfully.

**Strengths and Limitations of the Study**

This study contains a number of strengths, and has produced, for the most part, what the researcher considers to be generalizable results. Some of the aspects of the study which the researcher considers to be strengths include (a) The timeliness of the topic: The researcher encountered a great deal of interest, and even excitement during the initial contact of the programs in the sample. The responses he received suggest that the topic touches on issues that are important to social work educators today. (b) The size and scope of the sample: Twenty-six schools were selected, twenty-two followed-through, for a potential yield of 947 survey packets; 571 packets were returned, producing an actual yield of 60.30%. (c) The
geographic distribution of the sample: The sample was national in scope, not only from the standpoint of numbers, but in its representativeness across the six major regions of the country. (d) The methodology: comparing two main groups, state-supported and religiously-affiliated programs, then dividing the religiously-affiliated programs into theologically-based subgroupings, and following up with a comparison of the extreme groups (state and theologically conservative) proved very beneficial. Each of the three comparisons provided significant results not seen in either of the other two.

The best planned studies have drawbacks and limitations, however. A number of these need to be considered. The first limitation is the use of paper-and-pencil inventories to measure the concepts under study. There is a fundamental difference between individuals recording on paper what they think is the best course of action and actually taking that action. To some extent, for example, only the cognitive affirmation of values was being measured with the SWVI. There is no way of telling what each student would actually have done in a given instance.

A second limitation, already mentioned, was the length of the survey packet, which led to incomplete
returns. The complexity of the DIT contributed to that problem. Feedback received by the researcher, both in the pilot and in the main study, indicates that many students were confused by the task required of them on the DIT. Due to that difficulty in understanding of the task, a large percentage of the potential data from the DIT was lost to the programmatic purging of inconsistent responses. In both the pilot and the main study, the amount of purged cases was quite a bit higher than that which Rest (1990, 1993, 1998) suggests is the norm.

Furthermore, space considerations dictated using the demographic items pre-printed on the optical scan form. Many students failed to see and respond to those items. Fortunately, information obtained from program directors about each program and the beginning and ending classes selected for study allowed the researcher to ascertain that the characteristics of the students who did code-in this information was very close to that of the entire class. The researcher was then able to extrapolate that the students who failed to code-in the demographic information do not differ greatly from those who did, nor from the surveyed class as a whole.

A third consideration is the possibility of differences contributed by geographic region. While all six geographic regions of the country were represented in
the sample, the sample of programs was randomly selected; there was no attempt made to match programs within geographic regions of the country. It is conceivable that differences attributed to the independent variable, "program type," could in fact be influenced by differing values by geographic region.

Fourth, a good deal of effort was put forth to control or otherwise take into account the possibly confounding effects of variables other than the independent variable, yet there was still the potential for one or more to affect the outcome of the study. To begin with, the methodology chosen made control of extraneous variables somewhat of a problem. This is inherent in survey research. The experiment has potentially more control, but then the research questions under consideration were just not amenable to experimental manipulation. There is a statistical way through this issue which will be presented under suggestions for further research in the next section.

While efforts to reduce the confounding effect of self-selection were made through examining differences between beginning students, this comparison was made with the religiously-affiliated programs aggregated. An additional comparison between state-supported program students and theologically conservative program students
would strengthen the case against institutional self-selection.

The three-way analysis of variance used to examine religiosity, political affiliation, and socioeconomic status contained empty matrix cells which precluded computing the three-way effects; only the main effects were examined. An examination of the raw data might suggest how a further collapsing of the variables could remedy the situation.

One additional moderating variable, the issue of having taken a social work course in values and ethics or an ethics course in another discipline, has continued to be elusive. It may be that the results obtained are valid, but further research is needed to confirm them.

Fifth, the method of subdividing the religiously-affiliated programs proved useful for the most part. At the same time, Roman Catholicism poses an interesting paradox which may have had an impact on the study. Roman Catholic theology in general, and the denomination's score on the Readiness for Ministry Project Core Cluster 31 in particular, type out as theologically liberal. In many of their social responses, Catholics as a group tend to be liberal, as well. Then, there is the matter of abortion. Catholics, as a group, are strongly Pro-life and conservative on this issue. There may be other issues on
which Catholics are more conservative, as well. This theological-social cross-over may explain why on some of the items on the SIS the mean of the theologically moderate programs was more liberal than the mean of the theologically liberal.

There is an alternative explanation for the means, however. The liberal subgroup was the hardest hit by the failure of some programs to follow through with the study. Two of the four programs which did not send in data were in the theologically liberal subgroup. This could also account for the discrepancy between some of the results obtained and those expected.

Suggestions for Further Research

A welcomed characteristic of this study was that it produced a "domino" effect: one research question led to another, which called for yet another phase of the study. Eventually, the researcher had to declare, "Enough." This left a number of considerations for further research, some of which this researcher plans to pursue.

First, and foremost, direct and indirect relationships among the variables in the current study could be examined further. As the study progressed, the researcher began to visualize a causal model with moderating and potentially confounding variables influencing the dependent variables, as was illustrated in
Figure 2 in the methodology chapter. This researcher intends in the near future to develop hypotheses related to those relationships and then reexamine the data of the current study, testing those hypotheses.

This researcher also plans to redivide the survey packets of the current study to examine alternate independent variables. The sample will be divided by: (a) religious affiliation to see if the religious affiliations of the individuals produce results different than those of program affiliations; (b) geographic region, both the region containing the BSW program and the one containing the student's home; (c) ethnicity, and possibly (d) gender (the sample did not include a very high percentage of males. Taken together with the problem of failure to code-in gender may make such a sample group prohibitively small).

The current research divided the religiously-affiliated programs on a theologically conservative-liberal continuum, based on the institution's parent religious body. There are other ways to divide the religiously-affiliated BSW programs, such as by the degree of social awareness manifested by members of the religious bodies to which they are affiliated. Future research could look at other criteria by which to divide the religiously-affiliated programs.
An examination of the way in which students' religious beliefs conflict with and support social work values would lend itself to a well-designed qualitative study. In-depth semi-structured and unstructured questionnaires, and even interviews with students, would yield what qualitative researchers call "thick" descriptions, providing an added dimension to this interesting interplay of personal and professional values.

Finally, the elusive issue of whether or not the discrete social work values and ethics course adds to students' adherence to social work values is waiting to be confirmed. The successful researcher will communicate the criteria in such a way that students will know beyond any doubt whether or not they have taken such a course.

**Summation**

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the differences between two categories of baccalaureate-level social work students, those in state-supported programs and those in religiously-affiliated programs, on three dependent variables: (a) adherence to social work values, (b) level of moral reasoning, and (c) attitudes on selected social issues. These differences were examined in two ways: (a) between state-supported programs and religiously-affiliated programs taken as a whole, and (b) with the sample of BSW students enrolled in religiously-
affiliated institutions broken into three subgroups, as
determined by the degree of theological conservatism or
liberalism of their parent religious body.

The study used self-report measures and survey
instruments to examine these differences. A causal model
was hypothesized, describing demographic and moderating
variables which might be acting in addition to the
independent variable (type of program) upon the dependent
variables. The methodology of the study, however,
precluded determining with any degree of certainty the
amount of influence these potentially confounding
variables might have. Still, this nonexperimental, causal-
comparative study was capable of showing differences
between BSW students at state-supported programs and those
at religiously-affiliated programs, both aggregated, and
divided into theologically liberal, moderate, and
conservative subgroups. Differences on the students’
attitudes toward selected social issues and social
programs, as measured by individual items of the SIS,
especially stood out, as did those in the comparison of
social work values between the state program students and
those associated with the theologically conservative
institutions. The study also examined the characteristics
of the relatively new Social Work Values Inventory.
The social work profession has prided itself in regard to the central position it has given professional values throughout its history. Yet the survey of the literature conducted for this study reflects a paucity of research in this area. It would seem that social workers have paid lip service to their constellation of values, but have done little to provide a clear picture of them empirically.

The previous section of this chapter gave just a few suggestions for future research in the area of social work values. More is needed. The advent of a new century and a new millennium seems like a perfect time to do some self-analysis as a profession. If social work is to survive another 100 years in a healthy manner, it must have a clear understanding of itself as well as an understanding of the needs of those it strives to serve. Only in engaging in continued critical reflection on what social workers value, and in making sure those values are passed along to succeeding generations of social work practitioners, will values truly be the "fulcrum of the profession."
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Appendix A

Social Work Values Inventory

UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTH CAROLINA

College of Social Work

July 8, 1998

Mr. Wade M. Tyler
Department of Social Sciences
Social Work Program
Northwestern State University
Natchitoches, Louisiana 71497

Dear Mr. Tyler:

I am writing to confirm my having given you verbal permission to use the Social Work Values Inventory (SWVI) in your dissertation research. You have my permission to use the SWVI in its entirety for your dissertation research. You also have my permission to re-format the instrument without changing the item content, so that the instrument is in a machine-readable format. If you do this, I would like to have a copy of the machine-readable format. I am currently searching for an inexpensive means to put the SWVI into a format that can be scanned. Seeing how your technicians at LSU do it may provide an extremely helpful prototype that other technicians working with me can use.

I do not want you, however, to include an entire copy of the SWVI in the appendices of your dissertation. There are a couple of reasons for this. First, the instrument is copyrighted, and publication in its entirety would place the instrument in the public domain. Second, I plan to allow the instrument to be distributed to schools where there is an interest in measuring changes in values adherence as a process of baccalaureate social work education. The SWVI will be distributed as a non-profit means by which social work educators can examine their students’ professional values adherence as an on-going process. The distributors of the former edition of BPD Outcomes Instrument plan to distribute the SWVI, along with several other instruments, and they will analyze the data over time for those schools wishing to participate. This method of distribution and data analysis eventually can provide social work educators with normative scores for students’ adherence to professional values. We will then be able to identify specific numbers that represent “typical” levels of values adherence among students at various points in the educational continuum and advise educators what scores lie outside a 95% confidence level. (The process is similar to that used by academic testing services to identify normative scores for...
The point of this rather lengthy explanation is there must be a common means by which educators can inexpensively obtain copies of the instrument and have the data analyzed before our profession will be able to develop this knowledge. I suggest that you include a copy of the instruction sheet and some sample items for each of the three scales in the SWVI. I am enclosing a copy of what I usually distribute at professional meetings to help participate develop a “feel” for the instrument. You are welcome to include it as is in your appendices or select two to three other items that you prefer to use from each scale. Please be sure to identify these items as “Sample Items.” For the time being, individuals wishing to use the SWVI should contact me. In the near future, they will contact the distributors of the Baccalaureate Educational Assessment Package to obtain the SWVI and several other instruments that measure baccalaureate outcomes.

I think your dissertation topic is very interesting, and I know you have invested a great deal of time in preparing for your study. I hope you will inform me of your findings. If I can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact me at the above address or at either of the following telephone numbers: 803 777-2608 (office), and 803 345-0904 (home). Please also feel free to contact me via e-mail at the following address: Cathy.Pike@SC.edu.

Sincerely,

Cathy Pike

Cathy K. Pike, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
The Social Work Values Inventory (SWVI) is designed to acquire information about how social work practice issues should be resolved. The inventory measures values. Consequently, there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Certain laws or agency policies in your area may apply to some of the case situations. In this inventory, your personal opinion is the standard you should use for choosing an answer. Therefore, your answers should reflect what you believe should be done in each of the case situations.

The SWVI contains 50 case situations. In each one, the social worker must make a decision. You are asked to read each case situation and circle the answer that best reflects what the social worker should do. Every attempt has been made to make the situations as clear as possible. In some instances, you may wish you had more information than only a short summary. However, respond to the case situation using only the information provided.

Example:
The following situation is provided to illustrate how to complete the questionnaire:

When Robert began working with Native Americans, he discovered that the Native-Americans with whom he worked often used stories about animals and nature to describe feelings that they were uncomfortable addressing directly. As a social worker with this population, Robert should:

1. ask clients to talk directly about their own feelings and not use stories about animals and nature.
2. also use stories about animals when confronting clients about uncomfortable feelings.

Directions:
The mid-point of the scale is 4. It represents no commitment to either of the descriptions at the ends of the scale. The letters N. C. have been placed at the mid-point to remind you of this. Begin at number 4 and decide the direction toward which you lean. Then, circle the number that corresponds most closely to your position. The description at each end represents the number closest to it. For instance, the 7 indicates a strong belief that Robert should ask clients to talk directly about their own feelings and not use stories about animals and nature. The 1 indicates a strong belief that Robert should also use stories about animals when confronting clients about uncomfortable feelings.

Copyright (c) 1994, Cathy King Pike (Illegal to Photocopy or Otherwise Reproduce)
(Appendix A continued)

Sample Items from the Social Work Values Inventory

Confidentiality

4. A fourteen year-old female is brought by her mother to Suzanne for counseling relating to the girl's school performance. During counseling, the adolescent confides that she occasionally uses marijuana and has been sexually active with several boys. Later, the mother asks to read her daughter's case record in which the above information is documented. Suzanne should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>allow the mother to read her daughter's case record.</td>
<td>not allow the mother to read her daughter's case record.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Beth is a clinical social worker. She and a close friend, Carmen, planned to go together to a concert after work. When Carmen arrived at Beth's office, she noticed a woman coming out of the office whom she had interviewed about providing day care for Carmen's two-year old daughter. Carmen was seriously considering hiring the woman. While driving to the concert, Carmen asked Beth whether she is providing clinical services for the woman. Beth should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not reveal the information to Carmen.</td>
<td>reveal the information to Carmen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Determination

18. Ms. Smith delivered her first child prematurely. The infant's physicians know that the child is severely brain-damaged. In addition, the infant has a heart condition that requires immediate surgery, if he is to live. The medical social worker, Chris, was referred to the parents by the physician. Upon assessing the case, Chris learns that the parents have decided not to sign the consent form for surgery and have requested that the infant be allowed to die. Chris should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>try to change the parents' decision to allow the infant to die.</td>
<td>do nothing to change the parents' decision to allow the infant to die.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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19. An unmarried, Native-American woman receives Aid to Families With Dependent Children and has just delivered her fourth child. All of the children have different fathers. The woman's physician has recommended sterilization, but the woman refused this form of birth control. The physician has asked the social worker to work with the woman and to advocate sterilization. The social worker should:

- refuse to advocate that the woman be sterilized.
- agree to advocate that the woman be sterilized.

Social Justice

35. Carla is a social worker at a shelter for homeless families. Carla's client applied for a job as an aide in a day treatment facility for clients with mental health conditions. Her client was not hired. The agency director told Carla that she decided not to hire Carla's client, because the client had no permanent address. Carla should:

- say nothing to the agency director about her decision not to hire the client.
- confront the agency director about her decision not to hire her client.

36. Mr. Chimalewsky was admitted to a medical unit of a large urban hospital. His primary diagnosis was an infection of the bone that developed after he fell while intoxicated. Mr. Chimalewsky has no health insurance, but will need intravenous antibiotic therapy for four weeks to cure him of the infection. The medications alone would cost about $4,000. The utilization review employee recommended that Mr. Chimalewsky be discharged to prevent the hospital from further nonreimbursable charges. She tells Angela, the social worker, that the hospital ought not pay for an accident that could have been prevented had Mr. Chimalewsky not been "stone drunk" when he fell. Angela should:

- support the recommendation of the utilization review worker.
- oppose the recommendation of the utilization review worker.
Appendix B

Defining Issues Test

CENTER for the study of
ETHICAL DEVELOPMENT
University of Minnesota

Mr. Wade Tyler
Northwestern State University/Dep. t of Social
Sciences
Natchitoches, LA. 71497

Dear Mr. Tyler:

I grant you permission to use the Defining Issues Test in your current study. If you are
making copies of the test items, please include the copyright information on each copy (e.g.,
Copyright, James Rest, 1979, All Rights Reserved).

I also grant you permission to reprint the Defining Issues Test as an appendix in your
dissertation or report for publication. This includes the stories and test items, but not the
scoring key or stage designations for specific items. Please make sure that the copy contains
the usual copyright information. I understand that copies of your dissertation may be duplicated
for distribution.

Please send me a copy of the report of your study. Thanks for your interest in the Defining
Issues Test.

Sincerely,

James Rest
Professor
Educational Psychology
Opinions about Social Problems

The purpose of this questionnaire is to help us understand how people think about social problems. Different people have different opinions about questions of right and wrong. There are no "right" answers to such problems in the way that math problems have right answers. We would like you to tell us what you think about several problem stories.

You will be asked to read a story from this booklet. Then you will be asked to mark your answers on a separate answer sheet. More details about how to do this will follow. But it is important that you fill in your answers on the answer sheet with a #2 pencil. Please make sure that your mark completely fills the little circle, that the mark is dark, and that any erasures that you make are completely clean.

The Identification Number at the top of the answer sheet may already be filled in when you receive your materials. If not, you will receive special instructions about how to fill in that number.

In this questionnaire you will be asked to read a story and then to place marks on the answer sheet. In order to illustrate how we would like you to do this, consider the following story:

FRANK AND THE CAR

Frank Jones has been thinking about buying a car. He is married, has two small children and earns an average income. The car he buys will be his family's only car. It will be used mostly to get to work and drive around town, but sometimes for vacation trips also. In trying to decide what car to buy, Frank Jones realized that there were a lot of questions to consider. For instance, should he buy a larger used car or a smaller new car for about the same amount of money? Other questions occur to him.

We note that this is not really a social problem, but it will illustrate our instructions. After you read a story you will then turn to the answer sheet to find the section that corresponds to the story. But in this sample story, we present the questions below (along with some sample answers). Note that all your answers will be marked on the separate answer sheet.
First, on the answer sheet for each story you will be asked to indicate your recommendation for what a person should do. If you tend to favor one action or another (even if you are not completely sure), indicate which one. If you do not favor either action, mark the circle by "can't decide."

Second, read each of the items numbered 1 to 12. Think of the issue that the item is raising. If that issue is important in making a decision, one way or the other, then mark the circle by "great." If that issue is not important or doesn't make sense to you, mark "no." If the issue is relevant but not critical, mark "much," "some," or "little" -- depending on how much importance that issue has in your opinion. You may mark several items as "great" or any other level of importance -- there is no fixed number of items that must be marked at any one level.

Third, after you have made your marks along the left hand side of each of the 12 items, then at the bottom you will be asked to choose the item that is the most important consideration out of all of the items printed there. Pick from among the items provided even if you think that none of the items are of "great" importance. Of the items that are presented there, pick one as the most important (relative to the others), then the second most important, third, and fourth most important.

**SAMPLE ITEMS and SAMPLE ANSWERS:**

**FRANK AND THE CAR:**

- Buy new car
- Can't decide
- Buy used car

**Great** Some No

**Much** Little

0 0 0 0 1. Whether the car dealer was in the same block as where Frank lives.

0 0 0 0 2. Would a used car be more economical in the long run than a new car.

0 0 0 0 3. Whether the color was green, Frank's favorite color.

0 0 0 0 4. Whether the cubic inch displacement was at least 200.

0 0 0 0 5. Would a large, roomy car be better than a compact car.

0 0 0 0 6. Whether the front convibules were differential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most important item**

- 0

**Second most important**

- 0

**Third most important**

- 0

**Fourth most important**

- 0

Note that in our sample responses, the first item was considered irrelevant; the second item was considered as a critical issue in making a decision; the third item was considered of only moderate importance; the fourth item was not clear to the person responding whether 200 was good or not, so it was marked "no"; the fifth item was also of critical importance; and the sixth item didn't make any sense, so it was marked "no".

Note that the most important item comes from one of the items marked on the far left hand side. In deciding between item #2 and #5, a person should reread these items, then put one of them as the most important, and the other item as second, etc.
Here is the first story for your consideration. Read the story and then turn to the separate answer sheet to mark your responses. After filling in the four most important items for the story, return to this booklet to read the next story. Please remember to fill in the circle completely, make dark marks, and completely erase all corrections.

**HEINZ AND THE DRUG**

In Europe a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost to make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about $1,000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." So Heinz got desperate and began to think about breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife. Should Heinz steal the drug?

**ESCAPED PRISONER**

A man had been sentenced to prison for 10 years. After one year, however, he escaped from prison, moved to a new area of the country, and took on the name of Thompson. For eight years he worked hard, and gradually he saved enough money to buy his own business. He was fair to his customers, gave his employees top wages, and gave most of his own profits to charity. Then one day, Mrs. Jones, an old neighbor, recognized him as the man who had escaped from prison eight years before, and whom the police had been looking for. Should Mrs. Jones report Mr. Thompson to the police and have him sent back to prison?

**NEWSPAPER**

Fred, a senior in high school, wanted to publish a mimeographed newspaper for students so that he could express many of his opinions. He wanted to speak out against the use of the military in international disputes and to speak out against some of the school's rules, like the rule forbidding boys to wear long hair.

When Fred started his newspaper, he asked his principal for permission. The principal said it would be all right if before every publication Fred would turn in all his articles for the principal's approval. Fred agreed and turned in several articles for approval. The principal approved all of them and Fred published two issues of the paper in the next two weeks.

But the principal had not expected that Fred's newspaper would receive so much attention. Students were so excited by the paper that they began to organize protests against the hair regulation and other school rules. Angry parents objected to Fred's opinions. They phoned the principal telling him that the newspaper was unpatriotic and should not be published. As a result of the rising excitement, the principal ordered Fred to stop publishing. He gave as a reason that Fred's activities were disruptive to the operation of the school. Should the principal stop the newspaper?
(Appendix B continued)
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IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

HEINZ AND THE DRUG: O Should Steal O Can't Decide O Should not steal

1. Whether a community's laws are going to be upheld.
2. Isn't it only natural for a loving husband to care so much for his wife that he'd steal?
3. Is Heinz willing to risk getting shot as a burglar or going to jail for the chance that stealing the drug might help?
4. Whether Heinz is a professional wrestler, or has considerable influence with professional wrestlers.
5. Whether Heinz is stealing for himself or doing this solely to help someone else.
6. Whether the druggist's rights to his invention have to be respected.
7. Whether the essence of living is more encompassing than the termination of dying, socially and individually.
8. What values are going to be the basis for governing how people act towards each other.
9. Whether the druggist is going to be allowed to hide behind a worthless law which only protects the rich anyhow.
10. Whether the law in this case is getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of society.
11. Whether the druggist deserves to be robbed for being so greedy and cruel.
12. Would stealing in such a case bring about more total good for the whole society or not.

Most important item
Second most important
Third most important
Fourth most important

ESCAPED PRISONER: O Should report him O Can't decide O Should not report him

1. Hasn't Mr. Thompson been good enough for such a long time to prove he isn't a bad person?
2. Everytime someone escapes punishment for a crime, doesn't that just encourage more crime?
3. Wouldn't we be better off without prisons and the oppression of our legal system?
4. Has Mr. Thompson really paid his debt to society?
5. Would society be failing what Mr. Thompson should fairly expect?
6. What benefits would prisons be apart from society, especially for a charitable man?
7. How could anyone be so cruel and heartless as to send Mr. Thompson to prison?
8. Would it be fair to all the prisoners who had to serve out their full sentences if Mr. Thompson was let off?
9. Was Mrs. Jones a good friend of Mr. Thompson?
10. Wouldn't it be a citizen's duty to report an escaped criminal, regardless of the circumstances?
11. How would the will of the people and the public good best be served?
12. Would going to prison do any good for Mr. Thompson or protect anybody?

Most important item
Second most important
Third most important
Fourth most important
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### NEWSPAPER:

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Is the principal more responsible than students or to parents?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Did the principal give his word that the newspaper could be published for a long time, or did he just promise to approve the newspaper one issue at a time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Would the students start protesting even more if the principal stopped the newspaper?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>When the welfare of the school is threatened, does the principal have the right to give orders to students?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Does the principal have the freedom of speech to say “no” in this case?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>If the principal stopped the newspaper would he be preventing full discussion of important problems?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Whether the principal’s order would make Fred lose faith in the principal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Whether Fred was really loyal to his school and patriotic to his country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>What effect would stopping the paper have on the student’s education in critical thinking and judgment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Whether Fred was in any way violating the rights of others in publishing his own opinions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Whether the principal should be influenced by some angry parents when it is the principal that knows best what is going on in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Whether Fred was using the newspaper to stir up hatred and discontent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Most important item

1.   2.   3.   4.   5.   6.   7.   8.   9.   10.   11.   12.

#### Second most important

1.   2.   3.   4.   5.   6.   7.   8.   9.   10.   11.   12.

#### Third most important

1.   2.   3.   4.   5.   6.   7.   8.   9.   10.   11.   12.

#### Fourth most important

1.   2.   3.   4.   5.   6.   7.   8.   9.   10.   11.   12.

### DOCTOR’S DILEMMA:

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Whether the woman’s family is in favor of giving her the overdose or not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Is the doctor obligated by the same laws as everybody else if giving an overdose would be the same as killing her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Whether people would be much better off without society regimenting their lives and even their deaths.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Whether the doctor could make it appear like an accident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Does the state have the right to force continued existence on those who don’t want to live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>What is the value of death prior to society’s perspective on personal values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Whether the doctor has sympathy for the woman’s suffering or cares more about what society might think.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Is helping to end another’s life ever a responsible act of cooperation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Whether only God should decide when a person’s life should end.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>What values the doctor has set for himself in his own personal code of behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Can society afford to let everybody and their lives when they want to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Can society allow suicides or mercy killing and still protect the lives of individuals who want to live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Most important item

1.   2.   3.   4.   5.   6.   7.   8.   9.   10.   11.   12.

#### Second most important

1.   2.   3.   4.   5.   6.   7.   8.   9.   10.   11.   12.

#### Third most important

1.   2.   3.   4.   5.   6.   7.   8.   9.   10.   11.   12.

#### Fourth most important

1.   2.   3.   4.   5.   6.   7.   8.   9.   10.   11.   12.
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Appendix C
Social Issues Survey

Social Issues Survey

Are you For or Against the following? How strongly?
For each item below, mark on your answer sheet one number to show how strongly for or against it you are. "1" indicates very strongly for, "2" moderately for, "3" somewhat for, "4" somewhat against, "5" moderately against, and "6" very strongly against.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>For or Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. School prayer</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Pro-choice (abortion)</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Cut welfare programs</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. National health care system</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Sex education—children</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Gun control</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Stronger labor unions</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Medicare</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Medicaid</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Condoms—elementary grades</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Food stamp program</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Civil rights for homosexuals</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Same-sex marriage</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Minimum wages</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Meals on wheels</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Help the homeless</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Politically correct speech</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Affirmative Action, jobs</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Affirmative Action, schools</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Death penalty for murder</td>
<td>FOR 1 2 3 4 5 6 AGAINST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Background Data Sheet

Background Data Sheet

71. Marital Status: A) Single  B) Married
     C) Partnered  D) Divorced  E) Widowed

72. Ethnicity: Record One group
     A) Native North American/First Nation
     B) Asian or Pacific Islander
     C) African Descent/Black (not Hispanic/Latino/a)
     D) Chicano/Mexican
     E) Puerto Rican
     F) Other Hispanic/Latino/a
     G) European/Caucasian (not Hispanic/Latino/a)
     H) Other

73. Which area of the U.S. best describes where you grew up? A) Northeast  B) Midwest  C) West
     D) Northwest  E) South  F) Southwest  G) not US

74. Which setting best describes where you grew up? A) Urban  B) Rural

75. Employment: Have you had full-time employment in a social work related position? A) No  B) Yes

76. Did you have work experience in any other career prior to entering this social work program? A) No  B) Yes

77. Course work: How many social work courses have you completed? (number, not hours)
     A) 0-3  B) 4-6  C) 7-9  D) 10-12  E) 13-15  F) >15

78. Have you taken a social work course in which social work values and/or ethics was at least 50% of the course content? A) No  B) Yes

79. Have you taken a course in ethics in any area other than social work? A) No  B) Yes

80. Political Affiliation: A) Democrat  B) Republican  C) Independent  D) Other  E) None

81. Religious Affiliation:
     A) Catholic  F) Buddhist
     B) Protestant  G) Muslim
     C) Mormon  H) Nation of Islam
     D) Jewish  I) Other
     E) Unitarian  J) Agnostic/Atheist

82. How useful is your religion to you in decision-making in your daily life?
     A) Very useful to me in daily decision-making
     B) Moderately useful to me in daily decision-making
     C) Only slightly useful to me in daily decision-making

Continues in next column
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(Appendix D continued)

D) Not at all useful to me in daily decision-making
E) I do not practice any religion

Socioeconomic Status
For items 83 and 84 refer to the clusters of occupation descriptions below.

A) CEO of large organization, owner of large business, physician, attorney, judge, high ranking military officer, holder of prominent political office

B) Owner of medium size business, business manager, minister (clergy), professor/teacher, nurse, physical/occupational therapist, social worker, engineer

C) Owner of small business, administrative personnel, large scale farmer, systems analyst, junior military officer, musician, reporter, interior designer, artist

D) Clerical/secretarial, sales, computer programmer, real estate agent, lab/x-ray technician, dental hygienist, bank teller, flight attendant

E) Carpenter, plumber, electrician, police, electronic/auto/appliance repair, data entry, small farmer

F) Machine operator, tailor, construction worker, factory worker, gardener, nurse’s/teacher’s aide, child care worker, route delivery

G) Domestic/custodian, fast food worker, newspaper carrier. Disabled or long term unemployed

83. Which cluster most closely represents or approximates your father’s main occupational experience?

84. Which cluster most closely represents or approximates your mother’s main occupational experience?

85. Father’s Educational level: A) Graduate Degree
B) Complete College C) Partial College D) Full High School E) Grades 10-11 F) Grades 7-9 G) <7

86. Mother’s Educational Level: Use above choices.

87. Which income range best represents the yearly income of your family of origin?
A) Under $10,000 E) $60,001 - $80,000
B) $10,000 - $20,000 F) $80,001 - $100,000
C) $20,001 - $40,000 G) Over $100,000
D) $40,001 - $60,000
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Appendix E
Letter to Program Directors

Program Director
Social Work Program
School
City, State, Zip

Dear (Program Director):

I am writing to request the participation of selected BSW students in your program as part of my dissertation research leading to the Ph.D. in social work at Louisiana State University. Your program has been randomly drawn for inclusion in the sample.

I am interested in examining BSW students in various programs as to their adherence to social work values, their level of moral reasoning, and their opinions on a number of current social work-related issues. I am particularly interested in seeing how those in public institutions and those in private, sectarian institutions compare.

I wish to survey students at two levels in your program: those who are just beginning, and those who are about to graduate. I have determined that the easiest way to do this is to survey (1) those students enrolled in an introductory course and (2) those students enrolled in their last field seminar (a senior capstone course would work as well).

As I will not be randomly selecting the students themselves, I believe better results will be obtained by surveying as close to all students in these two groups as possible. Therefore, I make the following two requests. I would like all sections of the two courses selected surveyed. Second, in order to assure the highest return rate, I hope you would consent to the surveys being given in class. Naturally, any student is free to decline, or withdraw, as will be explained in their cover letter.

I will be using a data packet for each student, consisting of the Social Work Values Inventory (SWVI, Cathy Pike, 1994), the Defining Issues Test (DIT, James Rest, 1979), a locally developed opinion survey modeled after one authored by Charles Grenier at Louisiana State University, and a demographic data sheet. Most students in the pilot study were able to complete these instruments in a 50 minute class. I realize I am asking professors to share valuable class time with me, but I believe this is critical for good return rates. However, if you do not believe a class period could be spared, but are willing to distribute the packets in class for outside completion, I would accept this limitation.
I anticipate mailing the packets to the randomly selected schools in 6-8 weeks at the latest. That time frame is because I need to know the number of subjects in advance of ordering the DIT, due to having to prepay with the order for computer scoring at the University of Minnesota, and the turn-around time involved with the order.

I hope you will support and join with me in this research. I truly need your help. Please indicate your reply by returning a copy of this page with the information requested below. You would really do me a favor and speed things up a bit if you would also e-mail your reply to me at tyler@alpha.nsula.edu. If I can clarify anything please e-mail me as well. Thank you for your consideration. I wish you a very productive academic year.

Sincerely,

Wade M. Tyler, B.C.S.W., A.C.S.W.
Assistant Professor of Social Work

Reply

Name of School: ___________________________________________________

___ Yes, we agree to participate.

Name and title of individual to whom to send data collection materials for administration: ____________________________________________

___ No, we will not participate.

Signature of Program Director: _______________________________________

Please return a completed copy of this page to

Wade M. Tyler, B.C.S.W., A.C.S.W.,
201 Myrtle Street
Pineville, LA 71360

and e-mail to tyler@alpha.nsula.edu

Thank you.
Appendix F

Instructions for Survey Administration and Return

Instructions for Administration and Return

Immediately upon receipt, please mail the enclosed post card indicating the materials have arrived.

Please administer the surveys and return the answer sheets and signed consent forms ASAP, and no later than December 4.

Make certain that the correct packets are administered in each course. ID numbers beginning with an odd digit are for beginning courses. ID numbers beginning with an even digit are for senior level courses. (ID numbers are found on the DIT instruction/story sheet.)

Students must use #2 pencils. It is good to have extras on hand.

It is advisable to familiarize yourself with the instrument instructions. This is especially important on the DIT. While most students will readily grasp the task, a few may need help.

The DIT has a restriction on answering questions once started: You may give a dictionary definition to any word in the story, but instruct the respondent to try to work out any question on the considerations in the "Importance" section or mark "No importance". You may answer any questions prior to a student’s starting the DIT, however. No such restrictions have been placed on any of the other instruments. Use your own judgment.

Pass the materials out in this order:
1. The sheet titled "Please Read These Instructions". A letter and consent form is on the back. Students agreeing to participate will need to sign the consent form.
2. DIT (Defining Issues Test) Instruction/Story Sheet (Red print)
3. DIT answer sheet (Red)
4. Stapled pages which begin with the Social Work Values Inventory
5. SCS Answer Sheet (Green) for the stapled pages in 4.

Remind students to code onto both answer sheets the ID number found on the front of the DIT instructions sheet & sign consent form. Tell them they are to answer only the first 3 stories on the DIT (down to "Newspaper"). Check these.

$78 on the Background Data Sheet has been giving students some difficulty. Please determine for yourself if your program has a course in which social work values and/or ethics is at least 50% of the course content. Instruct students to respond "yes" if they have taken that specific course, and "no" if they have not.

Encourage students to work quickly and carefully. Most will be able to finish in 50 minutes. The ones who agonize over your test questions will probably take longer to deliberate on this as well! It is advisable to note the time to students periodically (about every 15-20 minutes would be fine), but emphasize that there is no time limit.

Anyone who does not finish in the class period (the preferred method of administration) may take the instruments with them, but please elicit a commitment for their return and follow up on it. Partially completed instruments are of little value. Discourage students from discussing their answers until the instruments are returned.

All materials, whether completed or not, should be returned by the students to you.

Continued On Back
Preparing Materials for Return

1. Separate completed DIT and NCS answer sheets and signed consent letters (from both beginning level and senior level students), and return them together, along with the completed Social Work Program Data Form, in the postage prepaid envelope. Do not fold, staple, or paper clip the answer sheets.

2. If there are unused NCS and DIT answer sheets and DIT instruction/story sheets (not any photocopied materials), I would appreciate your returning them to me under separate cover. I would be happy to reimburse for postage, if needed.

3. Destroy all photocopied materials containing Social Work Values Inventory/Social Issues Survey/Background Data Sheet and all DIT instruction/story sheets other than those returned with unused DIT answer sheets explained in #2 above. Special permission has been granted to this researcher to use these materials in dissertation research. That permission is not extended to others. These materials should be destroyed.

At the conclusion of this research, I will send each participating program a summary report. You or your students may contact me at:

Wade M. Tyler Phone (318) 357-5491 (office)
201 Myrtle Street (318) 442-2819 (home)
Pineville, LA 71360 email tyler@alpha.nsula.edu

Post Administration Check List

In return envelope

___ DIT answer sheets (beginning and ending students)
___ NCS answer sheets (beginning and ending students)
___ Signed consent forms (beginning and ending students)
___ Completed SW Program Data Form

Under separate cover

___ Unused DIT answer sheets
___ DIT Instruction/story sheets for above answer sheets
___ Unused NCS answer sheets

Destroy

___ SWVI/SIS/Background Data Sheets (stapled photocopies)
___ Remaining DIT instruction/story sheets
Appendix G

Student Letter with Consent Form

Dear Student:

I am currently involved in a research project to compare BSW students in different categories of schools in regard to professional values and opinions about social problems. This study is being conducted as part of the requirements for the Ph.D. in social work at Louisiana State University.

Your participation will provide useful information about baccalaureate level social work students, as well as help me complete requirements for the degree.

It is important for you to understand that your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose to participate or decline to participate without any effect on your standing in your social work program or on any course grade. Furthermore, even if you first choose to participate, you may discontinue at any point.

All data from this study are confidential, and will be reported only as group means. No individual will be identified, and there is no place for identifying information on the data collection materials. You will be given an identification number for the two answer sheets, but this is simply to keep each respondent's data together for analysis.

The data collection materials consist of three self-report instruments plus a background data questionnaire. One instrument is an inventory about professional social work values; one measures how people think about social problems in general; and one solicits your opinion about current social issues. It is anticipated that all four instruments can be completed in about 50 minutes (a standard class period). It is important that you try to answer all items. Also, it is a good idea to pace yourself so that you will finish in a reasonable length of time.

There are no foreseeable risks to the participants of this study. However, if you feel questions that deal with moral, ethical, and value issues would be upsetting, please feel free to decline or discontinue participation at any point.

Questions about this research or your participation may be directed to: Wade M. Tyler, 201 Myrtle Street, Pineville, LA 71360 or call (318) 442-2819.

Thank you for your assistance in this study.

Wade M. Tyler

Your signature below indicates that you have read and understand the information above, that you willingly agree to participate, and that you understand that you may withdraw at any point.

_________ ___________ ________
signature date

Please return completed and uncompleted instruments to the faculty member distributing them.
Appendix H

Instructions to Students

Please Read These Instructions

1. You should receive A) the DIT (Defining Issues Test) printed in red, B) Red answer sheet for the DIT, C) Stapled photocopied pages that begin with the Social Work Values Inventory, D) Green NCS answer sheet for the photocopied materials.

2. Turn this page over, read the letter from the researcher, and sign the consent form. Then continue reading these instructions. You will return the consent form with the survey instruments. If you decline to participate return all forms to the faculty member administering the surveys now.


4. A) Find the 5-digit number stamped in black on the first page of the DIS (Defining Issues Test).

   B) Record this number in the place for "identification number" on the red DIT answer sheet. Blacken the corresponding circles.

   C) Record this number on the green HCS answer sheet (beginning in the first block under "identification number"). Blacken the corresponding circles.

   D) Do not record your name on the HCS form, but give the other information asked for. Blacken the corresponding circles.

5. Most respondents will be able to complete all the surveys within 50 minutes. To do so, work quickly and carefully.

6. Read all instructions carefully.

7. Answer all items. On the green NCS answer sheet mark only one answer for each item.

8. The faculty member administering this survey will give you special instructions for answering item #78 about a course in social work values and/or ethics.

9. The researcher is interested in your views. Please do not discuss any responses or possible responses with others until all participants have returned the instruments to the faculty member administering the surveys.

10. Please begin with the DIT (Red pages and answer sheet).

Remember: Work quickly and carefully.
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LSU Office of Sponsored Research/OSR 388-6891; FAX 6792

LSU: HUMAN RESEARCH SUBJECTS

APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM INSTITUTIONAL OVERSIGHT

Unless they are formally qualified as meeting the criteria for exemption from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight, ALL LSU research/projects using living humans as subjects, or samples or data obtained from them, directly or indirectly, with or without their consent, must be approved in advance by the LSU IRB. This form helps the PI determine if a project may be exempted, and is used to request an exemption.

NOTE: Even when exempted, the researcher is required to exercise prudent practice in protecting the interests of research subjects, obtain informed consent if appropriate, and must conform to the Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects (Belmont Report) and LSU Guide to Informed Consent; (Available from OSR or http://www.osr.lsu.edu/osr/comply.html).

Instructions: Complete checklist, pp 2-4; if exemption appears possible, follow instructions on p. 4. Otherwise apply to the IRB.

Principal Investigator: Wade M. Tyler

Student? Y N

Department/Unit: Social Work

Project Title: A Comparison of BSW Students in a Religiously-Affiliated Institution of Higher Education with Those in a State-Supported Institution Relative to Adherence to Social Work Values, Level of Moral Reasoning, Social Attitude Agency expected to fund project:

Subject pool (e.g. Psychology students) Baccalaureate social work students

Circle any "vulnerable populations" to be used: (children <18; the mentally impaired, pregnant women, the aged, other). Projects with incarcerated persons cannot be exempted: apply directly to IRB.

I certify my responses are accurate and complete. If the project scope or design is later changed I will resubmit for review. I will obtain written approval from the Authorized Representative of all non-LSU institutions in which the study is conducted.

PI Signature __________________________ Date __/__/__97 (no per signatures)

Screening Committee Action: Exempted V Not Exempted ___ *

Reviewer: __________________________ Signature _______________ Date __/__/__97

Comments: cc PI (signed face page only); OSR Director (application with protocol) 117 David Boyd Hall, LSU.

* PI: Obtain a current IRB application packet from the IRB office (8-1492; karenb@lsu.edu; 117 David Boyd Hall, LSU).
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