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INTRODUCTION

The social work profession, since its emergence as a profession, has had an avowed commitment to address an impressive diversity of client needs and situations. This attention to diversity has included the family experiences of clients. In Mary Richmond's classic, Social Diagnosis (1917), she discussed extensively the importance of understanding family experiences as a context for individual client behavior.

Family life in the United States is changing. The perceptions and expectations of family members are also changing. As the needs and problems of social work clients change, social work practitioners have attempted to respond to these situations with relevant knowledge and constructive solutions. Critics disagree about how well the profession is doing in its collective responses to families. Beck (1973, 1976) and others have concluded that social workers have produced validated positive results. Cogswell and Sussman (1974), Duhl (1976), Freed (1975), Hinchman (1977), Schuerman (1975) and others have concluded that, based on the evidence, social work practice has been marginally responsive with families, at best.
Conceptualizing families too narrowly has been seen by recent writers as a major problem (Robertson, 1971; Sussman, 1971), preventing social workers from accurately addressing client needs. Social work educators have been the target of much of this criticism, because educators claim to provide students with the conceptual tools and operational framework needed for effective practice. The family content social work educators included in their curriculum in the past was strongly influenced by the traditional nuclear family model (Moynihan, 1965; Ogburn, 1955; Parsons and Bales, 1955; Rodman, 1965). Birdwhistell (1974) has called this "the idealized model of the American family". Life-styles, family composition, gender roles, and ethnic values have evolved to suggest the need for a more comprehensive and flexible conceptual framework for viewing family life. Expecting conformity to one model of family experience is no longer accurate or appropriate. Regarding diversity in American culture, Robertson (1970) has observed that

The changes in modern America have included the majority of people but the continued existence of large groups in marginal roles represents a serious deficit in the fabric of American society. For despite the ideals of pluralism, there is a basic strain toward conformity, toward standard life styles and values. We have underestimated heterogeneity, variability, and change. The terms 'culture and subculture' are used to describe life styles and behavior under contemporary urban conditions....Although they are not so intended, these concepts....are frequently interpreted as indicating a kind of homogeneity and a degree of regularity that does not exist.
Nobody has studied the family content in social work curriculum systematically and comprehensively to determine whether the "strain toward conformity" identified by Robertson has pervaded what has been taught about family life. This dissertation focuses on the nature and extent of family content in the required portion of masters-level curricula accredited by the Council on Social Work Education since 1974. Curriculum documents from 30 schools of social work (See Appendix A, p. 160) were studied, using the method called content analysis, in this exploratory-descriptive study.

In addition to measuring traditional family content, the research defines and identifies four types of non-traditional content: familologic autonomy, family compositional diversity, family gender-role flexibility and family ethnic diversity. Recent writings by social work educators (cited earlier, and reviewed in Chapter 2) have called for inclusion in the curriculum of these four types of content as preparation for contemporary social work practice.

Social work practice and social work education continue to experience pressures both from outside and from inside toward more precise specification and measurement of outcomes. This research is seen as demonstrating one method of curriculum assessment, and developing baseline data regarding family content through the application of that method. Perhaps this effort can influence family curriculum toward being more comprehensive, flexible and consistent with the needs of social work clients.
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

How social work educators conceptualize family life, and what they teach their students about families, are the central concerns of this dissertation. As a foundation for discussion of family curriculum, several aspects of the environment of social work education will be examined briefly. 'Environment' in this context includes the social work profession as a whole, professional education in general, issues particular to social work education, and the accreditation process as administered by the Council on Social Work Education. Changes in American families also constitute an important component of the environment of social work education, and of this problem statement.

The Commitment of the Social Work Profession

Professions generally claim to: 1) possess a specialized body of knowledge, 2) exist to serve the needs of persons within a society, and 3) require an intensive and continuing socialization/education process which occurs through a professional culture (Towle, 1954). Social work, more than some other professions serving the needs of individuals, has focused its theoretical attention on the client-in-interaction. The family, as one of
the most immediate systems of interaction for clients, has attracted the interest of social workers consistently. Early social workers recognized the family as a critical source of information both for serving clients effectively in direct practice and for attempting to develop a general framework for understanding human behavior. As a pioneer in both practice and research, Mary Richmond (1917, p. 140) concluded that "we cannot understand the evils that beset them (certain families) unless we are at some pains to study the racial and national traditions that cling so tenaciously around certain of the foreign family groups...and that crumble away too quickly from certain others." Richmond was one of a group of social workers who emphasized individualizing families in order to appreciate their unique experiences and problems (Lubove, 1971, chap. 2). This same professional commitment led Richmond to be an articulate advocate for professional education as necessary preparation for practice (Trattner, 1974, chap. 11).

In contemporary social work practice three crucial concepts support a broad and flexible approach to families ("Working Definition", 1970). First, individualization of client needs is important. Client populations, both individually and in groups, vary in their actual needs. They also differ in their ability to perceive and to respond to their own needs. Effective practice
then requires a broad range of knowledge about families and careful assessment of the needs of each client system, based on that range of knowledge.

Secondly, self-determination has been high in the heirarchy of social work values. The profession encourages each client system to participate actively in defining its own needs, aspirations and problems. Without a diversified view of family life, the practitioner may tend to constrict the opportunities of the individual or family to make its own decisions.

Finally, in addition to individualization and self-determination, social workers support the concept of the family as a social service delivery system—a type of social utility (Moroney, 1976). This view implies a preventive and supportive approach to intervention. It suggests that an important aspect of the assessment phase with each client system is the identification of what strengths exist in the family situation. Family members are involved in making decisions about what intervention is needed. Latent family resources are mobilized to help to implement the intervention plan. Evaluation of outcomes also depend on the contribution of family members. These successive phases of the intervention process can be more accurately executed if the practitioner's view of family functioning is broad enough to include a wide range of possibilities. Some individual clients may not identify with any group whom they consider to be their
family. For those who do relate to a family group, however,
seeing the family as a service delivery system parallel to social
agencies adds to the vitality of the intervention effort.

In the past few years members of the profession, particularly
educators, have said we ought to measure empirically what future
practitioners are being taught (Arkava and Brennen, 1976; M.
Bloom, 1975, 1976; Levande, 1976; Norton, 1978; Rothman and
Vigilante, 1974; D. Sanders, 1975; Sotomayor and Ortego y Gasca,
1975). The Council on Social Work Education appointed two task
forces, which published reports in 1974. The Task Force on
Structure and Quality in Social Work Education reported the
judgment that masters-degree graduates are not being prepared
adequately for practice with families and children (Ripple, 1974,
p. 38). Dolgoff (1974) reported for the Task Force on Social Work
Practice and Education. The Dolgoff statement was more general
regarding curriculum than the Ripple document, but it urged that
curriculum content decisions be made systematically and be tied
closely to the needs of present and future clients.

In summary, members of the social work profession have ex­
pressed their commitment to the importance of family experience
in the lives of clients. This commitment has been communicated
historically, conceptually, and through actions of the Council on
Social Work Education. The range of family experiences confronting
social workers will now be examined.
Diversity and Change in U.S. Family Experience

Since Chapter 2 of this dissertation includes detailed discussion of varied aspects of family life, this brief section only introduces a definition of family and some major issues and trends in family life in the United States affecting the practice of social work.

Over eighty definitions of family have been located by this writer in professional literature written since 1970. While there is little agreement, family definitions tend to cluster around three variables: 1) kinship—legal relationship through marriage, birth, or adoption, 2) residence—occupying the same housing unit, or 3) social functions—execution of certain prescribed tasks or responsibilities. Frequently a combination of these variables is employed. In this dissertation, based on reasons discussed in a later section, family is defined as two or more persons who have:

1) face-to-face interaction on a regular basis by choice, often involving a common residence (Axinn and Levin, 1972)

2) a pattern of economic support and the use of economic resources (Advisory Committee, 1976; Kanter, 1977; Sawhill et al., 1977)

3) division of responsibilities for maintaining the residence(s) (Ogburn and Nimkoff, 1955)

4) an understanding about responsibilities for any children who may be involved in the group (Bronfenbrenner, 1977)
5) a commitment to continuing the relationship for an extended period of time (Macklin, 1972), and

6) often, but not necessarily, a close relationship between two or more persons which may include a sexual dimension (Cogswell and Sussman, 1974)

This definition is broad and functional. It allows for either kinship or residence, but is not restricted to either. Important living experiences of many social work clients are within the boundaries of this definition which would be excluded by many narrower ones. The definition includes many situations in which there is mutual support, or one person caring for another (or others). Examples, to be discussed later, are unmarried single parents, cohabiting couples with or without children, homosexual couples, co-parenting families (separated or divorced parents who share responsibilities for children), widowed persons living together unmarried, and other current groupings. Self-definition and functional viability outweigh legal process when this definition is applied. With family defined, some aspects of contemporary family life are now reviewed.

Systems theory is the general framework used here to discuss social work's concern with families. From this perspective, the definition of family being used recognizes that families have boundaries and territoriality, they possess an organized division of labor, and they develop patterns of communication and adaptation which affect both their internal and external activities. These
activities, according to systems theory, can be described on three levels: 1) family as subsystem, 2) family as system, and 3) family as environment. Social work practice and education are concerned about all three levels. Persons involved with direct practice focus particularly on the family as an interacting system and on its capacity, as an environment, to meet the needs of its members. Practitioners and educators emphasizing social policy focus on the family as a subsystem of the larger society, and on its interaction with other subsystems such as government, schools, the economy, organized religion, and social welfare programs (Axinn and Levin, 1972; Bell, 1967; Kanter, 1977; Moroney, 1976; Schorr, 1972; Staples, 1973; Zimmerman, 1976).

What processes are operating which lead to concern about family content in social work education? A virtual catalogue of family issues have been identified in comprehensive writings based on empirical family research ("Advisory Committee", 1976; Beck, 1973, 1976; "Population", 1972; Ross, 1975; Schlessinger, 1975; "U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee", 1973; "U.S. Congress, Senate", 1974; "U.S. Department of Commerce", 1977). Many other professional, but non-empirical, assessments of family functioning have been made (Blenkner, 1965; Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Cogswell and Sussman, 1974; Gordon, 1972; Hawkes, 1978; "Second Experience", 1975; Young, 1973). From this literature three types of changes regarding the family can be identified: 1) changes in the nature
of family life itself, 2) altered perceptions about family experience, and 3) shifting expectations on the part of family members. These tend to be interdependent phenomena, however, not isolated processes.

1. Changes in family life itself

The behavior of persons in their family roles during the past decade (or beyond) has changed in these ways ("Advisory Committee", 1976; "Population", 1972; "U.S. Department of Commerce", 1977):

a) Cohabitation a viable alternative to marriage

b) Increasing use of contraception and decreasing birth rate

c) Practice of co-parenting

d) Increasing employment of mothers of young children

e) Increasing births and adoptions by unmarried persons

f) Increasing lifespan with shorter childbearing period (more years as a couple without children)

g) Increasing family income

h) More dependence of peers on one another (hours with no parent at home)

i) Subsidized adoption begun (paying non-poor families to care for some of their legal children)

2. Changes in perceptions about family experience

Modified perceptions about situations tend to lead to different responses to those situations (Berger and Luckmann, 1967). Examples of new views of family phenomena are:
a) Divorce less traumatic for children (and adults) than unhappy intact marriage

b) Non-nuclear family structures (e.g. single parent or homosexual couple) potentially adequate nurturing environment

c) Voluntary childlessness a desirable option for some

d) Singleness for indefinite period a potentially desirable alternative to marriage

e) Strengths and potential resources of non-nuclear minority families

3. Shifting expectations of family members

Some persons find new possibilities for family interaction presented to them in the mass media or through other means. These images lead them to expect different experiences through their families, including:

a) More sharing of household tasks and childrearing (by males)

b) Opportunities for female employment, including mothers of young children

c) Increasing standard of living (material possessions, recreation)

d) Personal fulfillment ('happiness') for all family members

e) Freedom from physical or verbal abuse by other family members

f) Acceptance by others outside the family of differing cultural values, language, dress or other expressions of uniqueness
The varied and changing aspects of family life identified here as behaviors, perceptions, and expectations, tend to cluster around four issues:

1) does one choose to become involved in marriage or parenting
2) what persons belong to one's family
3) to what extent does gender shape family behavior, and
4) in what ways, if any, is ethnic minority family life different from that of the majority culture

These four issues are being referred to as non-traditional family content, and each is operationally defined later in this chapter. Whether these types of content are included in masters-level social work curriculum to prepare future social workers for diverse practice with families is the major concern of this dissertation.

Reviewing what has been explicated thus far, social work has an established commitment to focus on families as a unit of intervention. Family life in the U.S. is complex, and changing. How can social work, as one of several human service professions, implement a curriculum which is responsive to these realities?

Issues Regarding Curriculum in Professional Education

Curriculum, at the time of its Latin origin, meant an enclosed race-course used by runners (American Heritage Dictionary, 1975, p. 324). That meaning seems to imply a tightly regimented series of experiences, leading to highly standardized educational outcomes.
A current definition used in this study (Posner, 1974, p. 401) is "a structured series of intended learning outcomes". From this perspective the two major components of curriculum in professional education are structure and content. Towle (1954) and Tyler (1949, 1952) developed guidelines which strongly influenced professional education for two decades (continuity, sequencing and integration).

During the 1960s professions, including social work, came under attack for not preparing practitioners adequately for society's diverse problems. A positive outcome of this experience was renewed activity by curriculum theorists to provide a framework for professional education geared to the diverse world of society's clients (Dressel, 1970; Dressel and Mayhew, 1974; Mann et al., 1970; Mayhew and Ford, 1971; Pinar, 1976; Worthen and Sanders, 1973). Growing out of the work of these persons, and others, the following relationship between client needs and the content of professional curriculum is suggested:
Even when accompanied by a clearly developed conceptual framework, however, professional curriculum tends to be the end product of a complex variety of interests and needs competing for limited resources. Curriculum building and maintenance are political processes. The primary resources for which there is competition are: 1) time—classroom time, students' time and instructor's time, and 2) conceptual space—what concepts, images, issues, or processes are considered essential in a given course or curricular unit. While other aspects of curriculum-building are recognized (Walz, 1978), the thrust of this research is toward
measuring the content of courses which supply the conceptual base for practice in the social work profession.

This study assumes that concepts and language used in presenting family content are important in determining educational outcomes. It is assumed that verbal communication serves as a vehicle which gives a particular shape to the perceptions students have about the family life of their future clients. It is further assumed that the perceptions created by language actually control—shape the boundaries of—the reality with which one later deals in professional practice. For example, if one uses the term 'natural parent' rather than biological parent in referring to one who bears a child, it tends to suggest that there is something about the procreation process (for fathers and mothers) which inherently prepares one to nurture a child. Conversely, 'natural parent' suggests that one who adopts a child is inherently less inclined to be nurturing, but can perhaps overcome that disinclination.

These assumptions about language shaping reality are based on the work of scholars representing diverse disciplines, and at varying levels of abstraction. Benjamin Bloom (1956) is a philosopher of education. Chomsky (1968), Fromkin and Rodman (1974), and Whorf (1961) work in psycholinguistics. Berger and Luckmann (1967) are experts in the sociology of knowledge, while Kuhn (1970) is a theoretical physicist and scholar in the history and philosophy of science. Cormican (1977) is a social work educator. While each of them has his/her unique emphasis, all
support the statements made above about ways in which language shapes social behavior.

To summarize, education for the professions is an important part of the environment in which social work curriculum-building occurs. This discussion has presented a definition of curriculum, a framework in which to place curriculum-building, and some assumptions about the relationship between curriculum content and expectable educational outcomes in professional education. The components of the educational process are next outlined briefly and more explicitly.

Components of the Educational Process

Baldridge (1971) and Dressel and Mayhew (1974) identify three major components in the educational system: 1) actors, 2) activities, and 3) products. Weick (1976) refers to the university environment in which this all occurs as a "loosely coupled system", indicating his contention that models of organizational behavior developed elsewhere do not fit academic life.

Among the actors in professional education, including education for social work, are somewhat-distant groups such as boards of trustees, alumni, client groups, community leaders, upper-level university administrators, and practice-oriented professional associations. More immediately involved are faculty, deans, department or sequence chairpersons, students, and accrediting associations. Social work educators, as members of the teaching profession,
have final authority and responsibility for what they teach, though this is shaped in varying degrees by the other actors in the system. Accreditation commissions bear responsibility for assuring that at least adequate amounts of essential content are communicated to future practitioners.

Activities of these educational actors are implicit in the roles they occupy. For faculty, these include development of parameters for their courses, or acceptance of guidelines established by a group responsible for that area of curriculum. With general boundaries determined by either means, the social work educator is expected to develop a course syllabus for (or with) students. This syllabus, referred to by Baldridge as an educational product, is the focus of this research.

The Council on Social Work Education (1971b, 1971c) has stated clearly and specifically the guidelines by which it expects instructors to develop their educational products. It has further stated that the syllabus is to be considered a contractual agreement between instructor and student, to direct the interaction between them.

The Relationship between Curriculum and Instruction

Curriculum theorists vary in their views of the relationship between curriculum and instruction. Most think that the two should be related, but the degree of relationship is widely debated.
Those who argue for a very close relationship say that 'the medium is the message'—that attempts to focus on the two separately are artificial and pointless. Theorists who do separate curriculum and instruction, for purposes of debate and specialization, consider instruction to be the 'how' of teaching and curriculum to be the 'what'. This study does not address the matter of instructional technologies, important as they are, because instruction is beyond the scope of the research questions considered in this exploratory-descriptive study. Since this study attempts to measure family curriculum content, exclusion of instructional data seems justified. Focusing on curriculum separately in this way is consistent with the Council on Social Work Education (1971a, 1971b) and Craig (1976, 1978), as well as educational theorists cited earlier and Gagne (1974).

**Current Issues in Social Work Education**

Social work education in the United States, like family life, is in a transitional period. This may seem to have been true throughout the entire history of preparation for social work practice, but it is particularly true now. Martin Bloom (1976, p. 3) observes that

Current student performance is being used to estimate competence with future clients having unknown problems, possibly requiring knowledge as yet undeveloped, perhaps to obtain goals not currently sanctioned. Yet if we are to improve social work education, this is the task before us.
Even the most salient issues facing social work educators can only be enumerated here without extensive discussion. Concerns facing professional educators generally have already been presented, and serve as a backdrop for this brief survey. The reports of Dolgoff (1974) and Ripple (1974) are the sources of much that is digested here. Some of these concerns definitely are continuing dilemmas, not new to this generation. Others are products of the contemporary scene.

The issues are:

1) balance of breadth versus depth in the curriculum
2) definition of boundaries for core content
3) location in the curriculum of core content
4) preferred bases for specialization at the masters level
5) structure and content of social work practice courses
6) boundaries and rationale for licensing or certification
7) division of responsibility between schools and agencies for practicum in particular, but also for learning generally
8) integration versus fragmentation of curriculum
9) decreased funding for social work education, and for social services generally
10) empirical validation of methods used in practice and education
11) overpopulated social work employment market
Some of these concerns are tied to the matter of family content in the masters-level curriculum, and are discussed in Chapter 3. Others are mentioned as a further recognition of the complex environment in which this research problem is couched.

The Council on Social Work Education and The Accreditation Process

Earlier, accreditation commissions were identified as one of the important actors in professional education, and the Council on Social Work Education was recognized as having authority to execute the accrediting function for social work. This has been true since 1952 (CSWE, 1971a, p. v). Accreditation involves the conduct by the applying school of an extensive self-study, and the submission to CSWE's Accreditation Commission of a written report, based on the Manual of Accrediting Standards (CSWE, 1971a). This written report must include syllabi of courses being taught as part of the masters-degree offerings. As indicated earlier, CSWE considers syllabi to represent a contractual agreement between the school and instructor on the one hand the students on the other (CSWE, 1971b, 1971c). Thus these documents are expected to reflect accurately, and in reasonable detail, what is actually taught in each course. All self-study documents are permanently filed in the CSWE Archives in New York; they are accessible only to CSWE staff or persons authorized by the respective schools. In the interest of improving social work education, the Council encourages selective use of these documents for research purposes.
The various parts of the environment of social work education have been introduced as a foundation for the research described in this dissertation. The specific focus of this study is now presented.

Focus of this Study

1. Recently accredited masters-level curricula

Both baccalaureate and masters programs are accredited by the Council on Social Work Education. The decision to analyze masters-level curriculum was based on several considerations. First, many within the profession still consider the masters degree to be the standard degree for entry-level professional competence, particularly in agencies in the fields of mental health and family and childrens services. Secondly CSWE only recently began accrediting baccalaureate programs (1974); consequently both curriculum-building in schools and the accreditation process for those programs have been considered to be in a 'shake-down period' up to the present time. Finally, since many masters-level programs have gone through the accreditation process several times, it was assumed they would be well acquainted with the accreditation guidelines, producing curriculum documents that are relatively standard in style while varying in content.

Thirty schools accredited or reaccredited between 1974 and 1978 make up the study population (Appendix A, p. 160). This time frame was chosen because it is recent, because new guidelines for
Standard 1234A were developed in 1973, and because during this period numerous educators expressed concern about lack of inclusion of certain types of family content in social work curriculum (Blake, 1974; Cogswell and Sussman, 1974; Chunn, 1974; Duhl, 1976; English, 1974; Freed, 1975; Montiel, 1973; Scheurman, 1975; Schwartz, 1973).

2. Traditional and non-traditional family content

The definition for family used in this study has already been presented (p. 8). Traditional family content is defined as all content regarding families which: a) is affirmatively based on the nuclear model of family functioning, or b) does not affirmatively express one of the four types of non-traditional family content identified in the study. A list of examples of traditional family content is included for illustrative purposes (See Appendix N, p. 177).

Non-traditional family content is of four types, with a few exceptions. Each of the four is defined below as one of the primary variables in the study. The exceptions are discussed in Chapter 3 under "Coding Procedures".

3. Primary variables

As described earlier in the context of diversity and change in U.S. family experience (pp. 7-12), new or newly recognized aspects of family functioning tend to cluster around four types of experiences. These are defined in this research as non-traditional
family content; the terms are: 1) familogic autonomy, 2) family compositional diversity, 3) family gender-role flexibility, and 4) family ethnic diversity.

a) Familogic autonomy - the view that choosing to remain single or choosing not to parent children can be positive and attractive decisions in the course of normal human maturation. Representative terms communicating familogic autonomy comprise Appendix H (p. 171).

b) Family compositional diversity - the view that any group meeting the definition of family used in this study is a family, i.e., a variety of groupings are families in addition to nuclear families. Appendix G (p. 170) is composed of terms considered to demonstrate family compositional diversity.

c) Family gender-role flexibility - the view that responsibilities in families should be carried out on the basis of interest, ability, or negotiation, rather than on a presumed basis of gender. Terms demonstrating this variable are included in Appendix I (p. 172).

d) Family ethnic diversity - the view that there tend to be some differences in the nature and meaning of family life within ethnic and racial minority groups. In this study this includes Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Native Americans, and Asian Americans.
4. Hypotheses

Since this is an exploratory-descriptive study, the hypotheses explored are descriptive hypotheses. That is, they refer to variables which are expected to occur in association with one another but are not inferred to have any cause-effect relationship to each other.

**Hypothesis FA1** — Familogic Autonomy is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of female faculty.

**Hypothesis FA2** — Familogic Autonomy is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of female students.

**Hypothesis FCD1** — Family Compositional Diversity is expected to be positively correlated with the size of metropolitan area in which schools are located.

**Hypothesis FGRF1** — Family Gender-Role Flexibility is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of female faculty.

**Hypothesis FGRF2** — Family Gender-Role Flexibility is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of female students.

**Hypothesis FED1** — Family Ethnic Diversity is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of racial minority faculty.

**Hypothesis FED2** — Family Ethnic Diversity is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of racial minority students.

**Hypothesis FED3** — Family Ethnic Diversity is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of minority population of the state in which the schools are located.
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A thorough search of the professional literature was conducted regarding the four major variables in this study—familogic autonomy, family compositional diversity, family gender-role flexibility, and family ethnic diversity. The search encompassed writings in family sociology, social work practice, and social work education. In addition a more cursory review was conducted in the areas of ethnic and racial minorities and male/female liberation, to the extent that these areas interface with family life.

Familogic Autonomy

The prevailing ideology in the United States suggests that marrying and bearing children are the expected course of events as persons reach late adolescence or early adulthood. Familogic autonomy represents freedom from this ideology. It holds that persons who become involved in marriage or parenting ought to do so by deliberate choice rather than by passive conformity to the prevailing ideology. The current situation regarding these two choices, and pertinent research related to the choices, are now reviewed.
1. Singleness vs. marriage

The U.S. Bureau of the Census (hereafter referred to as U.S. Census, 1977, p. 79, Table 114) reported a decline of marriages per 1,000 single women from 144.3 in 1965 to 113.4 in 1976. This decrease was true for all age categories of single women from 15 through 44 years.

Paralleling the declining marriage rate was a major increase in the percentage of persons who chose to remain single through their 20s. Table 1 indicates the particularly large increase between 1970 and 1977 of single males (36.6%) and females (53.3%) in the 25-29 year category.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>Percentage of Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Though choosing never to marry is the primary form of singleness, declining to remarry after divorce is a similar phenomenon.
The remarriage rate increased from 1950-72, but has declined since 1972. In 1977, 75% of divorced women remarried, compared with 83% of men. The median interval between marriages for divorced persons is three years (U.S. Census, 1977, p. 79, Table 114).

In research regarding marital status, Stein (1975) found at one university in 1962 that 2% of unmarried female seniors had little or no interest in marriage. By 1973 the percentage at the same institution increased to 40. Edwards and Hoover (1974) and Francoeur (1972) support Stein's findings, attributing much of the change to a more relaxed attitude toward non-marital sex. Many respondents indicated that they think men no longer need to marry to have sex, and women no longer need to marry to receive financial support, therefore much of the basis for monogamous marriage is gone. Other attractions to singleness in addition to economic independence and sexual availability were increased mobility, expanded career opportunities, less restrictions on personal freedom, and possibilities for experimentation in relationships with either gender. Some respondents candidly recognized that they also experience negative aspects of single life. There were times when the continuity and security of a legal marriage commitment seemed appealing, and they felt some negative stereotyping from employers and co-workers (Stein).

Singleness is not new. Religious celibacy and other forms have existed for centuries. The past decade, however, has resulted
in a major expansion of interest in this lifestyle which reflects one kind of freedom from prevailing family ideology in the U.S.

2. Parenting as a deliberate choice

Following marriage, couples experience pressure from prevailing social norms to bear children. Persons who despite this sociocultural influence decide for themselves whether or not to bear or adopt children demonstrate a second type of familial autonomy. Between 1966 and 1970, 44% of all U.S. births were unplanned, and 15% were unwanted (Population, 1972, p. 164). The percentage of unwanted babies dropped to 12 during the 1973-76 period (U.S. Census, 1977, p. 66, Table 93). The likely negative consequences for any unwanted child have been well-documented (Humane Reproduction, 1973, Chap. 3; Population, 1972, Chap. 11; H. Stein and Sanders, 1971; Howerton, 1977), including child abuse, poor health, and lowered educational attainment. Blake (1974) and Radl (1974) have theorized that as the stresses of parenting are discussed more openly, adults are less likely to bear children out of sentiment or a sense of guilt, freeing them to make a more rational choice. Rossi (1968) has held that the birth of a child into a family requires greater adaptation than becoming married. Nevill and Damico (1975) and Satir (1964) have suggested that the emotional economy of the family, particularly the nurturing capacity of the parent or parents, ought to weigh heavily in a decision about whether to parent a child.
While the number and spacing of children in families has been a concern of social workers for more than a decade, voluntary childlessness has become increasingly significant as an option during the past five years. Between 1965 and 1977 the rate of childlessness among women through age 29 has more than doubled (U.S. Census, 1977, p. 64, Table 89). Chester (1974) and Movius (1976) think being childless by choice enables a couple to explore and to invest themselves in creative endeavors which would otherwise be superseded by children. Chester, Russell et al. (1978), and Veevers (1975) found that voluntarily childless couples adapt to their pronatalist environment by: 1) selectively perceiving the consequences of parenthood in a negative light, 2) differential associations which emphasize interaction with others who share their ideology, 3) structuring 'trial parenthood' experiences so as to reaffirm their biases, and 4) capitalizing on the social ambivalence which surrounds parenthood for many parents.

Haselkorn (1977), Meyer and Stone (1974), and Stein and Sanders (1971) have urged that social work educators view inclusion of familologic autonomy in the social work curriculum as an urgent matter. As social work seeks to shift its purpose more toward prevention, they reason, averting ill-planned marriages and unwanted conceptions ought to be high on the list of social work priorities. Nason and Poloma (1976) encourage further study of the decision-making process in childless couples to learn how they differ from
other couples, and that existing knowledge regarding childlessness be taught to professionals who are in positions to influence family decision-making styles, such as social workers.

In summary, familologic autonomy enables persons to approach two major decisions—marriage and parenting—unencumbered by the prevailing ideology and the social pressure which expect one to marry and to bear children. Both marriage and childbearing have been declining in the U.S. recently, due to a more deliberate approach to these decisions. Recent writers encourage social work educators to teach future social workers to view marriage and parenting as choices, not assumptions, and to help their future clients to do likewise.

**Family Compositional Diversity**

The traditional nuclear family consists of wife/mother, husband/father, and their legally recognized children (by birth, adoption, or guardianship). Family compositional diversity refers to persons who live as a family in any combination other than the traditional nuclear one. Specifically, any grouping which meets the definition of family used in this study (p. 8) and is not nuclear is considered to display compositional diversity.

Cogswell and Sussman (1974, p. 92) charge that social workers and other professionals fail to appreciate the diversity or the prevalence of non-nuclear structures, and are not prepared to deal with them responsively:
In performing their functions, human service systems make certain assumptions about the family. They gear their services toward an ideal of what the family ought to be, namely, a nuclear traditional one...Because agencies idealize the traditional family, their programs are aimed at restoring this form and, thus, are ill-equipped to provide relevant support services to variant family forms.

Blenkner (1965) and Freed (1975) fear that as social workers help individuals to separate from their families at certain points in the life cycle, they concentrate on the nuclear model as the only model, instead of supporting and encouraging whatever family structure is most functional for those seeking help. Empirical evidence needed to either support or refute these statements is not yet adequately developed.

A number of the major family structures reflected in the literature and conceptualized by the author are now described.

1. Cohabitation

When two adults of different genders live together as if they are married, this is called cohabitation. In Macklin's (1972) research at Cornell University she operationally defined cohabitation as "sharing the same bedroom at least four nights per week for at least three consecutive months". By this definition over 40% of her sample of college women qualified. An additional 38% had lived with the other sex but not frequently enough or long enough to satisfy the definition. Less than 2% said they had not and
would not because it would be wrong outside of marriage (p. 265).
From 1970 to 1977 there was a 131% increase in cohabitation,
according to the U.S. Bureau of Census (p. 42, Table 53), with 43%
of two-person unmarried households composed of mixed genders.
Cohabitation is not only a campus phenomenon. Seventy-three per-
cent of those living together are over 25, with 106,000 households
composed of persons over 65 (U.S. Census, p. 42, Table 53).
Social Security policy as presently constituted would reduce
the income of many of these senior citizens if they would choose to
be legally married. Therefore, despite possible social criticism,
cohabitation is an attractive family structure. Future social
workers would seem better prepared to serve their clients if
knowledge about this family structure were included in their
curriculum.

2. One-parent family

In 1977, 17.2% of U.S. families (nearly 10 million) had one
parent present (U.S. Census, p. 459). About 2.8 million of these
are widowed, 3.2 million are divorced, 2.1 million are married
with spouse absent, and the remaining 1.9 million have never
married. Nearly 8.3 million of these (84%) are headed by women,
with 1.6 million headed by men. Millions of these families are
temporarily headed by a single parent, soon to become reconstituted
families after the parent remarries. About 14% of all U.S. women
have now been divorced at least once (p. 80, Table 115), and half
of them remarry within three years.
Authorities disagree regarding the effects of living in a one-parent family. Maruyama (1966) stated that when a child's primary socialization is confined to one parent, the parameters of his/her development tend to be narrowed, with undue responsibility resting on the shoulders of the one parent. Schlesinger (1975) and Ross (1975) emphasized that financial, social, and emotional stresses faced by solo parents tend to consume some of the energy they would otherwise have free to invest in interaction with their children. Anne Schwartz (1968) and others have documented, however, that children functioned better in one-parent divorced families than they did in unhappy intact families. Accurate assessment of one-parent families seems to require a great deal of information beyond merely knowing that there is one parent. What involvement, if any, does a second parent have with the family? What kinship, neighborhood or other social supports contribute to the life of the family? What kind of two-parent family is the basis for comparison? If both parents are employed for long periods there may be less parent-child interaction than in a one-parent family (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). The literature suggests that educators train future practitioners to individualize these multiple aspects of family life, rather than making assumptions about one-parent families or any other type of family structure.
3. Reconstituted families

A family with two adults involving at least one prior marriage is a reconstituted family. About 11% of U.S. families currently are of this type, containing about 10% of America's children (U.S. Census, p. 80, Table 115). The ratio of children to divorces has been increasing to the current mean of slightly more than one child per divorce (p. 79, Table 114). The median duration of marriages declined from 7.2 years in 1965 to 6.5 years in 1975 (p. 80, Table 117). These facts suggest that reconstituted families will make up an increasing part of the caseloads of social workers. Bernard (1956) pointed out that a liberal remarriage policy in the United States logically follows from the assumptions that: 1) unhappy or destructive marriages should end, and 2) continuity of family is important for children and adults. Simon's treatise on step-children (1964) and Duberman's empirical study of remarried couples identified special needs of these populations. Conceptually, reconstituted families are not merely re-created nuclear families. Emotional commitments and role expectations tend to be somewhat ambiguous in these families. Previously married adults may carry some unfinished agenda with them into a subsequent marriage, depending on whether the death or divorce which ended the prior marriage was constructively resolved. Children and their non-biological parents may find their relationships haunted by precedents, positive or negative, from earlier relationships.
One partner to the marriage may have no prior experience with parenting. Pressures from outside the family can also add to the adjustment problems.

Reconstituted families can provide satisfying, growth-producing relationships for their members, but education should prepare social workers with special knowledge and sensitivity to deal with the issues these persons face.

4. Homosexual family

A homosexual family involves two or more persons of the same gender, with or without children, living as a family (as defined for this study) and including sexual access of members to one another. Reliable data on persons with homosexual orientation are not available, but estimates range up to 20 million persons, or nearly 10% of the U.S. population (Voeller and Walters, 1978). Some of these persons live alone, others are members of other family structures already described. An increasing number, however, have become involved openly in a commitment to one another which resembles marriage (Mileski and Black, 1972).

With increasing frequency, homosexual adults also have children living with them. In some jurisdictions public policy now forbids discrimination based on sexual orientation in child welfare decisions, notably California, Massachusetts, and Washington DC (Voeller and Walters). Courts have concluded that in some instances a homosexual family is the most nurturing environment available to a child, and custody was awarded on that basis.
Educating for practice with homosexual families involves both affective and conceptual content. Does the future practitioner agree with the homosexual lifestyle as an abstraction, but find it distressing to work with clients who live this style? Unless professional education encourages abstractions and feelings to be integrated through self-examination, practice with homosexual families will be ineffective.

5. Extended family

Inclusion of other relatives with the nuclear family, such as grandparents, aunts, uncles, or cousins, constitutes an extended family. Whether the extended family was ever the predominant form in the U.S. is still debated. Social work writers (Freed, 1975; Gibson, 1972; Litwak, 1965; Lopata, 1978; Silverman et al., 1977) reported that the extended family is virtually non-existent in the U.S. presently. Exceptions are among minority groups and the rural poor, such as in Appalachia; even in Appalachia the decline is apparent (Kaplan, 1971; Schultz and DeSavage, 1973; Schwarzweller, 1971). Where are the kin who used to be included in extended families? Most have established separate households (in the case of unmarried aunts and uncles) or are living as couples (grandparents) rather than joining existing nuclear families. For example, among persons over 65 in 1977, only 12% of those widowed lived with relatives (U.S. Census, p. 31, Table 32).
Among the Amish (a religious minority) and among racial and ethnic minorities, the extended family contributed to group self-sufficiency and even to survival itself (Maldonado, 1975; Sotomayor, 1973; Yelder, 1975). Consequently, senior members of kinship groups still tend to live with their younger generations more frequently than is true in the majority culture. The authority and influence of these older members ought to be assessed and valued by social workers practicing with minority group members.

6. Communal/group marriages

If three or more persons live together with a commitment equivalent to marriage, their experience is called a group marriage. In the United States legal marriage is restricted to two persons at any given time (in all jurisdictions), but legal parameters are considered largely irrelevant by participants in group marriage. The emphasis among the members tends to be on personal growth, self-awareness, and extra-monogamous intimacy. While members of this structure tend to reject the monogamous nuclear family structure, they participate actively in most aspects of the larger culture.

Communes, by contrast with group marriages, often have an ideological base which leads to rejection of much of the larger culture. This ideology may be religious, political, or ecological; it frequently is a source of group identity and fosters collective commitment (B. Berger, Hackett and Millar, 1972). Some communes practice monogamy, some do not.
Social workers may seldom encounter members of communes or group marriages, because self-reliance and internal problem-solving are stressed in both structures. If members do seek help, however, social workers should be prepared to assess these potentially complex networks of relationships and to respond appropriately.

7. Other family forms

Several other types of family experiences of importance to social workers defy classification because of their unique characteristics.

Co-parenting describes two divorced parents who share child custody, an increasingly common court disposition. Social workers may be sought to help to delineate the complex network of rights and responsibilities growing out of this arrangement. Ideally in this situation each parent puts the needs of the children ahead of any power struggle or other unfinished agenda involving one's former spouse.

Foster families represent a variety of family structures which in addition have extra children as temporary members. About 250,000 children are served each year in the U.S. by these homes (Howerton, 1977). Since these relationships are by definition temporary, ambivalence and role ambiguity characterize the status of both the foster child and the participating family. Since the mean length of stay in foster care in the U.S. is four years (Howerton, 1977), both child and family may be in limbo a long time
before the relationship ends through adoption, return of the child to his/her biological family, or through reaching age of majority. In foster care situations, social workers frequently are asked by judges to assess families and to make recommendations which may last for years. Such responsibility demands the most recent and thorough professional education available regarding the special needs of foster children and the families who reach out to help them.

A double-nuclear family is formed when two couples and their children live as one psychosocial and economic unit. This author participated for five years in such an experience with two successive nuclear families, and at least 22 other double-nuclear families are functioning currently. Conceptually, this structure offers some of the benefits of a communal family without drastically increasing the number or complexity of relationships involved. Increased sibling interaction, more adult role models for children, and varied adult companionship provide a richer family experience in the double-nuclear structure. All of such families known to this writer practiced monogamous marital relations, based on legal marriages formed before joining the double-nuclear structure. While the number of participants in double-nuclear families is small, social workers should be aware that this is one more attempt to cope with some of the limitations of the traditional nuclear family.
Recent writers have discussed a range of interactional patterns for families in addition to the structures reviewed here thus far. These do not meet the definition of family used in this study because in each case more than one autonomous psychosocial-economic unit makes up the structure. They are mentioned for the purpose of illustrative contrast to the structures already described, and to further demonstrate attempts to adapt to the limitations of the nuclear family. Otto (1971) proposes "family clusters", a group of three to five families who would meet regularly for personal and family growth experiences and may share some family functions such as purchasing and child care.

Speck and Attneave (1973) suggest establishing "family networks" by selection of persons from neighborhood, church, place of employment, friends, or other sources, to provide mutual support on a regular basis. This structure could be particularly helpful in times of family emergency, since the structure would already be in place and could be mobilized quickly.

Ramey encourages the formation of "intimate networks" (1975) providing sexual availability beyond legally married couples in a manner similar to group marriage, but with a lesser degree of commitment.

Finally, Kempler (1976) thinks modern alternatives to extended family ties can be created by "adopting" persons from outside the family representing different stages of the life cycle.
To summarize, family compositional diversity includes the proliferating variety of structures in which individuals experience family life. Clearly the traditional nuclear family has not met many of the expectations persons have for family experience. Family specialists have been calling for social work educators to prepare practitioners who can appreciate the unique needs of differing families, and can assist in constructive problem-solving which grows out of that appreciation.

**Family Gender-Role Flexibility**

A third major area of non-traditional family content, in addition to familologic autonomy and compositional diversity, is family gender-role flexibility. 'Gender' rather than 'sex' is used here to indicate the author's assumption that most of this role behavior, other than reproduction itself, is learned behavior—not biologically based.

Meisel and Friedman (1974), Neale (1977), and Schwartz (1973) are social work educators who have recently attacked directly the issue of gender-role expectations in social work curriculum. Schwartz documented the stereotyping impact of concepts from neo-Freudian theory such as intrusive vs. receptive mode, penis envy, feminine identity, and sublimation. "Head of the house" and "role reversal" are examples of explicitly family terms which imply that there are gender-based 'right' ways for persons to act in families (Schwartz, pp. 67-69). Meisel and Friedman identified similar examples of material taught to social work students which
is, in the light of recent research, mythological. They described their successful experience with initiating an elective course to present a more open view of human behavior, based on recent biological and anthropological research and committed to the social work value of maximizing human functioning.

Neale's exploratory-descriptive research (1977) focused on characteristics of women's studies courses in both graduate and undergraduate programs in the U.S. She found that most of the 59 courses were offered as elective seminars under either human behavior or social work practice. Instructors reported primarily positive feedback from students, but experienced covert resistance from male faculty and administrators (p. 66).

What ought future social workers know about the current status of gender roles in families? Pleck (1977) thinks recognizing the complex nature of gender identity is a desirable beginning. Money and Ehrhardt (1972), after 15 years of research at Johns Hopkins University, identified 12 elements of adult gender identity. Six are physical, six are psychosocial (p. 3). The interaction of these elements from conception through adolescence is strongly shaped by patterns of family interaction. Rubin et al. (1974) and Biller (1971) found newborns vulnerable to stereotyping in hospital nurseries before they arrived at their new homes. Papanek (1969) and Entwisle and Greenberger (1972) found that in families where parents' roles were highly differentiated on the basis of gender, daughters and sons predicably held the same expectations for role
performance in their future marriages. The gender-role typing of families also tends to be reinforced by the schools (Mulawka, 1973) and by television (Long and Simon, 1974).

While the limiting and destructive impacts of stereotyping on women have been documented for some time, more recently Goldberg (1976) and Jourard (1971) emphasized the vulnerability of males which results from the pressures of their 'privileged' status—leading to an early death. The man's provider role has been a major source of pressure in some cases, leading to excessive investment of time in his employment.

In many families the division of labor is shifting. In 1977 47% of all married women were employed, including 41% of those who had children under six years of age (U.S. Census, p. 405, Table 659). Theory regarding power in families implies that one who earns an increasing portion of the family's income will also play a larger role in family decisions (Lipman-Blumen, 1976). Scanzoni (1976) found that female employment gave the wife a larger say in fertility decisions. Wives also frequently expect husbands to become more involved with their children and with housework after the wives are employed.

No doubt many families are able to negotiate their own changes in role expectations. Some, however, will seek the assistance of social workers in sorting out the meaning of changes in their lives (Duhl, 1976). How well have practitioners done in dealing
with gender-role problems? Fischer et al. (in "Special Issue on Women," 1976, pp. 428-433) found that social workers tend to have some bias toward clients which is based on gender, leading to more positive responses toward female clients. That study did not specifically examine worker involvement with gender-role problems, however. Broverman et al. (1970) found extensive evidence of gender stereotyping which resulted in female clients being perceived as being less capable, more passive, less able to make decisions, and less mature. Walum (1977, pp. 95-97) cited the continuing influence of Parsons's instrumental and expressive roles (1955) as a problem for professionals attempting to help individuals with their family role expectations. Gingras-Baker (1976) found the professional literature to have little value in counseling couples regarding gender roles. Sherman (1976) found systems theory to be useful, recognizing that as the role of one person in the family changes, the others will also adapt in response to that change. Wetzel (1976) found the feminist movement to be offering a positive stimulus to social work, raising questions which may raise anxiety currently but will lead to long-term growth in families.

Writers on education regarding family gender roles seem to agree that several types of learning must take place if students are to be prepared for effective practice. First, students need to be exposed to current thinking and research regarding gender,
including its implications for family functioning. Without an adequate conceptual and factual base, growing out of recent research, students will tend to ground their practice in the stereotypes which have influenced curriculum in the past. In the second place, students need opportunities and encouragement—and confrontation if necessary—to explore their own socialization for gender roles. These affectively oriented learning experiences tend to raise issues about instruction rather than curriculum content, and are therefore not explored further at this point.

**Family Ethnic Diversity**

The fourth and final major area of non-traditional family content explored in this literature review pertained to the impact of ethnicity on family life. The scope of the term "family ethnic diversity" could vary widely, depending on the writer. In this review, the boundaries of this concept are limited to the five minority groups which the Council on Social Work Education has recognized as experiencing particularly harsh discrimination in the U.S.—Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Native Americans, and Asian Americans.

1. **Overview**

Paradigms for viewing majority-minority relations in the U.S. have changed significantly during the past two decades. The Civil Rights struggle of the 1960s, led primarily by Blacks during its
earlier stages, generated a new confidence in claiming the guarantees of the U.S. Constitution. A by-product was a heightened sense of pride in minority-group membership, and discovery of positive aspects in situations which the majority culture had previously defined as negative. The 'melting pot' metaphor, suggesting that minorities ought to lose at least part of their uniqueness in the process of becoming Americans, was replaced by the goal of active acceptance of (or at least toleration of) cultural pluralism ("Ethnicity and Social Work," 1972' Norton, 1978; Sanders, 1975). In spite of this ideological shift, racism continues to be a major problem in our country, directly affecting the family life of minority persons. Social workers serve many of these ethnic families, but critics have said that curriculum revision is needed to deal adequately with the problems confronting such families.

With regard to social work curriculum, Sanders (1975) identifies three major goals concerning ethnic diversity:

1) each minority student should have opportunity for in-depth knowledge about his/her own group

2) every student should acquire knowledge and understanding regarding the major ethnic groups in American society, and

3) one interested in becoming a minority-problem specialist should be given the encouragement and educational resources to pursue that goal
Five Task Forces were established by the Council on Social Work Education to assist schools of social work in revising the ethnic content they were teaching. Reports by the Task Forces were published in 1973 (Francis; Mackey; Miranda; Murase; Ruiz). Each of the five groups identified family life as one of the special areas of knowledge needed for competent social work practice in minority communities.

While there is much variance within and among ethnic groups, family life and commitments for ethnic groups tend to have common differences from the majority culture. These differences, distilled from the vast literature of family sociology and social work education, are:

1) Survival (collective self-defense) has been a major concern.

2) The extended family has served as an important buffer against the hostile environment in a way that the nuclear family probably could not have, due to its more-limited resources and flexibility.

3) Older family members seem to generally have higher social status in minority families than they do in the majority culture.

4) Self-help has been stressed, meaning dependence on the extended family and the neighborhood to meet needs, rather than on formal organizations such as social service agencies.

5) The average number of children per family is greater.

6) A functional (rather than legal) view is held of some social roles, especially male roles such as father or uncle. One who relates to a child as an uncle is an uncle, whether a blood relationship exists or not.
7) Ethnic identity includes an acute awareness that one is different from members of the majority white, Anglo, European society.

In addition to these general descriptions of ethnic family life, some more specific aspects are now presented.

2. Black families

Income differentials are a major fact of life for Black families in the U.S. In 1977 the white median family income was $16,782; for Blacks, it was $9,485, or 56% of the white level. This represents a worsening of the relative position of Black families collectively, since their income was 61% of the white figure in 1975 (U.S. Census, p. 457, Table 738).

The percentage of one-parent Black families is relatively stable (41% in 1977; U.S. Census, p. 44, Table 57), but more solo parents who used to be separated are recently getting divorced. This is assumed to reflect some improvement in the income level of Black women, making divorce affordable. Forty-two per cent of Black children under age 18 live with one parent (U.S. Census, p. 48, Table 65). As some Black solo parents are able to earn more income, they seem to be establishing separate families rather than living as part of an extended family.

Previously unnoticed strengths have been identified in Black families by Berger and Simon (1974), Billingsley (1968), English (1974), and Hill (1972). Martin (1975) and Yelder (1975) found
that grandparents still play important roles in Black family structures, even if they are not living three-generation families.

Chestang (1972, 1977) and Rainwater (1965) noted how the Black family has served as a nurturing environment for personhood, softening the impact of the hostile outside world.

Based on an empirical study of family therapy with Black families, Prater (1977) urged social workers to use a flexible application of the systems model, carefully exploring the relationship network to assess who should be included in therapy and in what combinations.

An adequate supply of resources regarding Black families has been developed for social work educators (Chunn, 1974; Davis, 1973; Dunmore, 1970; Francis, 1973; Goodman, 1974; Gunman, 1977; Norton, 1978; Robertson, 1970; Staples, 1973). The commitment to provide adequate space in the curriculum for this content is sometimes lacking. Faculty may view this content as being marginal, and therefore expendable. The search must continue for ways to motivate white students (Kagwa, 1976) and to convince faculty that learning about Black families is a necessity, not a luxury (Trader, 1974).

3. Chicano family life

The second-largest ethnic minority group in the U.S. is composed of persons of Mexican ancestry, known as Chicanos. About 6.5 million such persons make up over 3% of the population (U.S.)
Census, p. 32, Table 34). This group has not been victimized by systematic efforts to destroy family life which characterized the history of Blacks in this country. Strong, cohesive families have been characteristic of the Chicano population (Montiel, 1973; Maldonado, 1975), often including an extended family structure.

The divorce rate (per 1,000 married women aged 15-44) for Chicanos has been well below the national average, but recently has increased sharply, nearly doubling from 2.8 in 1973 to 5.0 in 1977 (U.S. Census, p. 41, Table 50). Increased family income, partly from increased female employment, seem to have shifted the balance of power away from husbands in young Chicano families, allowing the less-dependent wives to end unhappy marriages. The historically strong influence of the Roman Catholic Church is declining in some families as well, decreasing one of the external deterrents to divorce.

Little empirical research of Chicano families has been done by social workers, but Sotomayor's study of the role of grandparents (1973) confirmed what Chicano writers have said recently about the centrality of the family for Chicanos. To some extent, Chicanos are becoming acculturated to Anglo ways of living; generally, however, the extended kinship group is a strong source of support, control, and identity formation.

Effective social work practice with Chicano families, to summarize recent writers, must take into account:
1) the importance of the Spanish language both as a symbol of cultural identity and as a concrete tool necessary for adequate communication

2) the continuing—though selectively declining—
influence of the Roman Catholic faith

3) the status of faith healers (curanderos) as central figures in the delivery of health and mental health services

4) reluctance to get involved with formal social service systems due to inexperience, distrust, and long-standing emphasis on family self-reliance

5) chronic and pervasive consequences of institutional racism practiced against Chicanos in areas of education, housing, employment, and political participation (Mangold, 1972; Moore, 1970; Souflee, 1974)

4. Puerto Rican family

The 1.7 million Puerto Rican persons in the U.S. (U.S. Census, p. 32, Table 33) share some important characteristics with Chicanos. Historically, they experienced the consequences of Spanish colonial oppression and U.S. militarism. The Spanish language and the Catholic faith are still central in the lives of many (Fitzpatrick, 1971; Mizio, 1974). Their subjection to minority status and exposure to continuing institutional racism parallels that of Chicanos (Campos, 1974). The extended family is still a dominant force in shaping interpersonal commitments (Campos, Fitzpatrick, Longres, 1973; Ruiz, 1973).

Important contrasts with Chicanos also have been identified, however. Puerto Ricans in the U.S. maintain a special identification with, and attachment to, Puerto Rico ("the Island") as a
cultural and social homeland (Fitzpatrick, Longres). Many persons move rather freely between the Mainland (principally New York) and the Island.

Another significant contrast with Chicanos, beyond the cultural identification with Puerto Rico, is the fact that most Puerto Ricans in the U.S. are urban; Chicanos are primarily rural, living in the Southwest. Living in metropolitan centers such as New York and Chicago has resulted in the emergence of certain positive need-meeting structures. For example, the small neighborhood grocery store (bodega) tends to be an important source of information, friendship, advice and counseling, and credit. Living in large cities has included negative aspects too, however—dilapidated housing, inadequate health care, high living costs, and easy access to harmful drugs (Longres).

Families migrating from rural Puerto Rico to cities like New York tend to face severe cultural shock. Conditions in urban American particularly strain these families because men face drastically different role opportunities from those they were accustomed to earlier. Wives frequently find jobs more available than husbands to, giving the wife a new source of power in the family while threatening the strong sense of responsibility to support the family which the husband brought with him from Puerto Rico. Men find their daughters wanting to go out with boys unchaperoned as their peers do, but in Puerto Rico fathers would feel a sense of moral failure if they do not physically protect
their women. Men also experience a loss of self-respect (dignidad) if their family receives help from a social agency, because this is perceived as an indication of the family's inadequacy (Fitzpatrick). When families, particularly men, are feeling these stresses they also have less resources with which to adapt. Often some members of the extended family—the family's support system—remain behind in Puerto Rico. Younger adult members who are in the U.S. may be eager to abandon former family expectations in the process of becoming 'Americanized'.

Effective social work practice in these situations requires adequate knowledge of ethnic patterns and utmost sensitivity to the special concerns of those in distress. This is the challenge presently facing social work educators. Campos (1974), Longres (1973), and Mirando (1973) present resources to face that challenge.

5. Native American families

In 1977 there were 792,000 Native Americans in the U.S., with 52% of them concentrated in five states—Arizona, California, North Carolina, New Mexico, and Oklahoma (U.S. Census, p. 35, Table 39). Every ethnic group has regrettable events in its past, but none is more tragic than the 389 treaties (Farris, 1975, p. 41) the United States has unilaterally broken with 'the first Americans'. As with other groups reviewed earlier, Native Americans have found much of their strength to survive by drawing on the resources of their family relationships.
While the extended family exists to some extent among all five ethnic groups reviewed here, it probably is most prominent among Native Americans. Physical circumstances have been part of the explanation for this. Historically many of the tribes lived in small villages structured around kinship. Since the coming of enforced reservation life in the 1890s, Native American families have continued to live in close proximity to their kin. Unique to Native Americans is the tribal structure which further supports the extended family as a kind of 'extended extended family' (Locklear, 1972). This pattern of organization has served well to meet the needs of Native Americans, but the tribes have been unable to protect their members from the overwhelming impact of U.S. Government policy. Much poverty resulted from the disruption of Native American living patterns of the 19th century. Economic, political, and ecological problems seemed to increase with every new action taken by the Government. The past five years show some indications that greater tribal and family autonomy will be encouraged by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, creating a more favorable environment within which families can function.

During the period when "assimilation" of Native Americans was the policy goal, many children were removed from their parents and placed in boarding schools or foster homes (Good Tracks, 1973; La Roque, 1975; Beuf, 1977). This practice was supposed to prepare them for life away from the reservation in the Anglo majority
culture. Regretably, mis-educated social workers were at times involved in implementing such policies. More accurate understanding of, and appreciation for, Native American values in contemporary social work education can prevent such inhumanity from recurring. Resources prepared by Brennan (1972), Locklear (1972), and Mackey (1973) can assist in this process.

6. Asian American family

Of nearly two million Asian Americans, 68% are from three national groups—Japanese (591,000), Chinese (435,000) and Filipinos (343,000) (U.S. Census, p. 35, Table 39). The others have origins in the Pacific Islands. Over 80% of Asian Americans are concentrated in California and Hawaii.

As is the case in other ethnic groups, the extended family and a high level of respect for elders characterize family life among Asian Americans. The family structure is patriarchal, with the oldest men in the kinship group exercising the most authority (Kushida, 1976). A close tie exists between personal identity and family identity; many also maintain a clear national identification within the Asian community (Murase, 1973).

Racism and acculturation are two major sources of stress for Asian American families presently. In some respects, racist behavior against Asians has not been as brutal or as consistent as it has against other ethnic groups, but racism clearly is an important part of life for Asian Americans. The "Yellow Peril" period in American history, and the "relocation camps" for
Japanese during World War II are blatant examples of institutional racism which disrupted or ended the lives of many Asian Americans. As recently as 1971 the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation stated publicly that every Chinese person in the U.S. must be considered a potential threat to the nation's security (Murase, p. 7). Many Asian Americans thought that maintaining a low profile was the best way to minimize racist behavior against them. With increased assertiveness by other ethnic groups, however, Asian Americans have more actively identified racist practices, and worked to eliminate them. Murase stated (p. 1): "Yellow is not white... there is no way that yellow can be white. Asians have known appeasement and it is not equal participation; and tokenism is not equality." This new assertiveness, led by young Asian Americans, causes tension with elders in the family, who think younger Asians should be grateful for what opportunities they do have. These differences in perception and strategy regarding racism challenge the authority structure of the Asian American family.

Acculturation presents another challenge to the Asian American family. Like Puerto Rican men, Asian men find more power shifting to women, as women earn an increasing share of the family's income and seek the same equality sought by their non-Asian sisters. This pressure toward equality regardless of age or gender threatens the "face" (self-respect) of Asian American men (Conner, 1974; Kushida, 1976).
Asian American social work educators urge that all social work practitioners receive at least minimal exposure during their education to the history and culture of Asian Americans, including their family structures and dynamics (Kitano, 1971; Kushida; Murase). Even for social workers who will not have Asian American clients, knowledge about Asian Americans provides a useful basis for comparative study of the family functioning of other American ethnic groups.

To summarize, this literature review has explored what recent writers have said about the need for social work curriculum to include four types of non-traditional family content which are the major focus of this research—familogic autonomy, family compositional diversity, family gender-role flexibility, and family ethnic diversity. Based on this literature review, the author presents the following summary statements as a framework within which to view curriculum content regarding families:

1) The nuclear family, despite its limitations, is and will continue to be a central structure in American family life. Therefore, it should also continue to be included in the preparation of social workers.

2) Family life in the U.S. has always been diverse, and is becoming more so in several ways. Consequently, a range of knowledge about families and models for family life are needed to make possible social work practice which is truly responsive to the range of situations practitioners will encounter.
3) Knowledge about family diversity can, and should, serve three primary purposes in social work practice: (a) to lead to provision of effective direct services to families, (b) to promote changes in social policies, organizations, and institutions which are adversely affecting family life, and (c) to actively support policies which will strengthen family life or prevent the development of family problems.

4) With increasing specialization in masters-level social work education according to practice methods or target populations, the appropriate amount and kinds of family content for any given student will vary. Every student should, however, receive exposure to some family content in the required curriculum. (For example, every direct practitioner needs some knowledge of the impact of social policies and institutions on families, and every planner or researcher needs some knowledge about how families are affected by composition, racism, or gender roles.) Writers have said that the necessary minimum of content should include some knowledge about: (a) marriage and parenting as choices, (b) the impact of family composition on family functioning, (c) factors affecting the family's balance of power, and (d) the effect of racism on the family life of five ethnic groups, and their resources used to adapt to their social environment.

5) 'Knowledge about' family diversity is a necessary—but not a sufficient—condition for effective practice. Skill in creative application of knowledge is also essential. (For example, knowing that members of a reconstituted family may carry over problems from prior marriages does not mean one should assume that they will.)

6) Special elective courses should make available types of family content needed by some practitioners, but not by all (rural family; families with chronic problems of health, mental health, or developmental disabilities; Chicano, etc., families; foster or adoptive families; abusing families; family policy assessment; the family as a unit of study in research).
The eight hypotheses of this study are based on Tripodi's conceptualization of descriptive hypotheses (1974, pp. 50-57). The hypotheses in no way infer any cause-effect relationship; they merely are intended to suggest which dependent variables might be expected to occur more or less frequently with certain independent variables. Statistically, if an increase in one variable is likely to be accompanied by an increase in another variable, the two variables are said to be positively correlated. Conversely, if an increase in one is more likely to be accompanied by a decrease in the other, the relationship between the two variables is referred to as negatively correlated.

Hypotheses FA1 and FA2 grow out of literature (Edwards and Hoover, 1974; Movius, 1976; Veevers, 1975) suggesting that females tend to be more significantly affected by decisions about marriage and child-rearing, and would therefore have a greater stake in having familologic autonomy content in the social work curriculum.

Hypothesis FCD1 is based on literature (Cogswell and Sussman, 1974; Norton, 1978; Robertson, 1970; "The Second Experience", 1975) implying that there is more cultural and compositional diversity in urban areas than in less populated areas.

The rationale behind Hypotheses FGRF1 and FGRF2 is that females are more directly affected by a reduction in gender-related differentiation, and would therefore have a greater commitment to having gender-role flexibility expressed in the curriculum (Meisel and Friedman, 1974; Neale, 1977; M. Schwartz, 1973).
Hypotheses FED1, FED2, and FED3 assume that the amount of family ethnic diversity in a school's required master's curriculum may be correlated with the percentage of minority persons in the faculty, the student body, or in the population of the surrounding state. It seems logical that these groups might be positively correlated with more ethnic diversity content in the curriculum (Chunn, 1974; Longres, 1973; Mackey, 1973; Murase, 1973; Norton, 1978; Trader, 1974).
The principal purpose of this exploratory-descriptive research is to determine the amount of family content in masters-level social work curriculum. Specifically, what is the minimum amount of family content which every student is exposed to throughout the master's curriculum, regardless of the student's concentration? Of particular interest is the presence of four kinds of non-traditional family content which are the primary dependent variables in the study. Data were collected by doing a content analysis of the curriculum documents for required courses which schools of social work submitted to CSWE's Commission on Accreditation between July, 1974, and June, 1978.

As Bloom (1976) and others have pointed out, evaluation of the effectiveness of social work education is currently in the early stages of development. Effective social work education should ultimately have a positive impact on the behavior of clients served by the graduates of the educational program. Figure 2 shows the theoretical relationship this study assumes between effective education and effective practice.
Social work researchers are working toward developing measures to test the impact of each of these components on the events which follow it. At this early stage, however, it would be inappropriate to attempt to measure the impact of curriculum content on subsequent events until curriculum content itself has been identified, described, and measured. The scope of this study is one piece of curriculum content—family content in the required portion of master's programs.

This chapter of the dissertation presents the population studied, the sources of data and types of data collected, the procedures used, and the rationale underlying decisions made in conducting the research.

Sampled Population

While the design for this study was being developed in 1977, the Council on Social Work Education staff were contacted in New York to learn whether curriculum documents may be used for research purposes. They granted approval, pending written permission from the deans of each of the schools involved (discussed later in this
chapter under "Access to Data"). CSWE supplied the names of 38 schools whose master's programs were reviewed since 1974. Thirty schools were considered appropriate and granted permission for their documents to be used. These schools are not a sample in the usual sense (a selected proportion of an entire universe) but rather represent all of the schools which could be used from the identified universe (schools reviewed by the Commission on Accreditation, 1974-78).

Data were obtained on 13 independent variables for the 30 schools as follows:

1) Geographic location (GEOLOC) is defined by the four U.S. Census Divisions (see Appendix S, p. A30). Four categories are used so the cell frequencies would be large enough to perform data analysis procedures (Northeast, North Central, South, West).

2) Urbanism (URBANISM) measures the degree of urban character of the community in which the school is located, based on the size of the Standard Metropolitan Area (SMA) in which it is located (see Appendix F, p. A9).


4) Size of school is based on the number of second-year master's students (TOTMSWII) from data made available annually by the Council on Social Work Education (Shyne and Whitcomb, 1977).

5) Percentage of female faculty (PFEMFAC), based on full-time faculty reported by CSWE (Shyne and Whitcomb).

6) Percentage of female students (PFEDSWII) is based on statistics from CSWE (Shyne and Whitcomb).
7) Percentage of racial minority faculty (PRACFAC) was calculated from CSWE (Shyne and Whitcomb) data.

8) Percentage of racial minority students (PRACMSWII) also is based on CSWE statistics for second-year master's students.

9) Percentage of students concentrating in micro practice (PMICRO) represents combined second-year enrollment of students majoring in casework, direct service, clinical practice, generic practice, and group work (Shyne and Whitcomb).

10) Family specialization (FAMSPEC)—yes or no—was gotten from the school's accreditation materials. For names of concentrations considered to be family specializations, see Appendix 0, p. A19.

11) Year of initial accreditation (INITACR) is considered to be indicative of the age of the school's master's program, obtained from CSWE data (1977).

12) Year of most recent accreditation (RECACR) was also obtained from CSWE information (1977). This variable is considered important to control for possible differences in the recency of the curriculum documents analyzed.

13) Percentage of state minority population (STMINPOP) was obtained from U.S. Census data (p. 33, Table 35) by combining "Black" with "Other races" for each state.

Although curriculum documents were produced in different years (1974-77), descriptive data for the independent variables have been used from the same year for all schools. This decision was based on visual inspection of data from several years, indicating no major changes during the 1974-76 period. Since "year of most recent accreditation" is one variable analyzed, it can be used to control for variance in other data.
Sources of Curriculum Data

Given the decision to study family curriculum content from recently accredited schools of social work, what should the data be? What is the best available measure of curriculum input? Several possible groups of respondents were considered for a mailed questionnaire approach to data collection: instructors, sequence chairpersons, students, curriculum committee members, or deans. Each seemed to present some problems.

Social work instructors—and other human beings—have a notably poor record for returning questionnaires. In a recent use of mailed questionnaires for analysis of social work curriculum, Neale (1977) received a return of 29%. An additional problem is validity. Since some of the material regarding family is rather sensitive material (ethnicity, gender roles), instructors may be inclined to bias their responses to present their curriculum in the best light. An unobtrusive measure (Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, and Sechrest, 1966), such as anonymous examination of course syllabi, may be preferable in such a situation.

Sequence chairpersons generally have administrative responsibilities regarding curriculum, but may not know details about the courses they do not teach; deans are in a similar situation.

In the organizational structure of many schools, curriculum committee members make large-scale decisions about the general structure and goals of curriculum, but are not involved in the details regarding content. Even if they were somewhat responsible
for family content, completion of a questionnaire would likely be delegated to instructors directly involved in teaching such content.

Students were another potential source of curriculum data considered, but were rejected because of anticipated problems with sampling, administration of questionnaires, and a low rate of return.

Finally, curriculum documents themselves were considered to be the best source of data about curriculum content, incorporating the following advantages:

1) Availability—once permission was obtained from the deans, the documents present few obstacles to access or analysis

2) Completeness—since every school is required to produce them, there are no 'missing data'

3) Comparability—since all curriculum documents are prepared in response to the same guidelines, they are relatively similar in structure while varying in content

4) Unobtrusiveness—conducting the research has no impact on the phenomenon being studied, i.e., when instructors were preparing their course syllabi, they did not know that these documents would be used to measure what they are teaching about family life

The use of curriculum documents also poses some potential disadvantages which must be addressed, however. First, they may be biased to present the curriculum inaccurately because of the crucial significance of accreditation for the school. There are several responses to the issue of bias. Any source of data is
somewhat vulnerable to this problem, but the unobtrusive nature of content analysis makes it less vulnerable than some other research methodologies. Furthermore, in the accreditation process curriculum documents are not an isolated phenomenon. Schools are aware that their documents will be read by several members of the Commission on Accreditation, that a site visit team must substantiate their contents, and that the documents are subject to the deliberations of the entire Commission. CSWE has clearly indicated (1971b, 1971c) that course syllabi are considered to be contractual agreements between faculty and students, and that they should accurately reflect the content being taught. Ultimately this matter depends on the ethical commitment of the faculty—as individual instructors, as committees, and as a whole—to generate relevant curriculum, and to reflect that curriculum accurately in their course syllabi.

In addition to bias, a second potential criticism of accreditation documents is that in some cases they do not represent the most current data. If one assumes that some change is occurring in curriculum, then the syllabus from the most recent offering of a course would seem to be the most accurate source of data. While this criticism has merit, there is evidence that curriculum does not change rapidly (Foster, 1971), and the documents used in this research are the most recent available through CSWE, none more than five years old. In this situation, some minimal compromise of recency seems justified in order to gain increased availability and completeness.
A third criticism of the use of course syllabi may be that they underrepresent some types of content which are covered in the classroom (e.g. non-traditional family content). In response to this, CSWE expects that syllabi be not only accurate, but also reasonably detailed in their portrayal of course content. To be sure, not every course is expected to include every type of content. The primary concern of CSWE, as reflected in the Commission on Accreditation, is whether the required courses as a total package meet the minimum standards of preparation for practice. Schools of social work are encouraged to move creatively and vigorously beyond the minimum standards. The purpose of accreditation, however, is to assure that every graduate reaches the minimum level of knowledge and competence.

A fourth and final criticism of course syllabi as a source of data about course content is that syllabi vary from instructor to instructor within a given school, yet only one syllabus per course is generally supplied to CSWE. This is a problem in instruction for schools as well as a measurement problem for researchers. In different sections of a required course, how much freedom should instructors have to determine course content? There is a tension between the specific goals the school has for all sections of that course on the one hand and flexibility for the interests and strengths of the individual instructor on the other hand. Since this research is concerned only with required courses, it assumes
that schools have developed a structure which assures coverage of crucial concepts in all sections of a course, while allowing for the creativity of individual instructors.

To conclude, the decision was made to use course syllabi from CSWE as the source of data regarding family content because, despite the limitations of these documents, they provide greater availability, completeness, comparability, and unobtrusiveness than other potential sources of data.

Access to Data

Obtaining the data for this research involved two types of access—legal and physical. Accreditation materials are housed in the CSWE Archives, located at 345 East 46th Street, New York. The Executive Director of CSWE agreed to make the documents available if each of the individual schools involved would give its permission. CSWE staff supplied the names of 38 schools whose master's programs were reviewed by the Commission on Accreditation between July, 1974 and June, 1978. In October, 1977, a letter was sent to each of the 38 deans or directors asking permission to analyze the documents for the required courses in the school's master's program (see Appendix B, p. 161). Two copies of a Research Authorization Form (Appendix C, p. 162) were enclosed, one to be signed and returned and the other to be retained by the school.
By November 10, all except seven schools had responded by mail. The remaining seven deans were contacted by telephone, so that a response was obtained from all 38 schools in the universe covered by the research.

Thirty schools granted permission for legal access to their curriculum materials and were found to meet the criteria of the study. Two schools were eliminated from the study because it was learned that their programs did not receive accreditation when reviewed by the Commission.

Three schools were eliminated because their course syllabi had not been prepared since 1974. Although these schools had been reviewed by the Accreditation Commission since 1974 (and hence were on the list of 38), their review was a Mandatory Review, not a full accreditation review. Mandatory Review does not involve presentation of course syllabi; it occurs when a school which received marginal accreditation is required to report to the commission that it has made progress on its problem areas. Since the most recent curriculum documents on file with CSWE had been prepared prior to 1974, these three schools were considered not to meet the criteria established for the research.

Three schools refused to grant permission to have their documents included in the research. One school reported being subject to a university-wide policy which prohibited the sharing of any accreditation materials with any person or organization outside the university. The reasons for this policy were not disclosed. A
second school reported such a deluge of requests for participation in research that all requests are being refused. It was explained that this requires no time or other cost to the school other than the returning of the form signed by the dean, but the refusal persisted.

One dean supplied a written refusal, arguing that the scope of the research was too broad and ill-defined:

I have difficulty with researchers who are interested in a wide variety of substantive content like, content regarding "women"; content regarding racial minorities; content regarding grieving and preparation for death...I am concerned, not because our school may or may not have this content, but because I think it is important for all of us in the profession to be in touch more clearly with respect to what we are looking for and in reporting it.

Repeated attempts were made to contact this dean by telephone. When he declined to return calls, this school needed to be eliminated from the study.

Once legal access to the materials was established for 30 schools, physical access was arranged through the CSWE staff. Temporary office space was arranged for the author at CSWE Archives in New York, and the most recent self-study documents for the 30 schools were pulled from the Archives. Materials for required courses were identified and photocopied. Actual analysis of the course syllabi was done at The Ohio State University.
Data Collection Technology

Content analysis (CA) was the method used to collect the data regarding family content in curriculum. Pioneered several decades ago by Berelson (1952) and Pool (1959), this technology is grounded in the communication theory of persons such as Chomsky (1968) and Whorf (1961) who say that all messages have six elements corresponding to six questions about the message: source (who?), encoding process (why?), channel (how?), message itself (what?), decoding process (with what effect?), and recipient (to whom?) (Holsti, 1969, p. 25).

Numerous definitions for content analysis have been developed. Holsti's will be used in this research (1969, p. 25): "Content analysis is a research technique used for making inferences about verbal communication by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages."

The application of the communication-theory paradigm through content analysis in this research is schematically represented by Figure 3 (p. 74).

1. Content analysis theory and literature

Some social research theory classifies research methodologies into either qualitative or quantitative types. Given this kind of differentiation, content analysis can be described most accurately as a 'hybrid' technology. It is qualitative in the sense that it involves making many judgments about semantic differences, based
"Content analysis is any technique... for making inferences... by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages."

Source: Holsti, p. 25.

FIGURE 3

CONTENT ANALYSIS AS VIEWED BY COMMUNICATION THEORY, APPLIED IN THIS STUDY
on a previously designed, tightly conceptualized classification system. Content analysis is quantitative, since it involves systematic coding and counting of units of content, resulting in data which can be analyzed using interval-level statistics.

Holsti (p. 26) identified three purposes for doing content analysis: to describe characteristics of messages, to draw inferences about the causes of messages, and to evaluate the effects of messages. Describing characteristics of messages, the most conservative of the three, is the purpose of this research; this has been the most frequent reason for using CA in the social and behavioral sciences (Carney, 1972).

The steps involved in doing content analysis parallel those of other kinds of social research. The variables are defined conceptually, then operationalized in a set of categories based on that conceptual framework. Budd (1967, p. 39) stressed the importance of the categories in the research process:

No content analysis is better than its categories, for a system or set of categories is, in essence, a conceptual scheme...Categories form a crucial link between the actual counting or measuring and the larger fields of theory and concept.

The categories ought to be exhaustive, including a coding possibility for every unit of material to be analyzed. They should also be mutually exclusive, offering one and only one best category for every unit to be coded.

After categories have been developed, the unit of analysis and recording unit are defined. The unit of analysis, as in most
research, is defined as the entity which is the focus of attention in the research, or what constitutes one case in the population (in this research, the curriculum documents for the required courses of one school are a unit of analysis). A recording unit is the smallest component the material is divided into for the purposes of counting and categorizing. In this study the recording unit is called a "thought unit", defined and discussed later in this chapter under "Unitizing".

When material within the universe of a proposed content analysis is too extensive for all of it to be analyzed, a sampling strategy is developed to obtain data from a representative portion of the material. In this research it was feasible to analyze all the material in the defined, available universe; therefore, a sampling strategy was not needed.

After the structure of a content analysis has been developed—the research question, the categories, the units, and the sampling—a pretest is desirable to discover any problems which were not anticipated in the design of the research. Modifications can be made before data are collected from the full-scale analysis.

Two perennial research issues—validity and reliability—are now discussed in the context of this study. Since reliability is usually considered a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for validity, it will be discussed first.

Reliability is understood here to mean that repeated measures with the same set of categories on a given sample of content should
yield similar results. Holsti (pp. 135-142) expressed the consensus of content analysts that the two major concerns are individual reliability and category reliability. When multiple judges are used, the amount of agreement reflected in their decisions is termed inter-judge reliability, and is thought to be a function of the skill and experience of the judges, and the ambiguity of the material being analyzed. Since all the materials were analyzed by one judge in this research, inter-judge reliability was not a significant issue. Category reliability tends to depend on the clarity of the conceptual definitions (and hence, the categories), the specificity of the coding rules, and the ambiguity of the material. Pretesting was done (described later in this chapter) to address this issue, producing results which were well above the .90 reliability coefficient generally agreed to be acceptable (Berelson, p. 172). The minor modifications in the set of categories which did result from the pretesting are also described later.

Validity is usually defined as the extent to which a set of categories measures what it is intended to measure. Holsti (pp. 142-149) identified four types of validity—content, construct, concurrent, and predictive.

Content validity, sometimes known as face validity, has been the most important type for content analysts. Holsti (p. 143) considered content validity to be a sufficient criterion if the purpose of the research is to describe characteristics of messages—
as is true for this research—rather than to draw inferences about the causes of, or effects of, messages. Content validity is developed by having referents for the categories clearly delineated, and by assuring that the categories as a whole are both comprehensive and mutually exclusive.

Construct validity depends on how adequately the set of categories is informed by the relevant theoretical literature underlying the research problem. When construct validity is present, the findings of the research will be consistent with previously validated knowledge in that field of study. In this research an effort was made to develop categories in close relationship with the conceptual literature regarding families from a broad spectrum, including several disciplines, and from current descriptive data regarding family life in the U.S. Although construct validity is more crucial in evaluative or experimental research than it is in exploratory studies such as this one, an effort was made to tie the variables into current family theory.

Concurrent validity is established by obtaining confirmation of one's findings from a source independent of the system of categories. In a general sense, CSWE curriculum documents receive concurrent validity from site visit teams and Commission on Accreditation deliberations, though there is no special focus on family content by these independent bodies.

The fourth and final type of validity—predictive—is confirmed by data which can forecast future events. Predictive
validity is important in experimental research; it is not related to the purpose of this study and would be inappropriate, given the early stage of development of research in social work curriculum content (refer to Figure 2, p. 63).

These, then, are the reliability and validity issues regarding content analysis generally, and this study in particular. Category reliability and construct validity were addressed through pre-testing. Content validity was approached primarily through careful development of exhaustive and mutually exclusive categories. The remaining issues are peripheral to the kind of content analysis done in this research.

The literature about the use of content analysis which is relevant to this study focused on three areas: 1) direct practice with clients, 2) non-direct social work practice, and 3) curriculum materials. These will be summarized briefly.

Regarding direct practice with clients, Dollard and Mowrer (1947) conducted the earliest known research using content analysis. They used case records to develop a Distress-Relief Quotient which had some value in predicting decrease in client anxiety level and subsequent benefit from casework intervention. Using descriptions caseworkers wrote about sessions with clients, Hunt and Kogan (1952) created a Movement Scale to be used by member agencies of the Family Service Association of America. Auld and Murray (1955) found mixed results when they attempted to measure success in therapy from
analysis of case records, primarily because of difficulty in arriving at a clear definition of 'success'. Client definition of problems was the main concern of Ripple and Alexander (1956), who analyzed transcripts of client's narrative statements. Psathas, Cleeland, and Heller (1966) have been working toward computerized analysis of therapy interviews using their specially prepared dictionary. Hollis (1972) developed a system (six types) of casework activities, then attempted to measure how frequently each occurred in practice, analyzing case records. Reid and Shyne (1969) analyzed the content of audio tapes to assess the styles and techniques of social workers, and to differentiate between the outcomes of long- and short-term casework. To summarize these studies using content analysis to measure direct practice, one can say that some degree of success has been achieved. Problems in these studies seem related more to the persistent difficulties of empirically validating direct practice, rather than to content analysis as a research method. What elements constitute success, and how are they to be empirically identified? These are conceptual issues which transcend any particular research technology.

A second area of content analysis research by social workers involves non-direct practice. Three investigators focused on the conceptual literature about social work practice. Fatout (1975) analyzed eight textbooks and seven doctoral dissertations centering on defining social work practice. Lewis (1974) concentrated on the relationship between knowledge and values in the major practice
journals, using William Gordon's framework. Hinchman (1977) examined a purposive sample of 130 articles from 1947-1973 about clinical practice with children and youth. The emphasis of content analysis on semantic differentiation helped each of these three investigators to sharpen definitions of social work practice in their respective areas—a continuing need within the profession.

Baldi (1971) and Abbot (1977) explored the productivity of social work research reflected in doctoral dissertations, from 1920-1968 and 1960-1974 respectively. Baldi found that only 7% of social work dissertations deal with social work education, indicating the need for more work in this area. Abbot concluded that content and methods of dissertations changed little during a 14-year period, with graduates of larger programs tending to do field studies and smaller programs producing more experimental designs.

In the policy-making area of practice, Hunter (1972) used CA to examine the efforts of religious groups to influence Federal policy regarding poverty during 1964-1971. Moss (1972) observed how an interprofessional task force formed mental health policy. He used CA to study minutes of meetings and to analyze the work of the task force as presented in newspapers.

Interested in what is presented to the public about family life, Rosenblatt and Phillips (1975) measured the content of family articles in current popular magazines. They identified strengths in these presentations as well as areas of suggested change.
In summarizing the use of content analysis in non-direct practice activities, one can say that these studies have led to some improvement in the clarity of conceptual definitions of practice, and have contributed to understanding the role of communication in influencing public policy.

The third and final use of content analysis relevant to this study pertains to curriculum materials in education for the professions. Among the earliest efforts was the system for classifying medical curriculum content generated by Rosinski and Wyndham (1962), as a way of assuring breadth and depth in the learning of students. In 1965, Rodman completed a somewhat loosely structured content analysis of family sociology textbooks, concluding that there was a wide range of books available to meet the content needs of nearly any set of course objectives. Geissler (1974), a nursing educator, attempted an evaluation of the educational objectives for an entire curriculum, using the cognitive taxonomy of Benjamin Bloom (1956) and the affective taxonomy of Krathwohl (1964). She developed a rationale for clear educational objectives as a necessary antecedent to selection of appropriate course content. Sanders and Cunningham (1973) supported this view also.

Two publications by social work educators have dealt with CA. Upham (1967) used the term content analysis to refer to her work in building four courses in human behavior and the social environment. The description of her activities indicated, however, that she did not collect empirical data, but was merely concerned that
curriculum content be selected in a deliberate manner. Neale (1977) in an exploratory-descriptive study investigated women's studies as an area of social work curriculum. Requests for course materials mailed to instructors resulted in a return rate of 29%. Most women's studies courses were taught by one female instructor, as elective seminars under social work practice or human behavior and the social environment.

The theoretical issues and the literature about content analysis relevant to this study have been reviewed. The remainder of this chapter describes procedures followed in collecting the data.

2. Boundary decisions

In approaching the curriculum materials of each school, four levels of decision-making were required which resulted in including or excluding material from certain classifications. Since this study includes only required (or core) curriculum the boundaries for that differentiation needed to be determined. Second, materials for all required courses were divided into five sequences, corresponding to the five types of content required by CSWE (see Appendix R, pp. 183-188). This required the delineation of another set of boundaries. Third, the course material for each sequence was divided into thought units through a process called unitizing. Finally, each unit needed to be categorized according to type of thought unit. Each of these four levels of decision-making are now discussed.
As was indicated in Chapter 1 (p. 20), the composition and the location of core or required curriculum is a major controversy in social work education. Since 1971 the CSWE guidelines for required content have been more flexible than they were earlier. This made the task of delineating boundaries for required curriculum difficult in a few instances, though for most schools the structure was clear. Two situations which needed to be dealt with were advanced standing and mandatory options.

If a school offered advanced standing through a waiver or a testing-out procedure, how can one handle the research implications of that possibility? In this research it was assumed that if a student could test out of a required course, that examination procedure would approximate the actual course nearly enough that one could safely infer the student's prior exposure to the content of the course itself.

Mandatory options are another issue for the research design. Students in some schools may choose from several courses to fulfill a requirement. To handle this possibility, a decision tree was devised to guide the boundary-making process. It assumes that an MSW student interested in working primarily with families would choose according to the following pattern, from options which may be available:
This model accommodates all the required choices which were encountered in the 30 schools of social work included in the research.

With the boundaries of required curriculum settled, the next level of decision-making involved dividing the materials for the required courses into five sequences: human behavior and the social environment (HBSE), social work practice, social policy, social work research, and field instruction. Again, it was usually clear into which sequence a course should be placed. Since CSWE accreditation standards require each school to include these five kinds of educational experiences, the self-study documents usually indicated which types of content the course is intended to provide, even for the less orthodox schools. In instances when there was uncertainty about the classification of a course, the following
functional criteria were applied to determine the preponderant focus of the course:

1) HBSE -- theoretical explanations regarding the individual or collective behavior of humans, including typical and atypical patterns of interaction with the physical and social environment

2) Policy -- currently used definitions of social problems or needs, goals set to change current situations in a desirable direction, programs designed to address these goals, and issues in the delivery and administration of services which make them continuous, accessible, integrated, and adequate

3) Practice -- characteristics of a profession, identification of the purposes, values, ethics, knowledge, and skills associated with social work as a profession, recognition of historical and current sources of community support for the profession, organizational arrangements in which practitioners function

4) Research -- systematic application of the scientific method to the study of situations in order to assess needs, evaluate programs, or develop new knowledge

5) Field -- direct participation in practice situations with client systems in order to apply and further develop professional skills

Initially course materials from all five sequences were analyzed. After coding the materials for ten schools and finding essentially no family content in the research and field sequences (3 TUs of 6,704, or 0.04%), data were collected only for HBSE, policy, and practice.
3. Coding procedures

Unitizing and categorizing are the two phases of the coding process. Unitizing consists of developing and applying rules about the boundaries of recording units—the smallest units into which the material is divided for the purpose of measurement. Recording units can be as small as single words or as large as entire books. In this research the recording unit is the "thought unit", borrowed from Bales (1970, p. 114-115), and defined as "any communication of sufficient length to permit the other person to interpret in, and so react in relation to its content." This relatively small recording unit was chosen for curriculum content because it is small enough to be quite sensitive but large enough to be free from the constraints of single-word coding.

Unitizing rules are of two types: inclusion rules and division rules. Inclusion rules specify kinds of material to be counted after larger boundaries have been determined (curriculum sequences, in this case). The following kinds of content were counted in this research:

1) course titles
2) course descriptions
3) narrative description or discussion of sequence or courses
4) course objectives
5) course outlines
6) assigned readings -- books (including texts), articles, chapters of books, or other specific assignments
7) charts and diagrams -- can usually be coded like an outline or as a series of interacting concepts
8) study questions
9) mandatory choice -- (e.g. "Each student shall select an article dealing with family planning issues in social work practice.")
10) assignments
Items not included in the analysis are:

1) course numbers
2) time, place, or frequency of class meeting
3) instructors' names, rank, or other identifying information
4) name of school
5) procedural information (e.g. "Assignment due during tenth week."
6) general headings ("Course Plan and Requirements", "Introduction", "Classroom Activities", "Unit 1")
7) prerequisites
8) ambiguous or indefinite information ("20-minute presentation by Kelley", "content to be determined by class")

Division rules guide the segmenting of the included material in preparation for categorizing, such as:

1) Multiple adjectives modifying a subject do not usually create additional thought units; multiple direct objects do create additional thought units.

2) Parenthetic expressions following a subject or direct object intended as an example or elaboration are unitized as part of the same thought unit as their antecedent.

3) Conjunctions usually divide two thought units (since, but, because, unless, and, by, until, that, however, which, if).

4) A separate thought unit usually is not created by an appositive, a participial phrase, or a restrictive clause; a nonrestrictive clause may create a separate unit.

Figure 5 (p. 89) illustrates the unitizing process as applied to rather complex sentence taken from a course syllabus in one school's social work practice sequence.

Categorizing is the last level of decision-making in this content analysis. It consists of assigning each thought unit which
The goals of this course are to teach students an integrated approach to the practice of social work and to enable them to develop broad-based competence which permits versatility in the choice and application of interventive methods.

FIGURE 5
AN EXAMPLE OF A COMPLEX SENTENCE UNITIZED INTO THREE THOUGHT UNITS
has been unitized, to one of nine categories on the Data Recording Sheet (see Appendix E, p. 167). The categories are, from left to right:

1) Familic Autonomy — already defined, one of the four major dependent variables in this study, see examples in Appendix H, p. 171

2) Compositional Diversity — also already defined, and a major dependent variable, see Appendix G, p. 170

3) Family Gender-Role Flexibility — likewise, Appendix I, p. 172

4) Non-Family Gender-Role Flexibility — thought units which reflected gender-role flexibility but did not specifically relate to family life were placed here; see Appendix J, p. 173

5) Family Ethnic Diversity — the fourth major dependent variable, illustrated by Appendix K, p. 174

6) Non-Family Ethnic Diversity — any thought units which demonstrated ethnic diversity but did not pertain to family life were coded here; see Appendix L, p. 175

7) Other Non-Traditional Family Content — family content which communicated some special focus beyond the traditional nuclear family but did not reflect one of the four identified dependent variables was coded here; this category was created during the pretesting phase of the research, and examples are in Appendix M, p. 176

8) Traditional Family Content — all thought units which either affirmatively identified with the nuclear family, or were family content that did not affirmatively communicate some non-traditional aspect of family life, belonged here; see Appendix N, p. 177

9) Other — any thought unit which did not affirmatively meet the conditions for some other category was classified here; this category received the most thought units because of the relatively small percentage of family content in the whole social work curriculum.
The actual process of categorizing each thought unit was a series of binary (yes or no) decisions, as demonstrated schematically in Figure 6 (p. 92).

4. Pretesting and data collection

Before the content analysis was begun, three schools were selected randomly from the group of 30. All the curriculum materials for these three schools were photocopied (a second set), and a pretest was done by analyzing the two sets of documents with a two-week interval between to allow for any carry-over from the prior analysis. The results were then compared for reliability. Ninety-seven pages of material (2,503 thought units) were involved from the three schools. A total of 11 discrepancies were found between the two sets of documents. Four clerical errors occurred, resulting in plus or minus one thought unit in the tabulating for four of the pages. Seven judgment discrepancies were observed, five involving unitizing decisions, and two related to categorizing. This resulted in an overall reliability coefficient of .9956. While content analysts agree that selecting an acceptable reliability level is somewhat arbitrary (Budd, 1967, p. 68; Holsti, 1969, p. 142), a reliability coefficient above .90 has been considered acceptable by those who have taken a position on the issue (Berelson, 1952; Budd, 1959; Carney, 1972; Hollis, 1972; Holsti, 1969; Pool, 1959; Reid and Shyne, 1969). Therefore, the category definitions and the coding rules were considered sufficiently reliable to be used for the analysis itself.
ENTER THOUGHT UNIT

Family content?  No  Coded "Other"
    Yes
Familologic Autonomy?  Yes  Coded "Familologic Autonomy"
    No
Family Compositional Diversity?  Yes  Coded "Family Compositional Diversity"
    No
Family Gender-Role Flexibility?  Yes  Coded "Family Gender-Role Flexibility"
    No
Family Ethnic Diversity?  Yes  Coded "Family Ethnic Diversity"
    No
Traditional Family Content?  Yes  Coded "Traditional Family Content"
    No
Coded "Other Non-Traditional Family Content"

FIGURE 6
DECISION TREE FOR CATEGORIZING THOUGHT UNITS
Pretesting resulted in the creation of three additional categories for more comprehensive and detailed differentiation of TUs. "Other Non-Traditional Family Content" (see p. 90, no. 7) was added to tabulate innovative types of family content found in the syllabi which were not affirmatively identified with one of the four primary kinds of non-traditional family content. "Non-Family Gender-Role Flexibility" was generated to keep an accounting of content observed in syllabi which clearly reflected gender-role flexibility but could not be affirmatively identified as family content (see p. 90, no. 4, and Appendix J, p. A14). A similar category was added for "Non-Family Ethnic Diversity" (see p. 90, no. 6, and Appendix L, p. 175) for ethnic diversity content which could not be affirmatively called family content. These categories were added after the pretest because the few coding discrepancies during the pretest due to categorizing seemed to indicate that the system of categories, while being mutually exclusive, was not sufficiently comprehensive.

Unitizing rules used for the collection of data were the same as those used for the pretest (see p. 87, 88). Categorizing rules were modified slightly from the pretest, consisting of the following:

1) A list of anchoring terms, developed before and during the pretest, were available for each category which were assumed, on the basis of face validity, to represent that kind of family content (e.g. one-parent family for Compositional Diversity). Any terms
reflecting that kind of content and differing conceptually from all the anchoring terms on the list, were added to the list during the data-collection process.

2) The principle of affirmative identification was followed throughout; that is, unless a thought unit clearly meets the necessary and sufficient conditions for inclusion in a particular category, it was coded in a less-specific category, such as "Other".

3) If the meaning of a thought unit was not clear from the TU itself, the TUs immediately preceding and following were consulted. If the meaning still was not clear, the next TU before and after were considered. If this process did not clarify the meaning of the thought being categorized, it was coded as "Other". In nearly all cases, however, the TU immediately preceding and following provided sufficient context.

4) If a thought unit met the requirement for two categories (e.g. gender roles in minority families) it was coded in the category which most differentiated it from the other material surrounding it. This was done to achieve maximum identification and differentiation in the coding process.

5) In differentiating family content from growth and development content, family content needed to focus on the interaction between individuals and those who constituted their family. This would include, for example, the significance of parents or socialization of the child; it would not include the importance of prenatal care or aspects of physical growth and development.

The actual analysis of each page of course material consisted of three steps. First, the material was unitized, following the unitizing rules. Second, each thought unit was categorized and immediately a mark was made in the proper column on the Data Recording Sheet, except that "Other" thought units were not recorded immediately because of their high frequency. Third, the
thought units for the entire page were counted and the ones in specialized categories were subtracted, to arrive at the total for "Other" TUs. That figure was then recorded, and the coding of that page had been completed.

One Data Recording Sheet was used per sequence. After all the material had been coded for a sequence, the various kinds of content were totaled at the bottom of the sheet. Later these figures were transferred directly to FORTRAN sheets to be key-punched to IBM cards for computerized data analysis.

Chapter 4 reports the results of the analysis.
IV. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The findings of this research are presented in three sections. The first includes descriptive data regarding the schools of social work included in the study. The second section provides data about the overall amount of family content found during the content analysis, and provides some separate analysis of the traditional family content identified. The final section of this chapter deals with the four types of non-traditional family content which constituted the major dependent variables in the research.

Description of Schools of Social Work

The 30 schools of social work included in this study (see Appendix A, p. A1) are 36% of the 83 accredited schools in the United States. They were found to be representative of the population of accredited schools, though no inferences are made from the schools in this study to the total population of accredited schools. Descriptive univariate data for each of the 13 independent variables (see pp. 64 and 65 for definitions) are now presented; bivariate statistics (Pearson's $r$) are additionally supplied for the ten interval-level variables.
For the purpose of geographic location (GEOLOC) in this study, the four U.S. Census Divisions were used (see Appendix S, p. 189). Seven of the schools (23.3%) are located in the Northeast, and eight (26.7%) are in the North Central Division. Eleven schools (36.7%) are situated in the South, while the remaining four (13.3%) are in the West. This distribution is representative of the population of accredited schools (p<.01).

The size of city in which schools in the study are located (URBANISM) was determined by the Standard Metropolitan Area (SMA) Census data for 1975. While this is interval-level data, it was grouped into four categories as shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Size*</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under .49 million</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5-.99 million</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1.99 million</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 million and over</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Regarding major source of funds (FUNDS), 20 schools (66.7%) were publicly supported and 10 (33.3%) received primarily private income. While this was coded as a dichotomous variable, funding
is frequently a combination of a variety of types. This was not
explored further because of the difficulty in obtaining data which
elaborate the details of university finances.

Size of school in this research is based on the number of
second-year master's students (TOTMSWII) enrolled. The mean
number of students is 103, with a range from 23 to 244. Bivariate
analysis indicates that the only other independent variables with
which school size is associated are size of city and age of the
master's program. Larger schools tend to be located in large
cities \( r = .38, p < .02 \), and also tend to have been initially
accredited (INITACR) earlier \( r = -.51, p < .002 \).

The percentage of female faculty (PFEMFAC) for the study
sample is 44.9, with a range of 21.0% to 70.7%. This percentage
approaches a significant association with percentage of racial
minority faculty \( r = .27, p < .07 \) and with percentage of female
students \( r = .32, p < .04 \).

The sixth independent variable analyzed is percentage of
female students (PFEMSWII). The mean percentage is 63.8, ranging
from 26.1% to 88.9%. This variable reflects a positive association
with percentage of female faculty (as indicated above) and with
percentage of racial minority population in the state where the
school is located \( r = .34, p < .03 \). Female students are positively
correlated with the age of the school's master's program \( r = .51,
p < .002 \); that is, programs with a high percentage of female students
tend to have been developed earlier than those with lower percentages of female students.

The mean percentage of racial minority faculty (PRACFAC) is 29.4, varying from 7.1% to 93.7%. Its positive associations with URBANISM and PFEMFAC have already been indicated. A very strong association also exists with percentage of racial minority students ($r = .86, p<.001$).

Percentage of racial minority students (PRACMSWII) shows a mean value of 22.3, fluctuating from 4.3% to 85.7%. The strong positive correlation of this variable with PRACFAC has been pointed out. It also has a positive association with the percentage of minority population in the state where the school is located ($r = .29, p<.06$).

Second-year students concentrating in micro practice (PMICRO) made up the eighth independent variable investigated. The mean percentage of such students in schools included in the sample is 60.6. This characteristic was negatively associated with recency of accreditation ($r = -.28, p<.06$). No significant positive correlation with any independent variable was found.

Whether a school of social work has a specialization which includes practice with families (FAMSPEC) was examined as a dichotomous independent variable. Twenty-six schools (86.7%) do have such a specialization, while only four (13.3%) do not.

The age of master's programs in this research is based on the year of initial accreditation (INITACR). Four schools received
recognition from the predecessor of CSWE in 1919 as members of
the charter group, and one school received initial accreditation
as recently as 1975. The median year of initial accreditation for
the research population is 1945. Bivariate analysis shows that
older schools tend to be larger ($r = .51, p < .002$) and to have a
higher percentage of female students ($r = .31, p < .05$).

The final independent variable being described is recency of
accreditation (RECACR). Table 3 (p. 100) shows the distribution
of the schools on this variable. Recent accreditation correlates
positively with percent of racial minority faculty ($r = .25, p < .09$)
and negatively with percent of students in the micro practice
concentration ($r = -.28, p < .06$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate descriptive data have been presented for all 13
independent variables in this research; all statistically
significant bivariate associations among the independent variables
have also been noted. An overview of findings for the dependent variables are now provided.

**Total Family Content**

Findings presented in this section describe the percentage of total family content (PFC) identified in all the syllabi for required courses of the 30 schools of social work included in this research. Data regarding percentage of total traditional family content (PTTRFC) are also included in this section. The other dependent variables (types of non-traditional family content) are included later in connection with discussion of the hypotheses of the research.

In the syllabi for required courses which provided the dependent variables for this research, 8.6% of the content was found to be family content. Traditional family content makes up 49% of the family content, and 4.2% of the total curriculum content.

Bivariate analysis of the dependent variables included one-way analysis of variance by the nominal independent variables and computation of Pearson's r with all interval-level independent variables. The analysis of variance indicates no significant associations between percentage of total family content (PFC) and the four nominal independent variables (GEOLOC, FUNDS, FAMSPEC, and URBANISM); percentage of traditional family content (PTTRFC) also shows no significant relationship with those four independent variables.
With the interval-level independent variables, percentage of total family content exhibits a moderately strong positive correlation with recency of accreditation (RECACR, \( r = .36, p<.02 \)). That is, recently accredited programs tend to have a higher percentage of family content. Positive correlations approaching statistical significance exist with percentage of micro students (PMICRO, \( r = .22, p<.09 \)) and with percentage of minority population in the state where the school is located (STMINPOP, \( r = .23, p<.09 \)). Correlations with all other variables are insignificant.

Percentage of traditional family content (PTTRFC) reflects a moderately strong positive correlation with PMICRO (\( r = .36, p<.02 \)), which seems to indicate that schools preparing more students for micro practice place more emphasis on traditional family content. Associations approaching statistical significance are present with age of program (\( r = .21, p<.09 \)), and with percentage of racial minority faculty (\( r = -.25, p<.09 \)). These findings suggest that traditional content is emphasized more by older programs, and less by programs with a higher percentage of minority faculty.

Non-Traditional Family Content

Four kinds of non-traditional family content—Familologic Autonomy, Family Compositional Diversity, Family Gender-Role Flexibility, and Family Ethnic Diversity—are the primary dependent variables in this research. This section of Chapter 4 first presents an overview of findings regarding non-traditional family
content as a whole, then examines in more detail each of the four major variables as it relates to the descriptive hypotheses presented in Chapter 1.

Non-Traditional Family Content (PNONFC) comprises 51% of the family content in the course syllabi analyzed, and makes up 4.4% of the total curriculum as measured in this analysis.

Analysis of variance yielded no significant association between PNONFC and geographic location, source of funding, or urbanism. The relationship with FAMSPEC approaches statistical significance \( F(1,28) = 3.495, p<.07 \).

Several bivariate correlations are significant for PNONFC. Recency of accreditation (RECACR, \( r = .41, p<.01 \)) indicates that non-traditional family content tends to receive more attention in the curricula of schools more recently accredited. A very high correlation of PNONFC with percentage of human behavior family content \( (r = .82, p<.001) \) implies that most schools have much of this kind of content in the HBSE part of the required curriculum.

Partial correlation analysis was done of the relationship between PNONFC and RECACR to determine what other independent variables are influencing this relationship. Zero-, first-, and second-order correlations all continued at \( p<.02 \), but controlling for PRACFAC and PRACMSWII strengthened the relationship to \( r = .53, p<.002 \). Conversely, controlling for PFEMFAC and for TOTMSWII weakened the relationship to \( r = .39, p<.02 \), suggesting that percentage of female faculty and size of school contribute to the
nature of the relationship between PNONFC and recency of accreditation.

Findings regarding each of the four kinds of non-traditional family content are now presented in relation to the descriptive hypotheses of this research.

1. Familogic Autonomy

Of the four major dependent variables, Familogic Autonomy occurs the least frequently in required courses of the 30 schools, accounting for only .22% of total curriculum content and 2.6% of family content. Bivariate analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship with only one independent variable: schools located in larger cities tend to have more Familogic Autonomy content \( r = .45, p < .006 \).

Multivariate analysis (zero-, first-, and second-order partial correlations) did not uncover any significant relationships, adding nothing to the bivariate analysis.

Two descriptive hypotheses in this research are related to Familogic Autonomy. Findings regarding these hypotheses, while not statistically significant, are reported now (see p. 25 for statement of all hypotheses).

**Hypothesis FA1** -- Familogic Autonomy is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of female faculty (PFEMFAC).

The simple correlation coefficient between these two variables is positive, but is so small that it can be considered negligible
First- and second-order partial correlations range from .002 \( (p<.50) \) when percentage of racial minority faculty is controlled to .13 \( (p<.25) \) when controlling for PFEMSWII and TOTMSWII. This suggests that even the small amount of association between Familogic Autonomy and PFEMFAC is explained largely by change in PRECFAC. One must conclude that the hypothesis is not supported by the data.

**Hypothesis FA2** — Familogic Autonomy is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of female students (PFEMSWII).

These two variables have a zero-order correlation of -.17 \( (p<.17) \) and partials confirm the absence of statistical significance in their relationship. The data therefore indicate that while the association does not approach significance, the direction is toward an inverse correlation, not a direct correlation as the hypothesis implies.

### 2. Family Compositional Diversity

Of the family content identified in this research, 6.9% reflects Family Compositional Diversity. This accounts for .6% of all content measured in the study. Percentage of Family Compositional Diversity (PCD) correlates significantly with three independent variables (in addition to the hypothesis to be discussed shortly). The percentage of racial minority students (PRACMSWII) shows the strongest association \( (r = .38, p<.02) \). Size of school (TOTMSWII) is correlated at .30 \( (p<.05) \), and
percentage of racial minority faculty (PRACFAC) approaches significance at \( r = .29, p<.06 \).

The one hypothesis involving Family Compositional Diversity is now discussed.

Hypothesis FCD1 -- Family Compositional Diversity is expected to be positively correlated with the size of the metropolitan area in which schools are located.

A moderately strong positive correlation exists between these variables \( (r = .37, p<.02) \) as a bivariate relationship, supporting the hypothesis as it is stated. Multivariate analysis shows this apparent relationship to be partially spurious, however, as exhibited in Table 4.

### TABLE 4. FIRST- AND SECOND-ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATIONS FOR URBANISM WITH FAMILY COMPOSITIONAL DIVERSITY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables Controlled</th>
<th>Partial ( r )</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECACR</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STMINPOP</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACFAC</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACMSWII</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTMSWII</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACFAC, TOTMSWII</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACMSWII, TOTMSWII</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Zero-order partial: \( r = .37, p<.02 \).
All first-order partials remain significant below $p<.06$, as do most of the second-order values except the two at the bottom of Table 4. This means that changes in percentage of racial minority faculty, percentage of racial minority students, and size of school actually account for nearly half of the variance which in the zero-order coefficient appears to be due to size of metropolitan area (URBANISM). In summary, the data marginally supports the hypothesis.

3. Family Gender-Role Flexibility

Course content demonstrating Family Gender-Role Flexibility accounts for 6.6% of all family material taught by the 30 schools in their required courses. This is .57% of all curriculum content measured in this study. Bivariate examination shows Family Gender-Role Flexibility significantly associated with recency of accreditation ($r = .29, p<.05$) and with size of school (TOTMSWII, $r = .34, p<.03$). Two hypotheses relate to this variable, discussed now.

Hypothesis FGRF1 -- Family Gender-Role Flexibility is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of female faculty (PFEMFAC).

There is no evidence whatsoever to support this hypothesis. The zero-order correlation coefficient is .03 ($p<.43$). Controlling all combinations of other independent variables yields no association which approaches statistical significance, the lowest $p$ being .28.
Hypothesis FGRF2 — Family Gender-Role Flexibility is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of female students (PFEMSWII).

Like its related hypothesis discussed above, this one finds no support in the data. The simple correlation coefficient is negligible ($r = .07, p < .35$), and further analysis proves to be fruitless also.

4. Family Ethnic Diversity

About 35% of the family content discovered in required masters-level curriculum consists of Family Ethnic Diversity, making up 3% of the total required curriculum as measured in this research. The only independent variable with which percentage of family ethnic diversity is significantly associated is recency of accreditation ($r = .40, p < .01$) (and a variable to be discussed with the last hypothesis). Family Ethnic Diversity is clearly more prevalent in required curriculum than the other three kinds of non-traditional family content measured. The three hypotheses related to this type of content are now investigated.

Hypothesis FED1 — Family Ethnic Diversity is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of racial minority faculty (PRACFAC).

Data supply no support for this statement. The bivariate relationship between the two variables is expressed by $r = .004, p < .49$, an extremely weak association. Multivariate partials, including second-order values, do not approach significant levels.
Hypothesis FED2 -- Family Ethnic Diversity is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of racial minority students (PRACMSWII).

As with the previous hypothesis, the zero-order coefficient does not support the statement ($r = .12, p<.27$) to an extent which can be considered significant. When other independent variables are controlled, however, the relationship becomes stronger. Controlling for PRACFAC yields $r = .24, p<.11$ on first-order analysis. When both PRACFAC and RECACR are held constant, $r = .43$ and $p<.01$. This multivariate data lends support to the hypothesis, although less complex analysis earlier seemed to imply almost no relationship between the two variables.

Hypothesis FED3 -- Family Ethnic Diversity is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of minority population of the states in which schools are located.

A simple $r$ of $.25 (p<.08)$ seems to demonstrate that these two variables have an association which approaches statistical significance. The complexity of this relationship is reflected in Table 5.

In this case, whether the relationship between the two variables is statistically significant depends on which other independent variables one chooses to control, and what alpha level one chooses. At $p<.05$, and with the proper variables controlled, the relationship between the two variables in the hypothesis approaches statistical significance.
TABLE 5. FIRST- AND SECOND-ORDER PARTIAL CORRELATIONS FOR STATE MINORITY POPULATION WITH FAMILY ETHNIC DIVERSITY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables Controlled</th>
<th>Partial r</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-Order</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECACR</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFEMFAC</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACMSWII</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFEMSWII</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second-Order</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACFAC, RECACR</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACFAC, PFEMFAC</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACFAC, PFEMSWII</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTMSWII, PFEMSWII</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACMSWII, PFEMSWII</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACFAC, PRACMSWII</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Zero-order partial: $r = .25, p < .08$.

To summarize the findings regarding the descriptive hypotheses posed in Chapter 1 of this research, five hypotheses (FA1, FA2, FGRF1, FGRF2, and FED1) clearly are not supported by the data. One hypothesis (FCD1) is supported, and two (FED2 and FED3) are marginally supported. These findings will be discussed further in Chapter 5.
5. Other non-traditional family content

As has been discussed earlier in connection with categorizing rules (p. 90), a few thought units have been coded as "Other Non-Traditional Family Content". These have been so few that they are not discussed quantitively here. These items of content (see Appendix M, p. A17) suggest an individualized, contextual approach to conceptualizing families, and to serving their needs. Problems such as poverty, chronic disability or illness, or agism have been identified by some schools of social work as necessary parts of their required curricula. Consequently these items were identified and collected as a kind of informal data which should not be lost during the measurement of the major variables.

Major findings of this research have now been presented for the 13 independent and four dependent variables. These findings are discussed further in Chapter 5.
V. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This exploratory-descriptive study has been concerned with the kinds of family content in master's programs in social work. A major concern, based on the literature about the needs of families, is whether social work curriculum content regarding families is sufficiently comprehensive and flexible to meet the needs of diverse client populations. Although the traditional nuclear family has been the model for much of the teaching in social work about family life, the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 suggested four types of non-traditional family content some social work educators consider essential for effective practice. These became primary dependent variables in this study.

To measure the family content being presented to all social work students, this research was designed to analyze the materials for required courses in recently accredited masters-level programs. The method used for collecting the data was content analysis, discussed in Chapter 3.

Descriptive data for 13 independent variables were obtained for 30 of 83 schools of social work. Total family content, traditional family content, and four kinds of non-traditional
family content were measured and reported in Chapter 4. Data about independent variables and overall family content were presented first, then findings regarding the four major dependent variables were organized around eight descriptive hypotheses presented initially in Chapter 1 (p. 25).

Because the descriptive hypotheses in this research are stated in terms of correlations, the methods of data analysis which flow from the design are:

1) Pearson product-moment correlations (r) for measuring the strength and direction of the relationship of independent variables to each other, and the relationship of one interval-level independent variable with one dependent variable

2) Analysis of variance for measuring the significance of change in one dependent variable with change in one nominal independent variable

3) Partial correlations to measure the significance of change in one dependent variable in relation to change in two or more independent variables. Partial correlations are particularly useful for uncovering spurious associations by controlling for the effect of other independent variables (Nie et al., 1975, pp. 302-305).

This review of the nature, purpose, scope, design, and methodology of this research is intended to provide the context in which to discuss the findings presented in Chapter 4. These findings and discussion about the findings are intended to flow from the design and methodology developed for the research.

The order in which findings are discussed in this chapter parallels the way they were presented in Chapter 4. Descriptive
independent variables regarding the schools of social work are explored first. Next, overall observations about family curriculum content are presented. Finally each of the four major dependent variables are analyzed in the context of the hypotheses of this study.

Characteristics of Schools

Geographic location (GEOLOC) was selected as a variable because it seemed that regional differences may be reflected in curriculum of the schools. The schools in the sample, though not evenly distributed throughout the four Districts, were highly representative ($p<.01$) of the distribution of all accredited schools. The use of the Census Divisions was an arbitrary matter, but there did not seem to be any compelling reason for adopting some other scheme for establishing geographic boundaries. The lack of any significant differences in dependent variables on the basis of (GEOLOC) seems to indicate that although there is diversity among schools of social work, there is as much variation within Districts as there is between them.

The 'size of city' variable (URBANISM) is a significant predictor of several dependent variables, discussed later. This variable could itself be the focus of some significant research in social work education, particularly for tax-supported institutions. How much do states vary in their urban/rural orientation? To what extent do schools of social work take that situation into account
in educating practitioners? Several schools have made a clear and strong commitment to serving rural populations. Visual inspection indicates that these were not included in this study because their reaccreditation did not happen to occur during the 1974-78 time period. Professional social work has been largely an urban phenomenon (Trattner, 1974; Lubove, 1971). Perhaps URBANISM should become a more important consideration in the planning of social work curriculum.

Primary source of funding (FUNDS) did not relate significantly to any area of family content. An organizational study of how funding patterns shape curriculum content might be informative.

Size of school (TOTMSWII) is positively associated with size of city and age of program. That is not surprising. Early schools of social work began in large cities (New York, Chicago, Boston), and have well-developed constituencies. Supply and demand would imply that schools in large urban areas would graduate more students.

Percentages of female faculty (PFEMFAC), racial minority faculty (PRACFAC), and female students (FEMSWII) were significantly correlated in the positive direction. One of the limitations of this research is the small number of cases (N=30), allowing a few cases to exert a strong influence on the composite statistics. (The sample is 36% of the universe, however.) In the sampled population there are three predominantly Black schools which have
high percentages of female faculty and female students (27 of 30 schools have a majority of female students). Zero-order correlations tend to be sensitive to such cases, and this is likely a partial explanation for the moderate positive relationship among these three independent variables. Perhaps Black females continue to view social work as a desirable profession to enter more than Black men, who might pursue professions which are more established, such as business, law, or medicine; females also have role-models in their female instructors.

Percentage of micro practice students (PMICRO) shows no significant positive correlations, but is negatively correlated with recency of accreditation (RECACR), i.e. of the most recently accredited schools, more students choose some concentration other than micro practice. Several of the newer schools recruit students on the grounds that the school prepares graduates for macro practice--planning and policy-making. Such a stance by several schools may account for the negative correlation observed between recent accreditation and PMICRO.

Recency of accreditation (RECACR = 1974-1978) also is significantly associated with percentage of racial minority faculty (PRACFAC). Having three recently accredited, predominantly Black schools (as was mentioned earlier) may account for this relationship because of the impact of a small number of cases in the sample. This correlation could also reflect the hiring of more racial minority faculty, however.
Total Family Content

It is difficult to assess the meaning of the fact that 8.6% of all curriculum content is family content. What would be an ideal percentage? On what basis would one determine an 'ideal' percentage? Since family content in social work curriculum has never been systematically measured before, identifying this empirical baseline for family content--and the corresponding figure for non-traditional family content--seems to the author to be one of the major contributions to social work education of this research. An alternative approach to measurement which could be tried in later research would use a different basis for calculating the percentage. Instead of asking what percentage of a school's curriculum is family content, one could develop a model for minimal essential family content and then measure what percentage of that content appears in the curriculum documents of accredited schools. This approach would more closely follow the trend toward competency-based education suggested by Arkava and Brennen (1976), Martin Bloom (1976), and others. Such an approach also seems compatible with the next logical step in social work education research--evaluative research. When the educational objectives for social work education become specified with sufficient clarity, it should be possible to measure the curriculum content against its objectives in order to arrive at a measurement of effectiveness. Such attempts to move toward more advanced levels
of measurement are consistent with curriculum theory as reflected in Figure 2 (p. 63).

Although other approaches to measuring family content seem desirable in the future, the approach used in this research seems to have been appropriate, based on the exploratory-descriptive nature of the research design and the current level of development of research in social work education. One advantage of content analysis as a research methodology is that it would be possible to reuse the same curriculum documents to arrive at results which are based on a different approach to measurement.

One of the significant findings of this research is that percentage of family content is positively correlated with recency of accreditation \( (r = .36, p<.02) \). This suggests a trend toward inclusion of more family content in the required curriculum for master's students. The trend for non-traditional family content is even stronger \( (r = .41, p<.01) \). Based on the extensive literature calling for increases in such content (cited frequently in Chapter 2), the author finds this trend encouraging. It is also encouraging to find, through first- and second-order partial correlation of these two variables, that this positive relationship continues while controlling for other independent variables such as PRACFAC, PRACMSWII, PFEMFAC, PFEMSWII, and URBANISM. The consistency of this finding throughout such thorough multivariate analysis implies that this result is one of the most substantively significant findings of this research. It further implies that the
The accreditation process, as administered by CSWE and highlighted by Standard 1234A (CSWE, 1973) is having a measurable impact on curriculum content.

The significant findings regarding traditional family content are not so encouraging to the author. The negative correlation with PRACFAC is not surprising ($p < .09$), implying that racial minority faculty may influence curriculum content away from a traditional view of family life. The positive association between percentage of traditional family content (PTTRFC) and percentage of micro students (PMICRO) at $p < .02$ seems to indicate that the students who perhaps most need a non-traditional view of families—the profession's future direct practitioners—may be underexposed to this content. Another finding which seems to contradict this is an analysis of the variance of Percentage of Non-Traditional Family Content (PNONFC) by Family Specialization (FAMSPEC). The result—($F(1, 28) = 3.495, p < .07$)—implies that schools with a family practice specialization tend to teach more non-traditional family content in their required courses. This apparent contradiction may be explained by examining the conceptual structure behind the measurement of these variables. That is, as the variables are defined, a school can teach both a high percentage of traditional family content and a high percentage of non-traditional family content. Such education may create considerable cognitive dissonance for students, but there is nothing in the conceptualization of this research (and, perhaps in the organizational structure of schools of social work) to prevent such an occurrence.
Non-Traditional Family Content

Several findings regarding non-traditional family content have already been discussed in the preceding section because of their relevance to the total situation of family content in the curriculum. The positive correlation with RECACR has been identified as an important result. A potential validity issue ought to be raised here which was discussed in Chapter 3 (pp. 66-70) regarding possible bias in sources of curriculum data. Since instructors know that CSWE uses their curriculum documents in making accreditation decisions, they may tend to bias the documents to present their course content in the most favorable light. This potential problem is counteracted by the site visit team's investigations and by the deliberations of the Commission on Accreditation. A further check on this potential problem when content analysis is used to collect curriculum data is the unobtrusive nature of the research. That is, the instructors did not know when they submitted their documents to CSWE that the documents would be used to measure family content. The author, therefore, considers the positive correlation between PNONFC and RECACR to be a valid and important indication that the amount of non-traditional family content is increasing in required masters-level curriculum.

The very high positive correlation of PNONFC with percentage of human behavior family content (PHBFC) seems to imply that many schools rely heavily on the HBSE sequence to provide the family
content for students. This matter will be dealt with in Chapter 6, when several models for organizing family content are presented.

1. Familogic Autonomy

Only one independent variable is significantly correlated with Familogic Autonomy; size of city (URBANISM) is significant at $p<.006$. If schools in large cities do emphasize Familogic Autonomy more, this may be because of a greater atmosphere of personal freedom in urban life. Edwards and Hoover (1974) suggested that there may be less pressure to marry in urban areas than in rural areas where informal social relationship networks tend to exert more control over personal decisions. Blake (1974) and Movius (1976) thought that urban living also have a freeing impact on the decision about having a child.

*Hypothesis FA1* -- Familogic Autonomy is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of female faculty (PFEMFAC).

Data do not support this statement. It was thought that since freedom from marriage and child-bearing has greater personal implications for women, the female faculty may tend to promote this kind of content in the social work curriculum. Several reasons may account for the lack of a significant association between the two variables. First, female faculty, by definition employed full-time, may identify more strongly with their occupational role than with family roles they may have. If this is so, it may be reflected in their teaching (or lack of teaching) about Familogic
Autonomy. Another possible explanation is that this content is located in elective courses and therefore did not appear in the research data. Neale's work (1977) seems to support this alternative. Another possibility is that female faculty may think more Familogic Autonomy should be in the curriculum, but they are unable to exert sufficient influence to make this happen.

Hypothesis FA2 -- Familogic Autonomy is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of female students (PFEMSWII).

The lack of significant association between these two variables may be similar to Hypothesis FA1. It would seem that many students would be at the point in the life cycle when they would be dealing personally with choices about marriage and parenting, in addition to their professional concern about these choices. Even if they are convinced of the importance of Familogic Autonomy, they may be less able to influence the curriculum than are female faculty.

2. Family Compositional Diversity

Hypothesis FCD1 -- Family Compositional Diversity is expected to be positively correlated with size of the metropolitan area in which schools are located (URBANISM).

These variables are correlated significantly at the zero-order level, but the relationship declines at the first- and second-order level (see p. 106). This hypothesis was developed because urban life is often described as being more diverse than life in smaller cities or in rural areas (Robertson, 1970; Cogswell and Sussman,
1974; Sussman, 1971, 1977). Results support the literature on this issue, but race emerges as an important complicating variable (discussed on pp. 106, 107).

3. Family Gender-Role Flexibility

The positive correlation of this variable with recency of accreditation (RECACR) at \( p<.05 \) seems to indicate that the implementation of accreditation Standard 1234A (CSWE, 1973) is having an impact on required masters-level curriculum.

Hypothesis FGRF1 -- Family Gender-Role Flexibility is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of female faculty (PFEMFAC).

The rationale for inclusion of this hypothesis was similar to that already given for Hypotheses FA1 and FA2, namely that women seem to be more directly affected by changing gender roles. The absence of any significant association between these two variables seems to indicate either that female faculty are primarily concerned with their occupational roles while they are teaching, rather than their family roles, or that as with Hypothesis FA1, female faculty may be attempting unsuccessfully to exert their influence to get more FGRF content into the curriculum. Neale's work (1977) reported resistance by male faculty to increasing this kind of content in the curriculum.

Hypothesis FGRF2 -- Family Gender-Role Flexibility is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of female students (PFEMSWII).
The dynamics operating between these two variables would appear to be similar to Hypothesis FA2. The lack of any significant association suggests that either female students are satisfied with the present content in the curriculum, or that they are powerless to change it. Schwartz (1973) reported that some of her students were so involved in working out their own stance on the issue of sexism that they had little energy to contribute to any agenda beyond their personal ones. One of these three explanations, or possibly some combination of them, could accurately describe the current status of female students in relation to gender-role flexibility.

4. Family Ethnic Diversity

The prevalence of more FED content in curriculum than the other three major dependent variables may result from the direct efforts of major minority groups. Since the early 1970s each of the five groups considered ethnic minorities in this research have been making organized attempts to influence curriculum. The passage of Standard 1234A (see Appendix Q, pp. 180-182) is a concrete expression of their efforts. The Standard is quite explicit; it is part of the organizational environment which every school of social work must recognize if its program is to be considered high quality.

Hypothesis FED1 -- Family Ethnic Diversity is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of racial minority faculty (PRACFAC).
The lack of any correlation between these two variables is somewhat baffling, given the clear advocacy stance of many ethnic minority writers (see Chapter 2, pp. 46-61). Perhaps many ethnic minority faculty see no need for special efforts to increase minority family content. Because of their positions within the university structure and society generally, minority faculty are primarily members of the middle class. They may be less immediately affected by racism than nonprofessional minority persons are. Minority faculty, and their colleagues, may not be convinced that FED content is any more important than other kinds of content competing for space in the required curriculum. Finally, if schools with a high percentage of white faculty are nevertheless teaching a considerable amount of FED content, that would tend statistically to reduce any correlation between FED and PRACFAC.

**Hypothesis FED2** — Family Ethnic Diversity is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of ethnic minority students (PRACMSWII).

Data do not support this assertion in bivariate analysis, but partial correlations do become significant ($p<.01$) when selected variables are controlled. The literature reported that at several schools, minority students played important roles in revising curriculum (Chicano Ad Hoc Committee, 1971; Chunn, 1974; Mackey, 1973) to include more ethnic content.

**Hypothesis FED3** — Ethnic Family Diversity is expected to be positively correlated with percentage of minority population of the states in which schools are located (STMINPOP).
These variables approach significance \((p < .08)\) on simple correlation, then range from .06 to .18 on partials (see Table 5, p. 110). Much of the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 argued that universities located in states with large minority populations should assume a kind of special responsibility to include curriculum content about the needs of these minorities. That position was particularly advocated for tax-supported universities. Data regarding this hypothesis may indicate that this is already happening to some extent.

5. Other non-traditional family content

The kinds of content categorized in this way are important not because they are frequent, but rather because they represent some of the most creative work being done with families, from this author's point of view (see Appendix M, p. 179, also discussed on p. 111).
VI. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research began with two questions: 1) what kinds of family content are being taught to masters-level social work students?, and 2) what amounts of the various kinds are being taught?

From its early years as a profession, social work has emphasized the importance of families and family life. Family life in the U.S. has always been diverse, and recently is becoming more so. Is social work education preparing future practitioners to appreciate the diversity found in American family life, and to respond in ways that lead to positive results in their work with clients?

This research set out to answer these questions by systematically and comprehensively measuring the family content in required courses of master's programs accredited or reaccredited (since 1974). Nobody had been known to do that before. Many writers in recent years have said that social work curriculum should have certain kinds of content. These ideas were reduced to four concepts, which became the primary dependent variables to be measured in this study, and were referred to as non-traditional family content, identified
as Familogic Autonomy, Family Compositional Diversity, Family Gender-Role Flexibility, and Family Ethnic Diversity.

Data to address questions about family content in social work curriculum were gotten by doing a content analysis of the course syllabi which schools of social work send to the Council on Social Work Education in order to receive accreditation. The findings have been reported and discussed. This final chapter is intended to summarize the results of the research, to examine family content and curriculum-building, and to identify possible directions for future research in this area. First, a summary of findings are presented.

**Total Family Content**

Since no researcher has measured social work family curriculum content before, the findings of this study identify a baseline which can be used for later comparative work. About 8.6% of all the curriculum materials for required courses in family content. Almost evenly divided, this content is 51% non-traditional and 49% traditional. The non-traditional content is subdivided into Familogic Autonomy (2.6%), Family Compositional Diversity (6.9%), Family Gender-Role Flexibility (6.6%), and Family Ethnic Diversity (34.9%).

Course syllabi were analyzed for 30 schools of social work, and data was obtained for 13 independent variables for each school. Data analysis procedures included analysis of variance, Pearson's r, factor analysis, partial correlation, and canonical correlation. Many of the findings are not statistically significant.
Recency of accreditation does correlate positively with percentage of total family content, suggesting that the percentage of family content in required curriculum may be increasing. Percentage of traditional family content correlates positively with percentage of micro students, suggesting that perhaps those soon to work directly with families are being exposed to traditional views of family life, and not being adequately exposed to non-traditional views.

Non-Traditional Family Content

Percentage of Non-Traditional Family Content shows a moderate positive correlation with recency of accreditation ($p<.01$); the author considers this finding to be significant, both statistically and substantively. It seems to indicate a trend toward more non-traditional content in the curriculum. For the purpose of coding, curriculum documents were divided into curriculum sequences. The human behavior and social environment correlated at $.82 (p<.001)$, demonstrating that many schools have most of their family content in the HBSE sequence.

Eight descriptive hypotheses were developed to explore the nature of interaction among certain variables. The only three significant ones correlated compositional diversity with URBANISM, ethnic diversity with STMINPOP, and ethnic diversity with PRACMSWII (presented on pp. 102-108, discussed on pp. 121-126.)
Toward Models for Family Content in Masters-Level Curriculum

Dozens of authors have advocated inclusion of a wide range of kinds of family content in the social work curriculum. Each seems to have a special concern about a small (or large) piece of the vast territory of family-related content. If the suggestions of all these advocates were followed, there would not be adequate space in the curriculum for many other kinds of content which are equally important. Figure 7 (p. 131) is the author's attempt to suggest a beginning framework for organizing a balanced and comprehensive family curriculum. Early in Chapter 1 (p. 9) the concept of family was presented from a systems perspective. This suggests that a family tends to be functioning simultaneously on three levels— as an environment for its individual members; as an interacting, communicating system; and as a subsystem of the larger society.

At the micro level, Biller (1971), Chestang (1972), and Rainwater (1965) emphasize the importance of the family as a nurturing environment for the development of personhood. Satir (1964) stressed the importance of the early life experiences of parents in the development of self-esteem which frees them to give nurture to their children.

The mezzo (middle-range) functioning of the family is discussed from a developmental perspective by Beatt and Wahlstrom (1977), Rhodes (1977), and Rossi (1968). They view a family as a group of persons each of whom have growth needs which combine to
FIGURE 7

SUGGESTED ELEMENTS OF FAMILY CURRICULUM CONTENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro</th>
<th>Traditonal Content</th>
<th>Familologic Autonomy</th>
<th>Compositional Diversity</th>
<th>Gender-Role Flexibility</th>
<th>Ethnic Diversity</th>
<th>Special Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family as Environment</td>
<td>1 MITRC</td>
<td>2 MIFA</td>
<td>3 MICD</td>
<td>4 MIGRF</td>
<td>5 MIED</td>
<td>6 MISN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezzo (Family as a Functioning System)</td>
<td>7 METRC</td>
<td>8 MEFA</td>
<td>9 MECD</td>
<td>10 MEGRF</td>
<td>11 MEED</td>
<td>12 MESN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro (Family as a Subsystem of the Society)</td>
<td>13 MATRC</td>
<td>14 MAFA</td>
<td>15 MACD</td>
<td>16 MAGRF</td>
<td>17 MAED</td>
<td>18 MASN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
identify ways that factors outside minority families affect the internal functioning.

Figure 7, in addition to the three-level functioning axis, includes six categories of family content which the author considers important in the preparation of social workers for diverse practice. Traditional content is likely to continue to be important, although alone it would not be sufficient. The four central categories in Figure 7 grow out of this research, and are based in the literature reviewed in Chapter 2. The "Special Needs" column is related to the types of "Other Non-Traditional Family Content" identified during this research.

Several models for organizing family content could grow out of this matrix. Model 1 could place the cognitive material for cells 1-12 in the HBSE sequence and the cognitive parts of 13-18 in the policy sequence. These kinds of knowledge could then be developed into practice skills in the practice sequence.

Model 2 might put both the cognitive and skill components in the HBSE sequence for cells 1-6, in the practice sequence for 7-12, and in the policy sequence for 13-18.

Model 3 might involve development of a separate course focusing on families, dealing with all three levels together. This might have integrative value for the family components, but tend to fragment family content from the remainder of the curriculum

Model 4 could be some combination of Models 1, 2, or 3, focusing the courses on certain target populations or problem foci.
This matrix is presented as a beginning organizational tool. How it would be used would depend heavily on the organization of the school of social work, the mission of the university or college, and the needs of the school's constituencies. Perhaps it will stimulate some thinking about the organization of social work curriculum in areas beyond family content as well.

Directions for Future Research

Several types of research could follow this study to expand the contribution it makes to social work education. First, an identical followup study at five-year intervals could provide useful data about the movement (or lack of movement) in family curriculum content. The author plans to undertake such studies if this is not done by others.

Second, it should be possible to move toward the design of research which would begin measuring curriculum against stated educational objectives--that is, evaluative research. Evaluative research would require clearly stated educational objectives. Some of the curriculum document used in this research would not have been adequate in that respect.

A third kind of research was suggested in Chapter 5 (pp. 117-119), involving the use of the same curriculum documents, but developed in connection with a competency-based philosophy of education (Arkava and Brennen, 1976; Gronlund, 1970; Mager, 1962;
Mayhew and Ford, 1971). This adaptation of the content analysis methodology used in this study would seem to be a useful and realistic direction to move at the present time, because of the problem of getting adequate data for evaluative research from the kind of curriculum documents which exist generally at the present time.
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LIST OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK

University of Alabama
Arizona State University
Atlanta University
Barry College
Case Western Reserve University
The Catholic University of America
Fordham University
Howard University
University of Illinois-Chicago Circle
University of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign
Indiana University
University of Minnesota-Duluth
State University of New York at Albany
State University of New York at Buffalo
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Norfolk State College
The Ohio State University
University of Oklahoma
Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
San Francisco State University
University of Southern California
University of Southern Mississippi
Temple University
University of Tennessee
University of Texas at Arlington
University of Utah
Washington University (St. Louis)
Western Michigan University
Dean
School of Social Work
University

October 26, 1977

Dear Dean:

Presently, I am a Ph.D. candidate at The Ohio State University College of Social Work doing dissertation research regarding the nature and extent of family content in MSW curriculum. The population for this research is those schools of social work whose master's degree programs have been accredited or reaccredited since 1974.

I am writing to ask permission to include in this research curriculum materials from your school, located in the Archives of the Council on Social Work Education in New York.

The research design, approved by my Dissertation Committee and by CSWE, involves doing a content analysis of materials for the core (required) courses in master's programs.

Numerous suggestions and proposals about family content have appeared in the literature of social work education, but no systematic attempt has been made to assess what is currently being taught. This research will hopefully be able to establish a baseline from which subsequent curriculum-building efforts can benefit.

If you have questions regarding the proposed research, feel free to contact me by phone at 614-622-6305. To facilitate progress on the research, I will appreciate hearing from you by November 3.

Sincerely yours,

Bradley L. Yoder, ACSW
Doctoral Candidate

Joseph J. Parnicky, Ph.D.
Dissertation Chairperson
APPENDIX C

RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

(One signed copy to be returned by November 3, one copy to be kept by Dean/Director for files.)

This is to indicate that Bradley L. Yoder, doctoral candidate at The Ohio State University College of Social Work, 1947 College Road, Columbus, Ohio, 43210, has permission to have access to curriculum materials from

(School of Social Work)

housed in the Archives of the Council on Social Work Education at 345 East 46th Street, New York, NY, 10017.

This authorization includes the following understandings:

1. This research has been approved by the researcher's Dissertation Committee, chaired by Professor Joseph J. Farnicky, and by the Council on Social Work Education.

2. The content analysis will be limited to materials from core(required) courses in the School's master's program.

3. Anonymity will be preserved for all materials (though a list of the cooperating schools will be included as an appendix to the research report, to acknowledge their help).

4. Materials will be used only for the immediate purposes of the dissertation research.

5. Findings of the research will be available to the School upon request.

Date: ____________________________

Dean/Director: ____________________________
## APPENDIX D

### LIST OF SYMBOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Compositional diversity. The tendency for families to have varying membership boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Ethnic diversity. The tendency for the meaning of family life to vary with different ethnic and racial groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Familogic autonomy. The degree to which one is free from the prevailing ideology that one ought to marry and bear children as a necessary part of the normal life cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMSPEC</td>
<td>Family/children's services specialization offered by a school of social work (yes or no).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMFAC</td>
<td>Number of female faculty members employed by a school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMSWII</td>
<td>Number of female second-year masters students enrolled in a school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDS</td>
<td>Major source of funding for a school (public or private).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOLOC</td>
<td>Geographic location of a school (northeast, north central, south, or west).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRF</td>
<td>Gender-role flexibility. The tendency for family activities to be shaped by interests and abilities of family members rather than their gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBCD</td>
<td>Human behavior (sequence) compositional diversity content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBED</td>
<td>Human behavior (sequence) ethnic diversity content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBFA</td>
<td>Human behavior (sequence) familogic autonomy content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBGRF</td>
<td>Human behavior (sequence) gender-role flexibility content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBO</td>
<td>Human behavior (sequence) other (non-family) content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBONON</td>
<td>Human behavior (sequence) other non-traditional family content (beyond CD, ED, FA, and GRF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBTRFC</td>
<td>Human behavior (sequence) traditional family content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Identification number of the school of social work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INITACR</td>
<td>Year the school was initially accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (or its predecessors).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEZMAC</td>
<td>Number of second-year masters students in a school who are concentrating on mezzo- or macro-level social work practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICRO</td>
<td>Number of second-year masters students in a school who are concentrating on micro-level practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCD</td>
<td>Percentage of compositional diversity content in all three sequences (HB+PO+PR).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PED</td>
<td>Percentage of ethnic diversity content in all three sequences (HB+PO+PR).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFA</td>
<td>Percentage of familologic autonomy content in all three curriculum sequences (HB+PO+PR).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFC</td>
<td>Percentage of family content (both traditional and non-traditional).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFEMFAC</td>
<td>Percentage of a school's faculty who are female.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFEMSWII</td>
<td>Percentage of second-year masters students in a school of social work who are female.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGRF</td>
<td>Percentage of gender-role flexibility content in all three curriculum sequences (HB+PO+PR).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMEZMAC</td>
<td>Percentage of second-year masters students in a school who concentrate on mezzo- or macro-level social work practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMICRO</td>
<td>Percentage of second-year masters students in a school who are concentrating on micro-level practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNONFC</td>
<td>Percentage of non-traditional family content (PCD+PED+PFA+PGRF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POCD</td>
<td>Policy (sequence) compositional diversity content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POED</td>
<td>Policy (sequence) ethnic diversity content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POFA</td>
<td>Policy (sequence) familologic autonomy content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POGRF</td>
<td>Policy (sequence) gender-role flexibility content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POO</td>
<td>Policy (sequence) other (non-family) content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POONON</td>
<td>Policy (sequence) other non-traditional family content (in addition to CD, ED, FA, and GRF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTRFC</td>
<td>Policy (sequence) traditional family content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACFAC</td>
<td>Percentage of a school's faculty who are members of a racial or ethnic minority group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACMSWII</td>
<td>Percentage of a school's second-year masters students who are members of a racial or ethnic minority group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCD</td>
<td>Practice (sequence) compositional diversity content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED</td>
<td>Practice (sequence) ethnic diversity content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRFA</td>
<td>Practice (sequence) familologic autonomy content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRGRF</td>
<td>Practice (sequence) gender-role flexibility content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>Practice (sequence) other (non-family) content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRONON</td>
<td>Practice (sequence) other non-traditional family content (beyond CD, ED, FA, and GRF).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRTRFC</td>
<td>Practice (sequence) traditional family content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTHBFC</td>
<td>Percentage of total human behavior family content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTHBNONFC</td>
<td>Percentage of total human behavior non-traditional family content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTPPOFC</td>
<td>Percentage of total policy family content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTPONONFC</td>
<td>Percentage of total policy non-traditional family content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTPRFC</td>
<td>Percentage of total practice family content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTPRNONFC</td>
<td>Percentage of total practice non-traditional family content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTTRFC</td>
<td>Percentage of total traditional family content (HBTRFC+POTRFC+PRTRFC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACFAC</td>
<td>Number of a school's faculty who are members of a racial or ethnic minority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RACMSWII  Number of a school's second-year masters students who are members of a racial or ethnic minority.

RECACR  Year of school's most recent accreditation/reaccreditation by the Council on Social Work Education (1974-78).

STMINPOP  Percentage of minority population in the state where the school is located.

THB  Total human behavior (sequence) thought units.

THBFC  Total human behavior family content thought units.

THBNONFC  Total human behavior non-traditional family content thought units.

TOTFAC  Total number of full-time faculty employed by a school.

TOTMSWII  Total number of second-year masters students enrolled at a school.

TPO  Total policy (sequence) thought units.

TPOFC  Total policy family content thought units.

TPONONFC  Total policy non-traditional family content thought units.

TPR  Total practice (sequence) thought units.

TPRFC  Total practice family content thought units.

TPRNONFC  Total practice non-traditional family content thought units.

TTRFC  Total traditional family content thought units for the school's three curriculum sequences (HB, PO, and PR).

TTU  Total thought units for the school's three curriculum sequences (HB, PO, and PR).

TU  Thought unit. The unit of recording used in analyzing the curriculum materials of the 30 schools.

URBANISM  The degree of urban/rural character of the community in which the school is located, based on the size of Standard Metropolitan Area (SMA), Bureau of the Census. 1=2 million +, 2=1-1.99 million, 3=.5-.99 million, 4=.49 million or less.
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### DATA RECORDING SHEET
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## APPENDIX F

### RAW DATA CODING GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column #</th>
<th>Variable #</th>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Coded Categories</th>
<th>Level of Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>1-30</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GEOLOC</td>
<td>1=Northeast</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=North Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>1=2 million +</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=1-1.99 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=.5-.99 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4=.49 million -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FUNDS</td>
<td>1=Public</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>TOTFAC</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FEMFAC</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>RACFAC</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>TOTMSWII</td>
<td>0-999</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>FEMSWII</td>
<td>0-999</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>RACMSWII</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>MICRO</td>
<td>0-999</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>MEZMAC</td>
<td>0-999</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>FAMSPEC</td>
<td>1=Yes</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>INITACR</td>
<td>(19)19-78</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year first accred.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column #</td>
<td>Variable #</td>
<td>Variable Name</td>
<td>Coded Categories</td>
<td>Level of Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>RECACR</td>
<td>(19)74-78 Year of most recent accred.</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>HBFA</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>HBCD</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>HBGRF</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>HBED</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>HBONON</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>HBTRFC</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>HBO</td>
<td>0-999</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>PRFA</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>PRCD</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>PRGRF</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>PRED</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>PRONON</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>PRTRFC</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>0-999</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>POFA</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-64</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>POCD</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-66</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>POGRF</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>POED</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-70</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>POONON</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-72</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>POTRFC</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-75</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>POO</td>
<td>0-999</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-78</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>STMINPOP</td>
<td>0.0-99.9</td>
<td>Interval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

LIST OF REPRESENTATIVE COMPOSITIONAL DIVERSITY TERMS

Unconventional families
Varying family lifestyles
Variant family structures
A range of family structures
Individual in whatever living group
Functional family group
New family forms
Communal family
Non-nuclear family
Family systems in the '70's

Unmarried living together
Cohabitation
Communal living arrangement
Living together

Open marriage
Liberated marriage
Unmarried parents

One-parent family
One-parent home
Single parent
Unmarried father
Divorced parent
Widowed family
Structural problems of the one-parent family

Professional parents
Updating adoption policy
Single adoptions

Homosexual families
Lesbian couples

Reconstituted family
Step-family

Extended family
Three-generation families
Multigenerational family
APPENDIX H

LIST OF REPRESENTATIVE FAMILOGIC AUTONOMY TERMS

Singleness
The case against marriage
Social pressure to marry
Alternatives to marriage

Voluntary childlessness
Family size as a significant decision
The case against parenthood
APPENDIX I

LIST OF REPRESENTATIVE GENDER-ROLE FLEXIBILITY TERMS

Emerging family role relationships
Challenging assumed male leadership
Shifting family power
Flexibility in gender identity
Changing marital roles
Sex-linked role negotiation
Dual-career marriage (differentiated from dual-job marriage)

New roles of women in families
Working mothers
The educated housewife
Family responsibilities as unpaid employment
APPENDIX J

LIST OF GENDER-ROLE FLEXIBILITY TERMS NOT CONSIDERED FAMILY CONTENT

Sex-role identification
Changing perceptions of male and female identity
Cultural influences on gender identity
Sexism

Employed women
Social oppression of women in vocational opportunity
Women's new roles in society
Women's Place
The Second Sex
Sisterhood Is Powerful
Myths about women and work
Social contradictions concerning women
APPENDIX K

LIST OF REPRESENTATIVE FAMILY ETHNIC DIVERSITY TERMS

Oppressed minority families
Dependence of family behavior on social and cultural factors
Accurate ethnic perspective on the family
Ethnic variations in childrearing
Religious meaning of family experience
Cultural stratification and the family
A range of ethnic family models
Stereotypes attached to minority family groupings
Effects of social oppression on minority families
Culturally coded family environment
Ethnic minority parents
Culturally relativistic framework for assessing families
Ethnic determinants of marriage patterns
Strategies for survival in minority families

Health and strength of black families
Black Families in White America
Children of the Storm
Black-white differences in psychiatric family assessment
The Strength of Black Families
Behind Ghetto Walls: Black Families in a Federal Slum
Character Development in a Hostile Environment
Contemporary black families
Social change and the black family
Families of the Slums

Puerto Rican extended family patterns
Role and function of Puerto Rican family members
Self-help in the Puerto Rican family
Puerto Rican family in mainland environment

La Vida
Chicano family patterns

Family life of Native Americans
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APPENDIX L

LIST OF REPRESENTATIVE ETHNICITY TERMS NOT CONSIDERED FAMILY CONTENT

Racism
Reducing racial oppression
Problems of minority's milieu
Varying needs of minority groups
Oppressed groups
Racial Oppression in America
The Social Order of the Slum
Social alienation of minorities
Racial classism
Residual colonialism
Differential opportunity structures
Racism in America and How to Combat It
Institutional Racism in America
Beyond the Melting Pot
Kerner Report

Blacks
Crisis in Black and White
Tally's Corner
Dark Ghetto
"Social Work in the Black Ghetto: The New Colonialism"
Slavery
Black migration
New black consciousness
Aspects of black identity

The Puerto Rican Mainland
The Puerto Rican migrant
Puerto Rican self-identity
Attitudes of Puerto Rican clients
Working with Puerto Rican clients
Hispanics

Native Americans
American Indians

"The Anthropology and Sociology of Mexican Americans"
Chicanos
Latinos
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APPENDIX M

LIST OF OTHER NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILY CONTENT TERMS
(In addition to CD, ED, FA, and GRF)

The changing family
Family as agent for social change
Liberated children and youth
Agism, children, youth, and aged getting more power in the family
Filial responsibility
Family development enhanced or impeded by social structure
Societal forces that limit family functioning
Social trauma and families
Families in poverty
Low-income families
Special-problem families
Family with a retarded child
Impact on family of disability to provider
Resources for the dying and their families
Impact of unemployment on the family
Impact of occupational choice on family life
Post-parental socialization for parents
APPENDIX N

LIST OF REPRESENTATIVE TRADITIONAL FAMILY CONTENT TERMS

Courtship and mate selection
Marriage and parenthood
Accommodation to marriage
Reorientation to the marital dyad
Psychodynamic view of the family
Oedipal conflict
Parenthood as a developmental phase
Family's socializing function
Normal socialization
Normal parent-child interaction
Marital interaction
Marital conflict
Family dysfunctioning
Family communication patterns
Kinship network
Separation from children (middle years)
Empty-nest stage
APPENDIX 0

NAMES USED BY SCHOOLS FOR THEIR FAMILY/CHILD/INTERPERSONAL PRACTICE SPECIALIZATIONS

Family and Children's Services
Family and Child Welfare
Individuals, Families and Groups
Interpersonal Practice
Micro Intervention
Micro Practice (3)
Practice with Children and Families (3)
Psychosocial Treatment
Urban Family Practice
APPENDIX P

LIST OF ELECTIVE COURSES INCLUDING NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILY CONTENT

Survival of Family Life and Development of the Poor
Institutional Racism: Perspectives for Social Workers
White Racism in the U.S.: Impact on Groups and Organizations
Individual and Family Interventive Methods
Toward a U.S. Family Policy

The Black Family
The Culture and Life of the Afro-American
Black Families and the Social Environment
Social Welfare and the Black Experience
Black Americans: Issues in Policy and Program Development

The Native American and Human Services

The Puerto Rican in Contemporary Society

Changing Roles in Family and Work
Women in a Changing Society

Seminar in Rural Family Life
APPENDIX Q

PORTIONS OF CSWE STATEMENTS RELEVANT TO NON-TRADITIONAL FAMILY CONTENT

Accreditation Standards (1971)

Purpose of Accrediting (#1110)
Accrediting of professional schools of social work is in the public interest. It is aimed at qualitative improvement in social work practice which will result in optimal community welfare. It serves to help schools of social work achieve maximum educational effectiveness and to identify schools whose competence in the particular educational programs they offer warrants public and professional confidence. Corollary to these basic aims, accreditation of programs of professional education for social work should also serve (1) to help schools achieve high standards rather than standardized educational programs; (2) to encourage well-advised and planned innovation and experimentation in social work education; (3) to foster continuing self-analysis and self-improvement of schools so as to encourage imaginative educational development; (4) to relate professional education for social work to social work practice.

Program of the School (#1224)
The curriculum for the master's degree program shall be developed in harmony with the most recent official curriculum policy statement adopted by the Board of Directors of the Council on Social Work Education.

Organization and Administration of the School
(#1234) A school must conduct its program without discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, ethnic origin, age, or sex. This principle applies to the selection of students, classroom and field instructors...and to all aspects of the organization and program of the school.

(#1234A) A school is expected to demonstrate the special efforts it is making to enrich its program by providing racial and cultural diversity in its student body, faculty, and staff.
Responsibility for Curriculum Development

(#3932) There shall be provision for regular, continuing faculty attention to curriculum development.

Curriculum Evaluation

(#3941) The curriculum shall be evaluated regularly by the school in the light of student outcomes, new knowledge, and the demands of the profession and of practice. Needed modifications shall be made on the basis of such evaluation.

Guidelines for Implementation of Accreditation Standards on Non-Discrimination (1973)

(#1234 and #1234A)

Intention

Effective, responsible discharge of its function as a helping profession requires that social work be responsive to the redefinition of individual and institutional roles in a diverse and changing society. During the past few years, a new and rapidly developing literature has become available which calls into question age-old myths about women, their roles in society, in the family, and in the community.

The specific intent of these guidelines is to provide direction for social work education programs and the accreditation site visit teams in evaluation of programs with regard to non-discrimination relative to...curriculum—content that promotes the student's understanding of the changing roles of women and their place in modern society and enhances the student's ability to provide sensitive and effective social work intervention.

Basic Principles

The curriculum in its several parts and as a whole should achieve the incorporation of current knowledge about women and the contributions of women to society and the elimination of sex-biased stereotyping. This principle does not suggest the addition of separate discrete courses.

Planning Guide

In order to evaluate compliance with non-discrimination Standards in relation to women, a program's self-study report and the report of the Accreditation Site Visit Team should provide substantive answers to the following questions:
Does content in all curriculum areas include current knowledge about women and the contributions of women to society and does it avoid sex-biased stereotyping? In order to answer this question it is necessary to examine syllabi...and other materials with respect to content and perspective in each major curriculum area.

Does the program have a mechanism that provides for continuous self-evaluation of the implementation of its plan for compliance with the Standards as they relate to women?
APPENDIX R
CURRICULUM POLICY FOR THE MASTER'S DEGREE
PROGRAM IN GRADUATE SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK*

Introduction

This document sets forth the official curriculum policy for schools of social work that are accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of the Council on Social Work Education. The Statement governs graduate programs leading to the master's degree and is the basis for formulation of accreditation standards. It does not state curriculum policy for post-master's education in social work or for undergraduate education relevant to social welfare and social work.

The Curriculum Policy Statement deals with the kind of substantive knowledge to be included in the master's program but does not present an organizing theme, suggest sequences, or in any other way direct how that knowledge is to be organized and conveyed. Each school carries full responsibility for the specific organization and arrangement of courses and other learning experiences. Each school is also expected to establish procedures for self-study and continuing evaluation of the effectiveness of its educational program.

The curriculum should be structured in a manner that permits recognition and response to the fact that students enter graduate schools of social work with varied socio-cultural, educational, and work experience. Schools should make explicit efforts to so organize the curriculum that a student's program takes account of any special needs arising either from limitations in previous education or from competencies already established.

This statement of policy and principles provides the foundation upon which each school of social work builds its own educational program. The breadth and complexity of curriculum plans and patterns, as developed within established curriculum policy, should be related to the educational resources and opportunities available to each professional school and to the educational philosophy and specific objectives of that school. A detailed and coherent instructional plan should be developed to attain the stated objectives, including identification of the requisite faculty and other resources, curricular arrangements, and student selection criteria. The standards against which the plan is evaluated are formulated and administered by the Commission on Accreditation of the Council on Social Work Education.

Educational Goals

Social work as a profession deals with problems and conditions which limit social functioning through the promotion of social and institutional change and the provision of opportunities which enhance social functioning of individuals, groups, organizations, communities, and nations. Social work has its own identity

* Approved by Board of Directors, November, 1969.
deriving from knowledge, values, and skill applied in professional practice. The social work curriculum rests upon a comprehensive view of the profession and its practice. The goals of social work education are to provide a basis for the students to:

- incorporate the knowledge and values basic to social work as a professional discipline;
- recognize the political, economic, social, and cultural influences on the social services both in his own country and in other countries;
- anticipate human needs in a rapidly changing society and project programs and services to meet those needs;
- understand his own role in society and contribute responsibly to the development of the profession that it may increasingly serve society in the prevention and treatment of problems of personal functioning, social problems, and the enhancement of social well-being;
- utilize scientific and scholarly inquiry in advancing professional knowledge and improving standards of practice;
- attain a level of competence necessary for responsible professional practice and sufficient to serve as a basis for a creative and productive professional career.

Professional competence in social work derives from the acquisition of knowledge, values, and skill learned in the basic curriculum; it is fostered through successful experience in practice and continuing professional development.

A concern for the development of new knowledge and the testing of generally accepted principles, formulations and hypotheses should be evident in the entire curriculum. The student should be encouraged to question constructively all aspects of the body of knowledge which is transmitted in education for social work practice (and the professional knowledge which is inherent in that practice).

Social Work Curriculum

The professional curriculum for social work draws broadly and selectively from the humanities, from other professions and scientific disciplines, as well as from the knowledge and experience developed by social work. Application of this content to social work involves ethical as well as scientific commitment. The study and analysis of ethical considerations is an important component of social work education.

The curriculum is developed as a unified whole and achieves its coherence by viewing all courses as presenting knowledge to throw light on several broad components related to human problems and needs: social welfare policy and services, human behavior and the social environment, and social work practice. These terms merely denote areas of substantive knowledge but are not intended to delineate the structure of the curriculum or the categorization of courses. It is expected that schools will provide systematic instruction relevant to the content of these spheres and that each school will develop an appropriate schema for the ordering of its particular courses. The general kinds of substantive knowledge and the major instructional objectives to be pursued within the total curriculum are described below.
APPENDIX R (Continued)

Content Pertaining to
Social Welfare Policy and Services

Opportunity should be provided all students to acquire knowledge of the
genral policies, conditions, legislative bases, institutions, programs, and broad
range of services relevant to social welfare in contemporary society. Similarly,
all students should be informed about the characteristics, functions, and contrib-
utions of social workers and of the profession in connection with social welfare
problems and programs. Further, each student should have an opportunity, con-
sistent with the school's objectives and resources, to concentrate study on a sec-
tor of social welfare having particular pertinence to his professional career
interests.

The major aims of study pertinent to social welfare policy and services are to
prepare professionals to act as informed and competent practitioners in provid-
sing services, and as participants or leaders in efforts to achieve desirable change.
Instruction should be directed toward developing both analytic skills and sub-
stantive knowledge, with a focus on the acquisition of competence required for
the development, implementation, and change of social work policies and pro-
grams.

Attention should be given to the historical as well as current forces which gen-
erate social policies and contribute to social problems. Of particular importance
is knowledge and ability to make choices about the social policies that condition
authorization, financing, and programming of social welfare services, and develop-
ment of a broad appreciation of the human values and social norms which
shape both policies and services. Students should be provided with a basis for
identifying and appraising the programs and agencies characteristically in-
volved in dealing with problems of the individual and society, as well as those
which contribute to the enhancement of personal experience and of social oppor-
tunity. Study should also be addressed to the changing nature of problem con-
ceptions, to deficiencies in contemporary programs, and to emerging forms of
service or expressions of need. Specific foci for study should include agencies'
structural and administrative patterns, their service-delivery systems, the popula-
tions served by agencies, their linkages with related programs and other organi-
zations, and their social and political environments.

Provision should be made for helping students to acquire an ability for critical
analysis of the problems and conditions in society and its major institutions
which have warranted or now require the intervention of social work. Study
should be given to the characteristics and structures of social work as a profes-
sion, with particular attention to the roles its members have served, historically
and currently, in the development and implementation of social welfare policies
and programs. With respect to the fields of service within which they are practi-
tioners, students should be helped to develop the capacity to pose relevant ques-
tions and to read and evaluate research reports bearing upon these questions.

Education in this area should aim at development among students of commit-
tment to the profession's responsibilities to promote social welfare goals and ser-
ices, to work toward prevention of social problems, and to contribute to posi-
tive social change. To be fostered are motivation and competence to participate
effectively in the formulation and implementation of policies, in the improve-
ment of programs, and in the progressive change of service agencies.

**Content Pertaining to Human Behavior and the Social Environment**

The body of content relating to human behavior is designed to contribute to
the student's understanding of the individual, group, organizational, institutional,
and cultural contexts within which human behavior is expressed and by which
it is significantly influenced. This objective is achieved through the retrieval,
specification, and extension of those theories and bodies of knowledge derived
from the biological, psychological, and social sciences as well as from the hu-
manities which are needed for an understanding of social work values and
practice.

Ultimately, all sciences are concerned with and contribute, directly or indirectly,
to an understanding of human behavior. There is no generally accepted unified
theory of human behavior, nor is there any single theory or formulation of rele-
vant content which is sufficient for all social workers. Rather, there are many
theories and systems of knowledge which have been developed for a variety of
purposes and within a wide range of perspectives. These theories and perspec-
tives, as well as their interrelationships, should be recognized and reflected as
specifically as possible in the curriculum design and modes of instruction.

While it is expected that all social work students achieve a basic understand-
ing of individual and collective dynamics, the particular specification of the
content of this component of the curriculum and the design within which it is
executed should derive from and be consistent with the educational objectives
and program of the individual school, the range and quality of its educational
resources, the needs and composition of the student body, and the functions of
social work. Opportunities should be provided for the social work student to
develop the capacity to identify and master those aspects of this body of content
which are relevant to the social work roles for which he seeks competence and
to the tasks which he expects to perform.

Equal in importance to the mastery of relevant content for the social work
student is the development of the capacity to assess critically the state of this
theory and knowledge as it relates to social work practice, the assumptions which
have influenced its development and, finally, to begin to develop the skills and
capacities which will ultimately permit him to fulfill his obligation to contribute
to its development.

**Content Pertaining to Social Work Practice**

This area of the curriculum is designed to help the student learn and apply
the knowledge and principles of social work practice in accordance with the
values and ethics of the profession. The components of knowledge and compe-
tence to be fostered in this area of the curriculum may be combined differently
in several areas of intervention for a variety of purposes and to meet diverse
needs.

The development of competence in the practice of social work is a primary
curriculum objective and requires provision of opportunities designed to help each student:

- Understand the relation of knowledge, value, and skill to each other and their utilization in the appraisal of problems or situations for social work intervention and in the provision of professional service.
- Develop the self-awareness and self-discipline requisite for responsible performance as a social worker.
- Recognize and appreciate the similarities and differences in the helping roles of various professionals and other personnel and in the problem-solving processes associated with service to individuals, groups, organizations, and communities.
- Understand the responsibility and functions of the social worker in contributing from professional knowledge to the prevention of social problems and to the improvement of social welfare programs, policies, and services.
- Develop a spirit of inquiry and a commitment throughout his professional career to seek, critically appraise, contribute to, and utilize new knowledge.

Social work practice is conducted through particular professional roles, generally in organizations providing social services. These roles require the practitioner to exercise his knowledge and skill. Preparation for these roles necessitates acquisition of specialized learning and competence. To assure the provision of both basic instruction and specialized study, the graduate curriculum must include one or more concentrations. A concentration presents a distinctive pattern of instruction that organizes experiences appropriate to a specific range of professional roles and functions. Each concentration should be developed so that the student can attain a level of competence necessary for responsible professional practice and sufficient to serve as a basis for continuing professional development.

Schools may identify a variety of modes or dimensions of competence and service as their basis for development of concentrations within the curriculum. Programs of graduate education, in addition to their conservation function, must react to and encourage consideration of new or expanded roles, the changing nature of professional roles, and the conditions bearing upon practice. The pattern of concentrations within the curriculum is intended to organize instruction in preparation for competent practice, not to define or govern the nature of professional roles.

Responsibility rests with each school for definition and development of its concentration(s) for instruction in social work practice. In view of the profession’s scope, no single concentration, and probably no school’s composite of concentrations, should be conceived as providing instruction sufficient for the full range of social work roles. But no concentration should be so narrowly conceived that it focuses primarily on specific competencies, specific positions, or on career lines within particular service organizations.

For each concentration it offers the school is expected to formulate explicitly the following:

1. Aims and rationale of the concentration including its relevance to social work.
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2. Identification of existing or emerging professional roles suitable for and available to those who complete the concentration.

3. Specific educational objectives including the professional knowledge and competence to be fostered.

4. The specific arrangement of educational experience, including courses and practice skill components.

5. Relation of each concentration to the total curriculum and to its several components including other concentrations.

It is anticipated that there will be diversity among schools in the kinds and number of concentrations offered, as well as in their designations, and in the instructional activities and learning experiences provided. Each school is expected to formulate, develop, and justify its concentration(s) oriented to the responsibilities of the profession and commensurate with the school's resources and capabilities.

LEARNING EXPERIENCES

Curriculum objectives define what the student is expected to learn. Learning experiences, such as those provided through classroom courses, the practicum, laboratory experience, tutorial conferences, and research projects offer the student the means to achieve the goals of social work education. Responsibility to select and order specific learning experiences rests with the individual school of social work.

The social work practicum is an essential component of professional education for social work. Its patterns may vary but an essential element of the practicum must include learning experiences that provide for students' direct engagement in service activities. Advances in educational methods may encourage use of a variety of practicum designs, even within the same school.

The practicum is intended to enhance student learning within all areas of the curriculum. There are several major objectives of the practicum. It should provide all students with opportunities for development, integration, and reinforcement of competence through performance in actual service situations. It should permit students to acquire and test skills relevant to emerging conditions of social work practice. The practicum should also foster for all students the integration and reinforcement of knowledge, value, and skill learning acquired in the field and through particular courses and concentrations. In the practicum the student should have an opportunity to delineate and comprehend questions for research which arise in the course of practice.

These objectives may be appropriately attained through diverse practicum designs and through various instructional formats. All arrangements should, however, be derived from clearly stated educational purposes, they should be articulated with other components of the curriculum, and they should be commensurate with the resources available to the school. Subject to these general principles, each school shall have freedom to determine the particular nature of its practicum, including the degree of variation for groups of students and the timing, level, and character of instructional experience to be provided through the practicum.
### APPENDIX S

**U.S. CENSUS DIVISIONS USED TO DEFINE GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>North Central</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**APPENDIX T (Continued)**

**CODED RAW DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORTRAN STATEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>651101130211150904556759000000111514060000005651240000100000131645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651101130211150904556759000000111514060000005651240000100000131645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651101130211150904556759000000111514060000005651240000100000131645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>