May 21, 1974

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Jerry Dean Scobee entitled "Personal Characteristics and Personality Traits of Social Service Workers in the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare." I recommend that it be accepted for nine quarter hours of credit in partial fulfillment of the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Social Work.

Mary H. Bloch
Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance

Georgiana McLarnan

Dana L. Tuttle

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton A. Smith
Vice Chancellor for
Graduate Studies and Research

E

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND PERSONALITY TRAITS OF SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS IN THE TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Council of

The University of Tennessee

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science in Social Work

---

by

Jerry Dean Scobee

June 1974

ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken in an effort to compare the personal characteristics and selected personality traits of protective service workers and nonprotective service workers in the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare. In addition the workers were questioned concerning their perception of the difficulty of the various service areas, and the skills and abilities of their fellow workers.

Based on the assumption that the protective service worker needs special skills and abilities, and the observation that it is common personnel practice to assign people who have a background and personality suited to the demands of the job, it was deemed reasonable to expect some measurable difference between the protective service worker and the nonprotective service worker in terms of personal characteristics and selected personality traits.

Questionnaires were sent to all social service workers in the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare in the Knox, Hamilton, and Shelby County offices who had a minimum of one year of social work experience. A total of 108 responses were used in the study, 95 representing the nonprotective service group, and 13 representing the protective service group.

While all study results were considered with caution due to the small sample base in the protective service

1150002

group, the data supported a hypothesis of no significant difference between the personal characteristics and personality traits of protective service workers and non-protective service workers. The hypothesis that the protective service area would be rated higher than the other service areas in terms of difficulty and requiring greater social work skill on the part of the worker was supported. Question concerning individual worker's skills and abilities appeared to reflect the worker's ranking of workers in their own service area as opposed to all workers in all service areas. As a result, no conclusions could be drawn concerning which workers possessed greater social work skills.

As a result of the study recommendations were made relating to the process of selecting and training of protective service workers. A need for evaluative research concerning the skills and abilities of protective service practitioners was also identified.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION.	1
	Purpose of Study.	3
	Need for the Study.	5
	Method and Scope of Study	7
	Description of the Sample Selection Process . .	9
	Response from the Sample Population	11
II.	A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	14
III.	STUDY GROUP'S RATING OF THE SERVICE AREAS AND OF FELLOW SERVICE WORKERS	21
	Summary of Responses on Items 1-12 of the Rating Scale.	26
	Study Group's Overall Ranking of the Service Areas	27
IV.	COMPARISON AND ANALYSIS OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND PERSONALITY TRAITS	30
V.	SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF STUDY RESULTS	35
BIBLIOGRAPHY		42
APPENDIXES		45
A.	LETTER TO COUNTY MANAGERS.	46
B.	QUESTIONNAIRE.	47
VITA		57

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Percentage Distribution of the Study Group on Items 1-12 of the Rating Scale.	22
II.	Percentage Distribution of the Nonprotective Service Workers on Items 1-12 of the Rating Scale	24
III.	Percentage Distribution of the Protective Service Workers on Items 1-12 of the Rating Scale	25
IV.	Mean Rank for Each Service Area by Difficulty and Skill Required	28
V.	Comparison of Groups by Personal Characteristics .	31
VI.	Comparison of Findings on Personality Traits . . .	34

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Child abuse and neglect has reached epidemic proportions in this country according to a report prepared for the American Medical Association by Dr. Vincent Fontana, chairman of New York City's task force on child abuse.[1] The report states that over the last decade there has been a 500 percent increase in known cases of child abuse and neglect. In Davidson County, Tennessee, alone the number of possible child abuse cases investigated by welfare workers during the first half of 1973 reflected a 50 percent increase in referrals over the same period in 1972.[2]

Those welfare workers in Tennessee who are most directly responsible for dealing with this mounting problem of child abuse and neglect are the protective service workers in the social services division of the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare. While most social service workers often find themselves in the position of making crucial decisions affecting the lives of children and families, this situation is particularly true for the protective service worker. Often the critical decision of maintaining the

---

[1]"Child Abuse in Epidemic Proportions," The Nashville Tennessean, June 26, 1973, p. 1.

[2]Keel Hunt, "Child Abuser Once Victim, Doctor Says," The Nashville Tennessean, June 28, 1973, p. 4.

family unit or removing the child or children for their own protection is one that falls on the shoulders of the protective service worker involved.

What are the implications to be drawn from these facts in terms of the qualifications needed for protective service workers? According to Dr. Vincent DeFrancis, "Administrators and practitioners in the field of Child Protection, with little exception, agree that staff in this specialized area of Child Welfare must acquire special knowledge and special skills."[3] DeFrancis points out attributes such as comfort with authority, ability to handle resistance and hostility, interpretive communication skills, high diagnostic skills, and sensitivity as essential to the protective service worker.

Clearly there are few instances where any worker will bring to the job all of the skills and abilities which the job may require. Generally speaking, these skills and abilities will be developed and sharpened through staff development and on the job experience. However, each worker does bring to the job certain personal characteristics and personality traits which may enhance his or her ability to acquire the skills and abilities which the job requires. As an example, a person with a degree in early childhood

---

[3]Vincent DeFrancis, Special Skills in Child Protective Services (Denver: The American Humane Association, 1958), p. 1.

development might more easily develop the skills needed in the area of day care than a person with a degree in literature.

The rather common practice of seeking to hire personnel with background and personality suited to the job, and the statement by DeFrancis that protective service workers need "special" skills and abilities form the basis of this study for if these statements are true, it is reasonsble to assume that there would be some measurable difference in either the personal characteristics or personality traits of the protective service workers and the non-protective service workers in the social service division of the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare.

I. PURPOSE OF STUDY

The purposes of this study are: to measure some personal characteristics and some personality traits of a specific group of social service workers, to note any difference between protective and nonprotective service workers in the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare, and to test the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference in the personal characteristics and personality traits of protective service workers and nonprotective service workers in the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare.

2. Social service workers in the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare will rank the protective service area higher than the other service areas in terms of difficulty, and higher in requirement of social work skills on the part of the worker.

Some questions to be answered are:

1. What service area do the social service workers name as most difficult?
2. What service area do the social service workers think requires the greatest social work skills?
3. In what service area do the social service workers prefer to work?
4. What service area do the social service workers like least?
5. In what service area does the fellow service worker named as "most skillful" work?
6. In what service area does the supervisor considered to possess highest social work skills work?
7. In what service area does the fellow service worker considered to be most intelligent work?
8. In what service area does the fellow service worker seen as most sensitive to clients work?
9. In what service area does the fellow service worker seen as best able to handle client hostility and resistance work?

10. In what service area does the fellow service worker seen as possessing the highest diagnostic ability work?
11. In what service area does the fellow service worker seen as most knowledgeable about agency philosophy and regulations work?
12. In what service area does the fellow service worker considered best able to communicate with the client work?

II. NEED FOR THE STUDY

Protective services is a specialized field in the area of child welfare, and in some ways is unique in the profession of social work. While any social work practitioner may be presumed to accept whatever responsibility and authority his agency has in carrying out its function, this acceptance is especially significant in child protective work. The protective services worker must fully accept and support the authority and responsibility of his agency, its right to offer services on behalf of neglected children, and its obligation, regardless of parental attitudes, to remain active in a case until there is sufficient change to reduce or remove the neglect.

Many social workers deal with client hostility and resistance, but it is uncommon to encounter these reactions in the initial contacts before any degree of relationship or

rapport has been established. Such resistance and hostility is often shown to the protective service worker, and he needs to be able to handle this early resistance without benefit of a good relationship with the client.

All social workers need to develop diagnostic skills in their practice, but this skill was especially necessary for the protective service worker due to the emergency or urgent nature of protective service cases. Decisions which may immediately and lastingly affect the welfare of children need to be made by the protective service worker. These decisions often involve weighing whether the child can remain in the home without suffering further demage while the parents are being motivated toward change, or whether removal of the child for his own protection is necessary. A hasty decision on the part of the protective service worker can have a profound effect on the future of the children affected by that decision.

The foregoing are some of the factors which lend support to the assumption that protective services workers do indeed need special skills and abilities. It is the intent of this study to point out that there is no significant difference in the personal characteristics and selected personality traits of protective service workers and non-protective service workers. The answers to specific questions concerning how the protective service area and the protective service workers are rated should indicate

whether the area of protective service and the workers in it are seen as special or possessing extra skills.

III. METHOD AND SCOPE OF STUDY

In order to measure the personality traits and characteristics of protective service workers and nonprotective service workers, three instruments were devised in the form of a three-part questionnaire. Part I was a survey focusing primarily on personal characteristics such as age, marital status, and so forth. From this external data, some comparisons can be made and some inferences drawn that might reflect skills and abilities via experience, college training, and so forth. Part II of the questionnaire was a rating survey which asks opinions of social service workers regarding the various skills areas. This rating survey should reveal how social service workers, themselves, see protective service workers and protective service as a skill area. The final part of the questionnaire consisted of three subscales taken from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. These scales measure the personality traits of ego strength, dominance, and control. These personality traits should reflect emotional capacity of social service workers to handle stress.

Two primary groups were used to compare and contrast personal characteristics and personality traits. One group consisted of protective service workers, defined as any

social service worker in the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare who spent at least 50 percent of his or her time in the service area of protective services. The second group consisted of nonprotective service workers defined as those social service workers in the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare who spent less than 50 percent of their time in the service area of protective services.

Protective services can be defined as specialized social services for children who are neglected, abused, exploited, or cruelly treated. The focus of the service is preventive, rehabilitative, and nonpunitive. It is geared to identifying the causative factors of the neglected.[4]

The researcher has made several assumptions which need to be recognized:

1. Social service workers in the State of Tennessee Department of Public Welfare comprise a representative sample of social service workers in public welfare agencies across the nation.
2. Social service workers in the Knox, Hamilton, and Shelby County Public Welfare offices comprise a representative sample of social service workers across the State of Tennessee.

---

[4]The Tennessee Department of Public Welfare, Tennessee Public Welfare Manual: Child Welfare, Vol. IV (Nashville: Tennessee Department of Public Welfare, February 15, 1961), p. 805.

3. Protective service workers need special skills and abilities.
4. Personal characteristics and personality traits influence a worker's ability to acquire job skills and abilities.
5. Instruments used will measure the personal characteristics and personality traits for which the instruments were designed.
6. The respondents will be honest in their responses to the items on the instrument.

The researcher has also recognized the following limitations:

1. The study data were gathered entirely from selected social service workers in the state of Tennessee Department of Public Welfare.
2. The study did not consider all aspects of personality, only those measured by the instruments used.
3. The test instrument did not attempt to directly measure social work skills and abilities.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE SELECTION PROCESS

Since the primary group to be studied was the protective service worker, it was necessary to select a sample of social service workers that would include service workers

who carried a caseload consisting primarily of protective service cases. According to Tennessee Public Welfare program specialists, the only geographical areas that were large enough in population and caseload numbers to warrant specialized workers and caseloads were the four major urban counties of Davidson, Knox, Hamilton, and Shelby. Since Davidson County workers were used to pre-test the questionnaire, only Knox, Hamilton, and Shelby counties were available from which to draw the sample.

Figures provided by the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare revealed a possible sample size of 345 service workers, this being the number of positions authorized in the three counties. Even with current vacancies the possible sample size was in excess of three hundred service workers.

While it would have been possible to administer the questionnaire to the entire sample group, program specialists in the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare recommended a method of reducing this sample size. According to their best estimates up to 40 percent of their social service workers would not have a minimum of one year of experience in the field of social work. It was felt that by administering the questionnaire to those service workers with a minimum of one year of experience in the field of social work, the sample size would not only be reduced, but the study results would be more meaningful. Workers with

at least one year of experience would be better able to rate the various service areas and fellow service workers.

As a result, the final sampling pool included all Tennessee Department of Public Welfare social service workers in Knox, Hamilton, and Shelby counties having a minimum of one year of experience in the field of social work. This resulted in a potential sample size of approximately two hundred service workers.

V. RESPONSE FROM THE SAMPLE POPULATION

As mentioned in the previous section, the potential sample size was estimated to be approximately two hundred social service workers. In an effort to assure that a more than ample supply of questionnaires was available in each of the three selected counties, the following number of questionnaires were sent to each county: 75 to Knox County, 75 to Hamilton County, and 150 to Shelby County.

Each one of the three county managers affected by this research effort was contacted by letter prior to the questionnaires being sent to the county offices. The purpose of the letter was to give advance notice to the county managers of the purpose of the research project as well as to indicate the amount of worker's time involved. This letter was sent out on November 27, 1973. See Appendix A.

The questionnaires were sent out in early December. By December 18, Knox County had returned 43, or 57 percent,

of the questionnaires they had received, and Hamilton County had returned 45, or 60 percent, of the questionnaires they had received.

Apparently as a result of a communication breakdown, the Shelby County office had not returned the questionnaires as of January 4, 1974. The administration in Shelby County had some questions about the appropriateness of the questionnaire and its legitimacy in the eyes of state-level administration. After some clarification by the researcher and state-level administration, the Shelby County office responded with 29, or 19 percent, of the questionnaires they had received.

The combined total of questionnaires received from the three county offices amounted to 117, or 39 percent, of the questionnaires they had received. Out of the 117 respondents, nine were incompletely filled out and, therefore, not included in the study results. This resulted in a study sample size of 108 respondents. Since the total potential sample size was estimated to be 200 workers, the 108 respondents represented 54 percent of the estimated sample size.

The primary study groups were protective service workers and nonprotective service workers. Thirteen, or 12 percent, of the respondents met the criteria to be included in the protective service group. The remaining 95,

or 88 percent, of the respondents comprised the nonprotective service group.

In the nonprotective service group, 49.5 percent of the workers listed services to children and family as their primary service area. A total of 29.5 percent of the workers listed the "other" category as their primary service area. The "other" category generally reflected either intake and referral responsibilities or reflected a generic caseload with no primary service area. The remaining 21 percent of the workers were distributed as follows: 10.5 percent were foster care workers, 7.4 percent were day-care licensing workers, 2.1 percent were adoption workers, and 1.1 percent were unmarried mothers' workers.

It was estimated by program specialists in the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare that there might be 30 social service workers in the Knox, Hamilton, and Shelby County offices who specialized in the protective services area. The 13 protective service respondents represented 43 percent of the estimated study group. It needs to be recognized that the 13 respondents in the protective services group comprise a very small sample from which to make comparisons and to draw conclusions. As a result of this small sample size, any comparisons that are made or conclusions that are drawn must be tentative in nature.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A review of the literature was conducted in an effort to investigate the thinking of professionals in the field of child welfare concerning the skills and abilities needed by the protective service worker in order to provide effective protective service casework.

A report by the Tennessee Senate Commission on Child Neglect, Dependency, and Abuse lent support to the idea that the protective services area demands staff with special skills and abilities.

> Child protective services are different from other child welfare services. They impose obligations and demand special skills in staff and a special approach in extending services on behalf of children despite rejection or resistance of parent(s) who are sometimes hostile or disturbed. They require the availability of skilled workers on a 24 hour per day, 7 day per week basis to assure that the right kind of service is given at the right time.[5]

This same line of thought was reflected by Simmons in his book on protective services for children.

> The agency needs to realize too that protective services are truly protective services only when given by staff with the professional skills needed to diagnose accurately each family situation and give the specialized help which enables many parents to change and to provide more acceptable care for their children. Risk often exists in leaving children

---

[5]The Tennessee Department of Public Welfare, Tennessee Commission on Child Neglect, Dependency, and Abuse (Nashville: Tennessee Department of Public Welfare, January, 1974), p. 9.

> in a neglect situation while the caseworker attempts to help the parents work out a better way of life for themselves and their children. However, agency policies regarding selection, development, and supervision of staff which reflect realization of the specialized and skilled nature of true protective services greatly reduce the risk.[6]

Simmons went on to say, "Protective services are a specialized form of casework requiring a deep understanding of human behavior and skills in establishing, with parents who do not seek help, a relationship in which they are motivated to work toward change."[7] Simmons further recommended that an agency should assign protection cases to its most skilled workers, establish protective service units where possible, and develop specialized workers where units are not possible.[8]

While both of these publications described protective service as a specialized area requiring highly skilled workers, no mention was made of the personal qualities necessary for the protective service worker. Davoren discussed the area of personal qualities in a book edited by Halfer and Kempe when she identified the following characteristics: a person with few managerial tendencies, someone with a fair number of satisfactions in his job so that he will not be looking to the patients to provide

---

[6]Harold E. Simmons, Protective Services For Children (Sacramento, California: The Citadel Press, 1968), p. 9.

[7]Ibid., p. 55.

[8]Ibid.

these satisfactions, and someone with a strong working knowledge of child behavior that can be shared with the abusive parents at appropriate times.[9] Polansky referred to characteristics such as being comfortable with authority but not punitive in nature, mature judgement, a willingness to get involved, and just plain stubborness.[10] Thompson referred to the need for self understanding, high diagnostic ability, and experience as some of the requirements of the protective service worker.[11] Williams described such worker characteristics as being firm, kind, consistent, nonjudgemental, dependable, able to set limits, creative, and determined.[12] Dolores Schmidt emphasized the qualities of competence and conviction in a protective service worker.[13]

Some central qualities appeared to run through the writings of these authors. Nearly all of them agreed the

---

[9]Elizabeth Davoren, "The Role of the Social Worker," The Battered Child, eds. Ray E. Helfer and C. Henry Kempe (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. 165.

[10]Norman A. Polansky and others, Child Neglect: Understanding and Reaching the Parent (New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1972), pp. 55-69.

[11]Ellen M. Thomson and others, Child Abuse: A Community Challenge (Buffalo, New York: Henry Stewart, Inc., 1971), pp. 31-36.

[12]Fredericka D. Williams, "AFDC Worker's Role in Protective Services," Child Welfare, XLVIII (May, 1969), pp. 273-78.

[13]Dolores M. Schmidt, "The Protective Service Caseworker: How Does He Survive Job Pressures?," Child Welfare, XLII (March, 1963), pp. 115-19.

protective service worker needs to be mature and experienced. The issue of authority, the workers' feelings about it and use of it, was a consistent area of concern. There was also general consensus that the worker must have determination, based on his own belief of his right and obligation to provide protective services when and where needed.

There was some line of thought that the demands and pressures of protective services required skills and expertise beyond the capacity of any individual caseworker. Kempe recommended a year of fellowship study and field work with a group who dealt directly with the problem of child abuse.[14] In addition, Kempe cited a need for intensive casework services and follow-up under the supervision of well-trained psychiatrists.[15] Kempe suggested that caseworkers in small counties need readily available expert consultation when dealing with protective service cases.[16]

In a study of professional social workers in a public child welfare agency, Wasserman discussed the nature of protective service work, the work conditions in a public agency, and the emotional effects of this work on the

---

[14]C. Henry Kempe, "Some Problems Encountered by Welfare Departments in the Management of the Battered Child Syndrome," The Battered Child, eds. Ray E. Helfer and C. Henry Kempe (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. 171.

[15]Ibid., p. 169.

[16]Ibid., p. 170.

caseworker. Wasserman observed that workers are overwhelmed by crisis after crisis, often suffering from physical fatigue and emotional upset. Of the twelve professionals he studied over a two-year period, eight left the agency. The primary feelings these workers expressed were frustration and fatigue.[17]

Costin expressed the feeling that no amount of casework service in itself, regardless of quantity and quality, was or is sufficient to overcome the effects of unemployment, sub-standard housing, lack of health care, and other social problems. Costin went on to suggest that traditional reliance on one method of social work was not sufficient to meet the needs of protective service families.[18]

In spite of the fact that a good deal has been written concerning the difficulty of protective service and the need for skilled workers, and opinions have been expressed concerning the personal characteristics the protective service worker should possess, surprisingly little research has been conducted that describes the caseworker who actually provides protective services. In a nationwide study of child protective services conducted by the American

---

[17]Harry Wasserman, "Early Careers of Professional Social Workers in a Public Child Welfare Agency," Social Work, XV (July, 1970), pp. 93-101.

[18]Lela B. Costin, Child Welfare: Policies and Practices (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1972), pp. 253-98.

Humane Association, recommendations were made that an adequate child protective program must recruit mature, experienced personnel with the highest social work skills. The results of this survey showed that most states described their child welfare staff as not fully trained. An overall pattern was discovered that showed less and less compliance between the necessary qualifications for protective service workers, and the qualification of the staff who were actually assigned to child protective services.[19]

In a comparative study of professional social workers in a family counseling agency and professional social workers in a child protection agency, Billingsley noted the following differences in characteristics. The FCA supervisors and caseworkers were overwhelmingly female and predominantly single, while the CPA employed a greater number of men and a greater number of married men and women. A significantly greater number of CPA supervisors majored in social science subjects in college. A significantly greater number of FCA caseworkers were fully trained. No other significant differences were noted.[20]

This review of the literature related to the protective service worker has revealed that writers in the

---

[19]The American Humane Association, Child Protective Services (Denver: The American Humane Association, 1967), pp. 25-26.

[20]Andrew Billingsley, The Social Worker In A Child Protective Agency (New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1965), p. 41.

field recognize the special demands of protective service work. There is further recognition that protective service workers must acquire special skills in order to provide effective casework services. In addition to these special skills, certain personal characteristics were identified as desirable in the protective service worker. While much was written regarding what the protective service worker should have in terms of skills, personality traits, and characteristics, little was written that described the qualities the protective service practitioner actually possesses.

CHAPTER III

STUDY GROUP'S RATING OF THE SERVICE AREAS AND OF FELLOW SERVICE WORKERS

Part II of the questionnaire asked the study group to rate the service areas and their fellow service workers along several dimensions. See Appendix B. It was reasoned that if the protective service area demanded workers with special skills and abilities, then the protective service area would be seen as more difficult and requiring greater social work skills. In addition, several questions were asked that dealt with individual workers' skills and abilities. It was reasoned that if the protective service area required workers with special skills and abilities, and if the protective service workers actually possessed these special skills and abilities, then the protective service workers would be seen as more highly skilled than the service workers in other service areas.

The data in Table I give the percentage distribution of the total study group on items 1 through 12 of the rating scale. As the data reveal, a clear majority (77.4 percent) of the study group saw the protective service area as the most difficult. Slightly less than a majority (47.1 percent) of the study group also considered the protective service area as the area that required the greatest social work skills.

TABLE I

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY GROUP ON ITEMS 1-12 OF THE RATING SCALE (N=108)

Item	Service Areas						
	Adoption	Unmarried Mothers	Day Care	Foster Care	Protective Services	Services to Families	Generic
1. Area most difficult	3.8	0.9	0.9	8.5	77.4	4.7	3.8
2. Area requiring greatest social work skills	11.5	1.9	0.0	15.4	47.1	16.3	7.7
3. Area most popular	18.9	3.8	12.3	21.7	14.2	26.4	2.8
4. Area least popular	9.5	1.9	29.5	5.7	39.0	6.7	7.6
5. Service worker most skillful	11.7	1.0	1.9	12.6	31.1	27.2	14.6
6. Supervisor with highest social work skills	6.1	1.0	5.1	10.1	18.2	33.3	26.3
7. Service worker most intelligent	5.1	2.0	4.1	11.2	16.3	41.8	19.4
8. Service worker most sensitive to client	5.1	2.0	0.0	13.1	11.1	46.5	22.2
9. Service worker best able to handle client hostility and resistance	1.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	35.0	37.0	17.0
10. Service worker with highest diagnostic ability	7.1	0.0	0.0	11.1	17.2	43.4	21.2
11. Service worker most knowledgeable about agency philosophy and regulations	5.0	1.0	5.0	9.0	12.0	39.0	29.0
12. Service worker best able to communicate with client	3.0	2.0	4.0	8.1	11.1	52.5	19.2

By separating the percentage distribution of the nonprotective service workers (Table II) and the percentage distribution of the protective service workers (Table III), an interesting observation can be made concerning the service area considered most popular. Of the total study group (108) only 15 persons, or 14.2 percent, considered the protective service area as the most popular, and of these 15, nine were themselves protective service workers.

While no clear majority of the total study group agreed on a service area that was least popular, the protective service area received a larger percentage (39 percent) than any of the other service areas. Table III indicates that the protective service workers did not share this opinion. Only 1 of the 13 respondents, or 7.7 percent, listed the protective service area as his or her least popular area.

Beginning with question five the workers were asked to rate their fellow service workers in terms of selected skill areas. These skill areas were selected based on their relationship to the skill areas mentioned in Chapter I, and discussed by DeFrancis in his work on child protective services.[21]

A review of Table I reveals a significant transition in the study group's thinking when they began to rate

---

[21]DeFrancis, op. cit., pp. 1-4.

TABLE II

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE NONPROTECTIVE SERVICE WORKERS ON ITEMS 1-12 OF THE RATING SCALE (N=95)

Item	Service Areas						
	Adoption	Unmarried Mothers	Day Care	Foster Care	Protective Services	Services to Families	Generic
1. Area most difficult	4.3	0.0	1.1	9.7	75.3	5.4	4.3
2. Area requiring greatest social work skills	12.1	2.2	0.0	17.6	42.2	17.6	7.7
3. Area most popular	21.5	3.2	12.9	24.7	6.5	29.0	2.2
4. Area least popular	7.6	1.1	25.0	6.5	43.5	7.6	8.7
5. Service worker most skillful	12.1	1.1	1.1	14.3	26.4	29.7	15.4
6. Supervisor with highest social work skills	5.7	1.1	4.6	11.5	13.8	36.8	26.4
7. Service worker most intelligent	5.8	2.3	4.7	11.6	9.3	45.3	20.9
8. Service worker most sensitive to client	5.7	2.3	0.0	14.9	3.4	48.3	25.3
9. Service worker best able to handle client hostility and resistance	1.1	2.3	2.3	5.7	29.9	41.4	17.2
10. Service worker with highest diagnostic ability	8.0	0.0	0.0	10.3	10.3	48.3	23.0
11. Service worker most knowledgeable about agency philosophy and regulations	4.5	1.1	4.5	9.1	10.2	39.8	30.7
12. Service worker best able to communicate with client	2.3	2.3	4.6	9.2	3.4	57.5	20.7

TABLE III

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE PROTECTIVE SERVICE WORKERS ON ITEMS 1-12 OF THE RATING SCALE (N=13)*

Item	Service Areas						
	Adoption	Unmarried Mothers	Day Care	Foster Care	Protective Services	Services to Families	Generic
1. Area most difficult	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	92.3	0.0	0.0
2. Area requiring greatest social work skills	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	76.9	7.7	7.7
3. Area most popular	0.0	7.7	7.7	0.0	69.2	7.7	7.7
4. Area least popular	23.1	7.7	61.5	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0
5. Service worker most skillful	7.7	0.0	7.7	0.0	69.2	7.7	7.7
6. Supervisor with highest social work skills	7.7	0.0	7.7	0.0	53.9	7.7	23.1
7. Service worker most intelligent	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	69.2	15.4	7.7
8. Service worker most sensitive to client	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	69.2	30.8	0.0
9. Service worker best able to handle client hostility and resistance	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	69.2	7.7	15.4
10. Service worker with highest diagnostic ability	0.0	0.0	7.7	15.4	61.6	7.7	7.7
11. Service worker most knowledgeable about agency philosophy and regulations	7.7	0.0	7.7	7.7	30.8	30.8	15.4
12. Service worker best able to communicate with client	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	69.2	15.4	7.7

*Reader is reminded of the small number of cases.

individual workers as opposed to service areas. The data show that the total group did not list a protective service worker in a majority of their responses to any of the eight items related to an individual worker's skill. Only in response to item five (most skillful) were the protective service workers rated higher than the workers in the other service areas. By considering the data in Tables II and III it can be seen that the small margin of difference in Table I between the protective service area and the service to families area can be attributed to the fact that a majority (9 out of 13, or 69.2 percent) of the protective service workers rated themselves as most skillful.

Beginning with item 6 workers in the service to families area were rated higher than workers in the other areas, and in item 12, were listed in a majority (52.5 percent) of the total group's response.

I. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES ON ITEMS 1-12 of the rating scale

The data from Table I show that a clear majority of the study group considered the protective service area to be the most difficult. A near majority of the study group also considered the protective service area to be the area that requires the greatest social work skills. At the point that the study group was asked to rate the individual workers in terms of skills and abilities, workers in the

protective service area were generally not rated higher than workers in other service areas. Other than item 5 (worker most skillful) workers in the service to family area were rated higher than workers in the other service areas.

While the data from Table III need to be considered with caution due to the small sample base, the data seem to indicate that the protective service workers consider themselves to be more skillful than workers in the other service areas. The only item that listed less than a majority in the protective service area was item 11 (worker most knowledgeable about agency philosophy and regulation).

II. STUDY GROUP'S OVERALL RANKING OF THE SERVICE AREAS

As a final exercise in Part II of the questionnaire the service workers were asked to rank the seven service areas in terms of difficulty and in terms of requiring the greatest social work skills on the part of the worker. The workers were instructed to rank order the service areas, one being the highest and seven being the lowest. For purposes of statistical analysis this rank order was inverted. An area ranked number one was given a value of eight while an area ranked number seven was given a value of one. This resulted in a ranking scale ranging from one to eight. The results of this rank order are displayed in Table IV.

TABLE IV

MEAN RANK FOR EACH SERVICE AREA BY DIFFICULTY AND SKILL REQUIRED

Protective Service Group (N=13)			Nonprotective Service Group (N=95)			
	Mean Rank	Standard Deviation		Mean Rank	Standard Deviation	t
Adoption	3.92	2.02	Adoption	3.42	2.24	.76
Day Care	2.38	1.98	Day Care	1.88	1.73	.95
Foster Care	4.08	1.61	Foster Care	3.95	2.31	.20
Protective Service	6.00	2.45	Protective Service	4.88	2.80	1.36
Service to Children and Families	3.92	1.93	Service to Children and Families	3.39	2.13	.84
Service to Unmarried Mothers	3.77	1.54	Service to Unmarried Mothers	2.97	1.86	1.47
Generic	3.92	1.42	Generic	2.17	2.20	2.76*

*This is the only significant difference found. It is significant at the .01 level of confidence.

As the data show, the protective service area achieved a higher mean rank compared to the other service areas in both the protective service group and the nonprotective service group. The highest rank (6.0) was given to the protective service area by the protective service group.

In comparing the mean rank of the service areas between groups, it can be seen that only the generic service area revealed a significant difference. The t score of 2.76 represents a difference significant at the .01 level of confidence. No significant difference was observed between the two groups in relation to the remaining service areas. It was interesting to note that the two study groups followed a similar pattern in their ranking of the service areas. The generic area was the exception to this pattern.

CHAPTER IV

COMPARISON AND ANALYSIS OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND PERSONALITY TRAITS

The primary focus of this study was to compare and note significant differences between the personal characteristics and personality traits of protective service workers and nonprotective service workers. It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the two study groups.

Table V gives the comparison of the two study groups by personal characteristics. In order to obtain a numerical figure in the measure of sex, major, MSW, and position, the following procedure was used. For the measure of sex the number one represented males and the number two represented females. For the measure of college major the number one represented a degree in an area other than the social sciences while the number two represented a degree in the social sciences area. In the MSW measure the number one indicated the worker held a Master of Social Work degree while the number two indicated he or she did not. The position measure was converted to a numerical figure by assigning a value of one to the case aide position, two to the social worker I position, three to the social worker II position, and so forth up to the value of seven for the

TABLE V

COMPARISON OF GROUPS BY PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Protective Service Group (N=13)			Nonprotective Service Group (N=95)			t
Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Age	28.77	6.15	Age	30.56	9.75	.64
Sex	1.69	.48	Sex	1.91	.21	2.31*
Yrs. Married	4.77	6.07	Yrs. Married	6.24	8.82	.58
No. Children	.77	1.01	No. Children	.66	1.19	.32
Education Level	16.31	.63	Education Level	15.71	1.95	1.09
Major	1.54	.66	Major	1.44	1.84	.19
Grade Point	2.78	.94	Grade Point	2.47	1.03	1.02
MSW	2.00	.00	MSW	1.98	.14	.51
Yrs. in Soc. Work	4.36	3.89	Yrs. in Soc. Work	4.83	5.72	.29
Yrs. with Current Agency	2.82	2.80	Yrs. with Current Agency	4.13	4.72	.97
Yrs. in Primary Area	1.89	2.28	Yrs. in Primary Area	3.35	4.32	1.19
Position	2.62	1.19	Position	2.53	1.16	.26

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

field supervisor III position. It was then possible to convert these numbers to mean figures and to make comparisons.

The comparison of personal characteristics listed in Table V reveals that with only one exception there was no significant difference in the personal characteristics of the two study groups. The exception was sex. A significantly larger number of males were found in the protective service group.

Since questions concerning marital status did not lend themselves to a mean figure, the percentage distribution by marital status was not included in Table V. In the protective service group, 61.6 percent, or 8 of 13 workers were married; one person, or 7.7 percent was divorced or widowed; and the remaining four, or 30.7 percent, were single. By comparison the nonprotective service group listed 60 percent as married; 11.6 percent as divorced or widowed; 2.1 percent as separated; and 26.3 percent as single. Even with the small sample base of protective service workers, there was no significant difference noted in the marital status category.

The personality traits which were measured in this study were dominance, ego strength, and control, all subscales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. By way of a brief review the MMPI consists of ten clinical scales and three validity scales from which profile patterns

of psychopathology can be drawn. In addition to the ten basic scales, research on the MMPI has resulted in several sub-scales which can be dealt with apart from the test as a whole. The emphasis in these sub-scale is on "normal" adults rather than on the diagnosis of psychopathology.

The measures of ego strength and control were utilized because they measure a person's ability to handle stress and remain stable under stressful conditions.[22] The dominance scale was utilized because it measures such traits as leadership ability, persistence, and strong and forceful action.[23]

The results of this testing can be seen in Table VI. The data show that while the protective service group scored higher in all three measures, none of the differences between the two study groups were significant.

The reader needs to be reminded that these results must be considered as tentative due to the small sample base in the protective services group. However, based on the data available, the hypothesis of no significant difference between the personal characteristics and personality traits of protective service workers and nonprotective service workers was supported.

---

[22]W. Grant Dahlstrom and George Schlager Welsh, An MMPI Handbook (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1960), pp. 300-01.

[23]Ibid., p. 361.

TABLE VI

COMPARISON OF FINDINGS ON PERSONALITY TRAITS

Protective Service Group N=13*			Nonprotective Service Group N=95			
Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	t
Dominance	67.08	9.5	Dominance	61.78	10.0	1.79
Ego Strength	59.31	5.5	Ego Strength	56.77	10.0	.89
Control	58.15	12.8	Control	54.22	11.5	1.13

*The reader is reminded of the small sample base in the protective service group.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF STUDY RESULTS

This study was conducted in an effort to compare the personal characteristics and personality traits of selected protective service workers and nonprotective service workers in the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare. In addition the workers were questioned concerning their perception of the difficulty of the various service areas.

Based on the assumption that the protective services worker needs special skills and abilities, and the observation that is a common personnel practice to assign people who have a background and personality suited to the demands of the job, it was deemed reasonable to expect some measurable difference between the protective service worker and the nonprotective service worker in terms of personal characteristics and selected personality traits.

Questionnaires were sent to all social service workers in the Tennessee Department of Public Welfare in the Knox, Hamilton, and Shelby County offices who had a minimum of one year of social work experience. A total of 108 responses were used in the study, 95 representing the nonprotective service group, and 13 representing the protective service group.

This study of personal characteristics and personality traits of social service workers in the Tennessee

Department of Public Welfare attempted to focus on three aspects of protective service: (1) a ranking of the service areas by difficulty and skill required, (2) a rating scale of individual worker's skill, and (3) personal characteristics and personality traits of the workers.

Questions were raised concerning which service area was considered most difficult and required the greatest social work skills on the part of the worker. The study results supported the hypothesis that the service workers would rank the protective service area higher than the other service areas in terms of difficulty and requiring greater social work skills.

At the point the questions in the rating scale were directed toward the skills and abilities of individual workers as opposed to service areas, there was a shift in the ratings to the service to families area. Several possible conclusions could be made to account for this shift. It is possible that the protective service workers did not possess skills and abilities special or different from the skills and abilities of workers in other areas. It is also possible that workers in the service to families area possessed special skills and abilities, and were recognized as more skillful by their fellow service workers.

While these conclusions are possible, the researcher has concluded that the individual workers rated the workers they knew best; i.e. the workers in their own section. It

is possible that the service workers were not familiar enough with the professional capabilities of workers outside their own service areas to feel comfortable in rating them. In the larger urban counties used for this study, it is possible they have little professional contact with workers outside their own section or unit. This conclusion could be supported by the fact that the ratings listed in Table I followed very closely the distribution of workers by service areas. For example, 49.5 percent of the workers in the nonprotective service group were in the service to families area, and this area averaged about a 40 percent response over the items dealing with individual workers skill. The pattern is similar for the other service areas.

The end result seems to be that there was no clear majority opinion as to which workers are more highly skilled even though the protective service area was generally believed to be the most difficult area, and the area requiring the greatest social work skills on the part of the worker. This apparently inconsistent result can be at least partially attributed to the researcher and the research instrument. The questions in the rating scale dealing with the skills and abilities of individual workers were constructed under the assumption that the service workers were sufficiently familiar with the professional capability of the co-workers in the other service area to make an across the board assessment of their fellow service workers. This assumption of familiarity was apparently not valid.

Some other method of assessing and comparing skills and abilities needed to be utilized in order to answer questions concerning which workers possess higher skills and abilities. Perhaps some more objective instrument could have been used such as case review coupled with worker and client interviews. It is also possible that supervisors in a position to know the professional abilities of all the workers in a given county office could have been identified and asked to rate the service workers. Whatever the method, an objective assessment of worker skills and abilities would have been valuable in determining if protective service workers in the study group possessed greater social work skills.

The major objective of the study dealt with a comparison of the personal characteristics and personality traits of protective service workers and nonprotective service workers. While there was a questionably small (perhaps insufficient) sample of protective service workers to draw comparisons from, the data available largely supported a hypothesis of no significant difference between the two study groups in terms of personal characteristics and personality traits.

There was one exception to this finding. The data revealed that proportionately more males worked in the protective service area. This result might be a reflection of the potential for danger in protective service work. Any

protective service case can potentially become volatile. Reports of protective service workers being assaulted or even killed are not uncommon. Perhaps more men were assigned to protective service because it is commonly felt that men are better prepared (physically) to handle potential physical assault. With no data to support this assumption, it becomes merely conjecture and no clear answer appears possible.

To briefly recapitulate, the study result showed that the protective service area was considered to be the area requiring the greatest social work skills on the part of the worker. At the same time protective service workers were not seen as more highly skilled by their fellow service workers, and did not differ significantly from nonprotective service workers in terms of personal characteristics and personality traits.

What are the implications that can be drawn from these study results? This researcher believes that the process of selecting and training protective service workers needs to be reviewed and altered. Based on these study results, the protective service workers do not bring to the job personal characteristics and personality traits that are different from the personal characteristics and personality traits of workers in other service areas. At the same time, the study supports the hypothesis that protective service is more difficult and demands greater

skills. The literature also cites a need for workers with greater skills and certain personality traits. It would seem logical then to attempt to select personnel who are suited to the demands of the protective service job.

As an outgrowth of the review of the literature and the study results, this researcher would make the following recommendation:

1. Protective service workers should have an undergraduate education in the social sciences, preferably in social work.
2. Protective service workers should have a minimum of two years of experience in social work prior to being placed in protective service.
3. Protective service workers should demonstrate an emotional capacity to handle the demands and stress of protective service work.
4. Protective service workers should have a minimum of six months "internship" under qualified supervision and expert consultation.
5. This qualified supervision and expert consultation should be available to the protective service worker on an ongoing basis during his or her practice.
6. The protective service worker should be given administrative recognition and support via higher position and greater remuneration for his or her services.

In addition to these suggestions concerning the selection and training of protective service workers, more evaluative research needs to be done concerning the skills and abilities needed for protective service work. Much has been written about what skills and abilities are needed in protective service, but little research has been done in terms of what skills and abilities practitioners in the field actually have. This research could take the form of a descriptive study which identifies "expert" practitioners in the field of protective services and describes their personal characteristics and personality traits. As a follow up, a comparative study could be done which compares the qualities of these highly qualified workers and workers of lesser ability.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Billingsley, Andrew. The Social Worker In A Child Protective Agency. New York: The National Association of Social Workers, 1966.

"Child Abuse in Epidemic Proportions," The Nashville Tennessean, June 26, 1973.

Costin, Lela B. Child Welfare: Policies and Practices. New York: McGraw Hill, 1972.

Dahlstrom, W. Grant, and Welsh, G. S. An MMPI Handbook. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1960.

DeFrancis, Vincent. Special Skills in Child Protective Services. Denver: The American Humane Association, 1958.

Helfer, Ray E., and Kempe, C. Henry (eds.). The Battered Child. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Hunt, Keel. "Child Abuser Once Victim, Doctor Says," The Nashville Tennessean, July 28, 1973.

Schmidt, Dolores M. "The Protective Service Caseworker: How Does He Survive Job Pressures?," Child Welfare, XLII (March, 1963), 115-19.

Simmons, Harold E. Protective Services For Children. Sacramento, California: The Citadel Press, 1968.

The American Humane Association. Child Protective Services. Denver: The American Humane Association, 1967.

The Tennessee Department of Public Welfare. Tennessee Commission on Child Neglect, Dependency, and Youth. Nashville: Tennessee Department of Public Welfare, 1974.

The Tennessee Department of Public Welfare. Tennessee Public Welfare Manual: Child Welfare. Vol. IV. Nashville: Tennessee Department of Public Welfare, Revised Feb. 15, 1961.

Thompson, Ellen M., and others. Child Abuse: A Community Challenge. Buffalo: Henry Stewart, Inc., 1971.

Wasserman, Harry. "Early Careers of Professional Social Workers in a Public Child Welfare Agency," Social Work, XV (July, 1970), 93-101.

Williams, Fredericka. "AFDC Worker's Role in Protective Services," Child Welfare, XLVIII (May, 1969), 273-78.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO COUNTY MANAGERS

November 27, 1973

Dear County Manager:

My name is Jerry Scobee and I am a second year student at the University of Tennessee School of Social Work currently in placement with the Department of Public Welfare, Community Services Division. I am writing to give you some advance information concerning thesis work I am doing toward my graduation requirements.

My thesis deals with the personal characteristics and personality traits of social service workers in the state of Tennessee. It focuses on the difference (if any) between protective service workers and nonprotective service workers.

The instrument I am using to collect data consists of a three-part questionnaire. This instrument will be administered to all social service workers in the Knox, Hamilton, and Shelby County offices, including aides and supervisors who have at least one year of experience in the field of social work. The instrument will require approximately thirty minutes to complete.

At this point the questionnaire is in the process of being edited and printed. I am hopeful that it can be delivered to the county offices in early December and returned no later than December 20th. I have attached a copy of the questionnaire for your review.

I realize this is a busy time for you and your staff. I am hopeful that the time your staff devotes to this project will not only be helpful to me, but also be of direct service to the Department.

Thank you in advance for your kindness.

Sincerely,

Jerry D. Scobee

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Part I

Personal Information

1. Social Security Number _____.

2. Age_____ 3. Sex_____.

4. What is your present marital status?
   1. Married_____.
   2. Widowed, divorced_____.
   3. Separated_____.
   4. Single_____.

5. Total number of years married._____.
   (Skip if never married)

6. If a parent, number of children_____.
   (Skip if not a parent)

7. Education: Circle the highest year completed.
   10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

8. If a college graduate, please list your major and degree held. Major_____ Degree_____

9. If a college graduate, please indicate your overall grade point average_____. (Approximately if you are not sure)

10. Do you hold a Master of Social Work Degree? _____Yes
    _____No

11. Please list the total number of years you have worked in the field of social work_____.

12. How long have you been working with your current agency?
    _____years _____months

13. Please list the approximate percentage of time you spend working in the following service areas.
    _____Adoption _____Unmarried mother _____Day care licensing _____Foster care (recruitment, licensing, placement, and supervision) _____Protective services _____Services to children and families (AFDC, WIN, Adult Services) _____Other.

14. What is the length of time you have been working in your primary (50% or more of the time spent) service area? _____years _____months. (Skip if you do not have a primary service area)

15. Please indicate your position title.

_____Case Aide
_____Welfare Worker I
_____Welfare Worker II
_____Welfare Worker III
_____Field Supervisor I
_____Field Supervisor II
_____Field Supervisor III
_____Other
(Please specify)

The following rating scale is designed to gather data concerning your opinions about the various service areas and of fellow service workers. You are asked to complete the sentences with a number that corresponds to a service area. When rating fellow workers by service area, do so on the basis that the worker spends the majority (50% or more) of his time in the service area identified. If the worker has no major service area, use the service area entitled generic. Please do not consider supervisors as a fellow service worker. Do not exclude yourself from consideration. Remember that this information is strictly confidential.

Service areas

1. Adoption
2. Unmarried mother
3. Day care licensing (recruitment, licensing)
4. Foster care (placement, supervision)
5. Protective service
6. Service to children and families (AFDC, WIN, Adult Services)
7. Generic

Part II

Rating Scale

1. In my opinion the service area that is most difficult is service area no. _____.

2. In my opinion the service area that requires the greatest social work skills is service area no. _____.

3. If I could work in any of the service areas mentioned, it would be service area no. _____.

4. The service area I like least is service area no. _____.

5. The fellow service worker that I consider most skillfull works in service area no. _____.

6. The supervisor that I consider to possess the highest social work skills, works in service area no. _____.

7. The fellow service worker that I consider to be most intelligent works in service area no. _____.

8. The fellow service worker that I consider most sensitive to clients works in service area no. _____.

9. The fellow service worker that I consider to be best able to handle client hostility and resistance works in service area no. _____.

10. The fellow service worker that I consider to possess the highest diagnostic ability works in service area no. _____.

11. The fellow service worker that I consider most knowledgeable about agency philosophy and regulations works in service area no. _____.

12. The fellow service worker that I consider best able to communicate with the client works in service area no. _____.

13. As a final exercise, please rank the service areas in terms of difficulty and in terms of requiring greatest social work skills on the part of the worker. 1=highest - 7=lowest.

_____Adoption
_____Day care
_____Foster care
_____Protective service
_____Service to children and families
_____Unmarried mothers
_____Generic

The final part of this questionnaire is an inventory which consists of numbered statements. Read each statement and decide whether it is <u>true as applied to you</u> or <u>false as applied to you</u>.

You are to circle the answers to the left of each statement. If a statement is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE, as applied to you, circle the letter T to the left of the statement. If

a statement is FALSE or NOT USUALLY TRUE, as applied to you, circle the letter F to the left of the statement. If a statement does not apply to you or if it is something that you don't know about, make no mark.

Remember to give YOUR OWN opinion of yourself. Do not leave any blank spaces if you can avoid it.

T F 1. I have a good appetite.

T F 2. I like to read newspaper articles on crime.

T F 3. I have diarrhea once a month or more.

T F 4. My sex life is satisfactory.

T F 5. At times I have fits of laughing and crying that I cannot control.

T F 6. At times I feel like swearing.

T F 7. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job.

T F 8. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.

T F 9. I have a cough most of the time.

T F 10. I seldom worry about my health.

T F 11. My sleep is fitful and disturbed.

T F 12. When I am with people I am bothered by hearing very queer things.

T F 13. I am in just as good physical health as most of my friends.

T F 14. As a youngster I was suspended from school one or more times for cutting up.

T F 15. Everything is turning out just like the prophets of the Bible said it would.

T F 16. I have not lived the right kind of life.

T F 17. Parts of my body often have feelings like burning, tingling, crawling, or like "going to sleep."

T F 18. I sometimes keep on at a thing until others lose their patience with me.

T F 19. I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.

T F 20. I sometimes tease animals.

T F 21. I am easily downed in an argument.

T F 22. These days I find it hard not to give up hope of amounting to something.

T F 23. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence.

T F 24. I would like to be a nurse.

T F 25. I do many things which I regret afterwards (I regret things more often than others seem to).

T F 26. I go to church almost every week.

T F 27. I have very few quarrels with members of my family.

T F 28. I have met problems so full of possibilities that I have been unable to make up my mind about them.

T F 29. Sometimes when I am not feeling well I am cross.

T F 30. Some people are so bossy that I feel like doing the opposite of what they request, even though I know they are right.

T F 31. I have never done anything dangerous for the thrill of it.

T F 32. I enjoy a race or game better when I bet on it.

T F 33. I like collecting flowers or growing house plants.

T F 34. At times my thoughts have raced ahead faster than I could speak them.

T F 35. I like to cook.

T F 36. At times I feel like picking a fist fight with someone.

T F 37. During the past few years I have been well most of the time.

T F 38. I resent having anyone take me in so cleverly that I have had to admit that it was one on me.

T F 39. It wouldn't make me nervous if any members of my family got into trouble with the law.

T F 40. I am not afraid to handle money.

T F 41. I have never had a fainting spell.

T F 42. When I get bored I like to stir up some excitement.

T F 43. I frequently notice my hand shakes when I try to do something.

T F 44. My hands have not become clumsy or awkward.

T F 45. I feel weak all over much of the time.

T F 46. I have had no difficulty in keeping my balance in walking.

T F 47. I like to flirt.

T F 48. I believe my sins are unpardonable.

T F 49. I frequently find myself worrying about something.

T F 50. I loved my mother.

T F 51. I like science.

T F 52. I very much like hunting.

T F 53. My parents have often objected to the kind of people I went around with.

T F 54. I gossip a little at times.

T F 55. I should like to belong to several clubs or lodges.

T F 56. I like to talk about sex.

T F 57. I get mad easily and then get over it soon.

T F 58. I brood a great deal.

T F 59. I have periods of such great restlessness that I cannot sit long in a chair.

T F 60. I never worry about my looks.

T F 61. I dream frequently about things that are best kept to myself.

T F 62. I believe I am no more nervous than most others.

T F 63. My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others.

T F 64. I believe there is a Devil and a Hell in after-life.

T F 65. I don't blame anyone for trying to grab everything he can get in this world.

T F 66. I have had blank spells in which my activities were interrupted and I did not know what was going on around me.

T F 67. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong.

T F 68. Sometimes at elections I vote for men about whom I know very little.

T F 69. If I were an artist I would like to draw flowers.

T F 70. When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.

T F 71. Something exciting will almost always pull me out of it when I am feeling low.

T F 72. When I leave home I do not worry about whether the door is locked and the windows closed.

T F 73. Once in a while I laugh at a dirty joke.

T F 74. At one or more times in my life I felt that someone was making me do things by hypnotizing me.

T F 75. I have periods in which I feel unusually cheerful without any special reason.

T F 76. In school I found it very hard to talk before the class.

T F 77. The man who provides temptation by leaving valuable property unprotected is about as much to blame for its theft as the one who steals it.

T F 78. Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people.

T F 79. I feel anxiety about something or someone almost all the time.

T F 80. At times I hear so well it bothers me.

T F 81. I usually have to stop and think before I act even in trifling matters.

T F 82. Often I cross the street in order not to meet someone I see.

T F 83. I have strange and peculiar thoughts.

T F 84. Sometimes I enjoy hurting persons I love.

T F 85. I have more trouble concentrating than others seem to have.

T F 86. Sometimes some unimportant thought will run through my mind and bother me for days.

T F 87. Almost every day something happens to frighten me.

T F 88. I am not afraid of fire.

T F 89. I have sometimes stayed away from another person because I feared doing or saying something that I might regret afterwards.

T F 90. I do not like to see women smoke.

T F 91. When someone says silly or ignorant things about something I know about, I try to set him right.

T F 92. I wish I could get over worrying about things I have said that may have injured other people's feelings.

T F 93. I feel unable to tell anyone all about myself.

T F 94. My plans have frequently seemed so full of difficulties that I have had to give them up.

T F 95. The future is too uncertain for a person to make serious plans.

T F 96. I would certainly enjoy beating a crook at his own game.

T F 97. It makes me feel like a failure when I hear of the success of someone I know well.

T F 98. At times I think I am no good at all.

T F 99. I played hooky from school quite often as a youngster.

T F 100. I have had some very unusual religious experiences.

T F 101. One or more members of my family is very nervous.

T F 102. I am attracted by members of the opposite sex.

T F 103. I have strong political opinions.

T F 104. People generally demand more respect for their own rights than they are willing to allow for others.

T F 105. It makes me nervous to have to wait.

T F 106. I do not try to correct people who express an ignorant belief.

T F 107. I enjoy gambling for small stakes.

T F 108. I am often inclined to go out of my way to win a point with someone who has opposed me.

T F 109. The man who had most to do with me when I was a child (such as my father, stepfather, etc.) was very strict with me.

T F 110. I have used alcohol moderately (or not at all).

T F 111. Christ performed miracles such as changing water into wine.

T F 112. I pray several times every week.

T F 113. I feel sympathetic towards people who tend to hang on to their griefs and troubles.

T F 114. I am afraid of finding myself in a closet or small closed place.

T F 115. Dirt frightens or disgusts me.

T F 116. I think Lincoln was greater than Washington.

T F 117. In my home we have always had the ordinary necessities (such as enough food, clothing, etc.).

T F 118. I practically never blush.

T F 119. I am made nervous by certain animals.

T F 120. The members of my family and my close relatives get along quite well.

T F 121. I would like to wear expensive clothes.

T F 122. My skin seems to be unusually sensitive to touch.

T F 123. I feel tired a good deal of the time.

T F 124. I never attend a sexy show if I can avoid it.

T F 125. If I were an artist I would like to draw children.

T F 126. I sometimes feel that I am about to go to pieces.

T F 127. A large number of people are guilty of bad sexual conduct.

T F 128. I have often been frightened in the middle of the night.

T F 129. I very much like horseback riding.

T F 130. The one to whom I was most attached and whom I most admired as a child was a woman. (Mother, sister, aunt, or other woman.)

VITA

Jerry Dean Scobee was born in Mason City, Iowa on December 3, 1942. He attended elementary school in Alexis, Illinois, and graduated from Alexis High School in 1960. After four years of military service in the United States Air Force, he worked for a year in Rockford, Illinois, as a computer operator. He entered Western Illinois University in 1966 and graduated in 1970 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology. Following his graduation he was employed by the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services as a Child Welfare Worker.

He entered the Graduate School of Social Work at the University of Tennessee in Nashville in September, 1972, and received a Master of Science in Social Work degree with a major in Administration in June, 1974. He is a member of the National Association of Social Workers and the Illinois Child Care Association.

He is married to the former Lehte Pool of Lincoln, Nebraska, and has a daughter, Jennifer Michelle.