




November 1983

Alienation among Social Service Workers and Integration into the Social Services

John F. Longres
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>

 Part of the [Social Work Commons](#), and the [Theory, Knowledge and Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Longres, John F. (1983) "Alienation among Social Service Workers and Integration into the Social Services," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 10 : Iss. 4 , Article 9.

Available at: <http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol10/iss4/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Social Work at ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact maira.bundza@wmich.edu.



ALIENATION AMONG SOCIAL SERVICE WORKERS
AND
INTEGRATION INTO THE SOCIAL SERVICES

by

John F. Longres
Professor of Social Work and Sociology
Portland State University

This study is concerned with objective alienation experienced by social service workers. To help understand this phenomenon, a Marxian sociological perspective will be used.

Marxian theory assumes that humans are self-conscious productive beings. Marxists believe that nothing is more natural than those activities we call work, for it is only through creative labor that humans demonstrate their full potential. Marxists also assert that human productivity is social in nature in that it is done in coordination with others. Thus, an analysis of the reasons why people might find themselves in dehumanizing work circumstances must begin with understanding the ways in which productive activity is organized in a society. When work activities separate people from their creative capacities, when people do not control production and productive activities, it degrades their humanity. This organized degradation may be referred to as alienation. Marx concluded that 19th century capitalist social relations around the means of production were alienating.

Alienation may be understood along an objective-subjective continuum. "Objective alienation" refers to those conditions that inhere in the organization of work that separate people from control over productive activity. "Subjective alienation" refers to those feelings and attitudes that separation from control over productive activity may engender in people. The two are related but may vary independently of each other depending on a number of social and psychological conditions.

The twentieth century witnessed an increase in occupational categories whose relationship to production seemingly differed from nineteenth century working class occupations. Some have concluded from this that "post industrial" society had created a thriving middle class of unalienated labor (Wilensky, 1966; Bell, 1973). Others have argued that the duties and relationship to production of many of these "white collar" occupations closely

resembled that of the working class proletariat of which Marx spoke (Mills, 1951; Braverman, 1974; Edward, 1979).

Social service occupations are among these new middle class occupations. Especially among those with professional degrees, one hears claims of being part of a professional cadre, governed by collegiality, with a code of ethics and a unique knowledge base that protects practice from administrative domination (Greenwood, 1958). However, there is little empirical evidence to support this belief (Epstein and Conrad, 1968; Wagner and Cohen, 1978). For anyone familiar with the conditions of work that prevail, it would be difficult to conclude that work in the social services is free of alienation.

RESEARCH CONCERNS

This study follows the path of a small number of sociologists who attempted to test Marxian ideas using empirical methods (Archibald, 1976; Wright and Perrone, 1977; Thompson, 1979). Until recently, the work of Seeman (1959) and Blauner (1964) represented the major attempts to apply a Marxian perspective in this manner. Both, however, focused on the subjective aspects of alienation. Blauner also emphasized the division of labor as a function of technology, rather than social organization around the means of production. Similarly, a study by Murdia (1979) of social service workers in India emphasized the subjective aspects of their alienation and did not follow a Marxian approach.

The work of Braverman (1974) has particularly influenced this study. Using qualitative methods, he focused on the objective aspects of alienation. Thompson (nd), using data collected from survey research, tested some of Braverman's ideas and in so doing demonstrated the utility of such methods.

Thus, this study is concerned with objective alienation among social service workers. Two types will be operationalized. "Societal alienation" will refer to those degrading work conditions which derive from the conflict between the ideals of the welfare state and the ideals of capitalism. Organizational alienation will refer to those degrading conditions which derive from control over the organization and delivery of service by capitalist ideals and interests.

Two general hypotheses guide the study. It is hypothesized (1) that the closer social service workers find themselves to situations which conform to the ideals of a capitalist economy, the less they will experience societal and organizational alienation; and (2) that objective alienation will vary according to

class position and to the status one has within the social services.

METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLE

A questionnaire was mailed to social service workers in a large metropolitan area of the northwest United States. The sample was not random and no claims will be made as to the generalizability of the results. Nevertheless, the sample is large and representative of many who work in the social services. The sample includes the entire membership of NASW in the area. An accidental sample of MSW's not members of NASW is included. The sample includes the universe of social service workers in Adult and Family Services in the area and the universe of social service workers of various branches within the Children's Services Division. Finally, an accidental sample of workers in the juvenile court is included.

In all, some 1400 questionnaires were distributed. Of these, 518 usable questionnaires were returned by the date expected. Some indication of the representativeness of these 518 can be given. The same proportion of male to female NASW members is reflected in the usable as in the sent questionnaires. There appears to have been a significantly higher return rate among those with an MSW and within NASW. Since it is being predicted that those with greater status will experience less alienation, the sample should underestimate the extent of alienating circumstances among social service workers as a whole.

NASW members and private practitioners had questionnaires mailed directly to their homes. Questionnaires for public social service workers were distributed at work. Permission was obtained from agency heads with the agreement that respondents had the complete right to refuse to respond to any and all items.

The delicacy of many of the items on the questionnaire undoubtedly influenced the response rate, the responses given and the willingness to respond to particular items. One area especially affected was that on information about the respondent. Table 1 indicates a rather high no response to items that could identify the respondent.

Consistent with the hypothesis that objective alienation will vary as a function of integration into services, three types of independent variables may be described: class, status and conformity to capitalist ideals. While these are not completely separable, they are analytically distinct. Type of practice, private practice vs agency practice, may be thought of as a measure

of social class since private practitioners, according to Marxian theory, own and control the means of their service while agency workers sell their labor power in the market. The measure is not a pure one, however, for it includes those who work full-time and part-time as private practitioners, with many of the latter also working in agencies. Nevertheless, since this distinction is so important in Marxian theory it is important to explore it. Status or prestige differences may also be noted in the sample. A full 28% of the sample were men, some 55% had graduate degrees, 55% were affiliated with at least one professional association (usually NASW), and almost 30% were ACSW. Likewise, 23.5% held administrative and supervisory positions, 11.4% were titled "therapist" or "counselor," 20% held the lower level line worker position of "social worker" and 30% held titles of "caseworker" or "worker aide." Thus sex, educational attainment, professional membership and job title may all be thought of as measures of status within the social services. The third type of independent variable may be described as conformity with the ideals of capitalism. Private agencies are more compatible with capitalist ideals of "charity" than are public services which are more compatible with socialist ideals of "right." Over 23% of the sample worked in the private sector. Finally, unions pose a greater threat to capitalism than do professional associations; 38.4% of the sample were union members.

FINDINGS

A. Societal Alienation

The concept of societal alienation derives from Marxian theory on the social services. Social services are seen as an arena of class struggle with, on the one hand, social service workers having to regulate and control recipients (Piven and Cloward, 1971) and, on the other, having to represent and respect the demands of recipients (Corrigan, 1977). The conflicts produced by such a contradiction generate alienating conditions with which service workers must contend.

To operationalize this concept, respondents were given a series of descriptive phrases and were asked to indicate on a six point Likert type scale the degree to which the phrases described the conditions of their work. It is important to note that they were not asked to express sentiments or to express feelings of alienation which would be more in keeping with an operationalization of subjective alienation. The phrases included such descriptions as "stable funding," "clients who come willingly," "good community resources" and the like which were then coded in terms of degree of alienation.

A factor analysis of the items led to the construction of two indices as shown in Table 2. Only items with a factor loading greater than .40 were included. The first factor (hereafter, variable) incorporates four items and will be referred to as "community support" after the item that loaded most heavily on the factor and in keeping with the combined sense of the items. The second factor, incorporating two items, will be referred to as "market problems" and describes financial support for program and worker.

Table 2 indicates that social service workers experience a good amount of societally induced alienation. With the exception of one item, at least 20% of the social service workers note that they find themselves in situations that may be described as "high" and "very high" alienation, and in three of these this rises to over 30%. Thus, 20.2% describe situations of low community status, 23.2% describe a high lack of community support, 30.6% a high lack of stable funding, 42.3% very limited resources and 1.6% a high number of clients with severe economic problems, a problem intimately related to capitalism and generating much of the tension between welfare and capitalist ideals. Furthermore, on all but one of these the median response is over three indicating that the majority of respondents report a significant amount of alienation.

On only one of the six items making up the two indices is this pattern broken. On the item of personal job security, slightly more than 15% admit to high or very high alienation while the median response is 2.48 indicating that the majority did not feel particularly threatened by the possible loss of their position. This result is surprising and possible reasons for it will be explored in the conclusion of the paper.

B. Organizational Alienation

Organizational alienation refers to those micro-structural conditions that affect work in the social services and that derive from the way in which the social services are organized. The idea of organizational alienation represents the traditional Marxian concern with alienation from production and productive activity. Two points of clarification need to be made.

Social service workers cannot be said to produce a product, rather they give a service. Yet the similarity between those who produce and those who serve cannot be denied (Braverman, 1974:410-423). Thus the problem of alienation from "service activities" and from the "service" is a legitimate concern. Similarly, some may contend that social services are not organized on a capitalist

basis since, in general, their purpose is not profit. Especially in the public sector, one might conclude that the social services are organized on a socialist basis. A Marxist perspective on the function of the state would argue that government run and controlled services in a capitalist society would incorporate the organizational ideals of capitalism (Harrington, 1976). The result is that autonomous and creative mental activity is continually separated from dependent, structured and routine activity in government agencies as well as in private, for profit enterprises. To the extent that social service work lacks autonomy, is controlled from without and routinized it is alienating.

Once again respondents were given a series of descriptive phrases and asked to indicate on a six point scale the degree to which the phrases described the conditions of their work. Table 3 shows twelve items making up an index of organizational alienation. This scale represents the first factor of an unrotated principle factor solution. As such it delineates the largest pattern of relationship in the data and defines the greatest amount of variation (Rummel, 1967). It is presented here in order to simplify a more complicated rotated factor solution. In addition, although such a large series of items leads to a significant loss in numbers, the separate rotated factor do not lead to any different conclusions. Thus, the factor may be thought of as a general measure of organizational alienation.

The results presented in Table 3 indicate a rather high amount of objective organizational alienation. On nine of the twelve items the median response is greater than 3.0 indicating that the majority of workers possess a substantial level of alienation. In addition, in 11 of the 12 items, at least 20% of the respondents indicate what might be described as high to very high alienation; in seven of these items, the percentage rises to over thirty.

C. Objective Alienation and Integration Into the Social Services

Table 4 assesses the relationship between the variable market problems, pertaining to job stability and program funding, and integration into the social services. No support for a hypothesis linking class, status or conformity to the ideals of capitalism with this type of objective alienation may be found. Not one of the eight measures tested reaches statistical significance.

Table 5 shows the relationship between community support and integration into the social services. No support is found for a hypothesis linking sexual status to this type of alienation. With

respect to all other measures, however, clear support for the hypotheses is shown.

Those in private practice report significantly less objective societal alienation stemming from problems of community support than those practicing in agencies. Those with graduate degrees report significantly less alienation than those with less than a graduate degree. Interestingly, no other variation according to education is evident. Those in professional associations and those with ACSW report significantly less alienation than those not in associations and without the title.

The findings with respect to job title prove somewhat unexpected. A curvilinear function appears evident. Those in administrative positions and those on the low level front line positions report significantly more problems of community support than do social workers and therapist/counselors. Indeed, therapist/counselors appear to experience significantly less alienation than any other category.

Those in private agency settings report significantly less alienation than do those working in public settings. Finally, those in unions report significantly more alienation than those not in unions.

Table 6 describes the relationship between objective organizational alienation and the integration of social service workers into social welfare. By definition, one should not expect private practitioners to report organizational alienation since they do not work in organizations. As noted previously, however, the measure of class position includes some part-time private practitioners who also work in agencies. Thus, while some private practitioners report organizational alienation, they report significantly less of it than people who only work in agency settings.

Those with a graduate degree report significantly less organizational alienation than those with less than a graduate degree. Those reporting membership in professional associations and those with the title ACSW indicate significantly less organizational alienation than those without these. Those in administrative positions report significantly less alienation than those in front line caseworker positions. However, those in positions of social worker and especially those in therapist/counselor positions do not appear to experience significantly more alienation than do the administrators and supervisors.

D. Multivariate Analysis

The results so far indicate that it is possible to talk of significant statistical relationships between the way in which social service workers are integrated into service activities and the experience of objective alienation deriving from problems in the organization of services and problems of community support. It remains to explore which among the various categories of integration contributes most to our understanding of these two types of objective alienation. By using a multi-variate technique, multiple classification analysis (MCA), the cumulative and relative importance of predictor variables may be assessed.

MCA requires that the dependent or criterion variable be measured on an interval scale (Nie, et. al., 1975). Each of the items used in creating the indices was measured on a Likert type instrument which can be said to approximate an equal interval scale. An examination of the means, standard deviations, peakedness and skewedness of the distributions resulting from each of the two indices suggest that they are relatively normatively distributed. On this basis MCA will be undertaken.

MCA makes no requirements with respect to level of measurement of independent or predictor variables. Since it is based on analysis of variance techniques, however, it assumes orthogonality among the variables. When cell distribution is not equal, as is often the case in survey research, orthogonality may not be assumed and thus the existence of interaction effects must be carefully examined. While Tables 7 and 8 do not present the analysis of interaction effects, the reader should note that in no instance were significant effects uncovered.

MCA accepts up to five predictor variables. After analysing the cross-tabulations among the seven independent variables that related significantly, it was decided to submit three predictor variables: type of setting, education of worker, and job title. The other variables appeared so completely related to these that further analysis of them seemed unnecessary. For instance, union membership was, by definition, a function of working in a public agency; ACSW completely a function of educational attainment; professional association membership highly related to education and to working in a private agency. Type of practice would have made an important fourth variable but owing to the small number of exclusively private practitioners in the sample a more in-depth analysis was not possible.

I. Community Support and Integration Into Social Services

Table 7 summarizes the results of an MCA analysis and the analysis of variance on which it is based. The reader should note that the n is 414 representing a loss of 20% of the sample. In assessing this loss, it should be realized that the analysis leaves out the some thirty who work exclusively as private practitioners. The remaining losses derive from no response on either the predictor or criterion variables. Examining the reduction in n 's suggests a rather equal loss among all categories of predictor variables with the exception of those with graduate degrees. It appears that those with graduate degrees were more likely not to complete all items of the questionnaire. This suggests that the results will underestimate differences in alienation as a function of education.

The Multiple R for the relationship between the three predictor variables and the criterion variable is a strong .508. The R^2 indicates that approximately 26% of the variation in community support is accounted for by introducing the three predictor variables of education, types of setting and job title.

The Eta (correlation) coefficients of the three variables before accounting for any of the others is .40, .42, and .35 respectively. That is, initially each variable demonstrates a moderately strong and relatively equal correlation with community support. The Beta (partial correlation) coefficients, however, demonstrate a very different pattern. Clearly, the most important of the three is type of setting (.32). Education drops to .22 and job title to .11. By examining the analysis of variance, it becomes apparent that while type of setting and education continue to contribute significantly, once job title is controlled it does not significantly contribute to our understanding of this form of societal alienation.

II. Organizational Alienation and Integration Into Social Services

Table 8 gives the results of a second MCA procedure. The n in this analysis drops even lower than in the previous analysis. Besides the reasons already noted, the reader should be aware that the index on which the criterion variable was based included some twelve items; missing data on any one drops the respondent from inclusion in the scale. Once again, there seems to be a disproportionate drop among those with graduate degrees and there also appears to be a disproportionate drop among those in supervisory

and administrative positions. Thus, the results should underestimate differences in alienation as a function of education and job title.

The multiple R is a rather strong .592 with the R^2 indicating that 35% of the variance in organizational alienation is accounted for by simultaneously examining education, type of setting and job title.

The first order Eta correlations once again suggest that all three are moderately strongly and equally related to organizational alienation. The second order Beta coefficients indicate that each of the three, even after being controlled, equally contributes to our understanding of this form of objective alienation. This is also supported by the analysis of variance which demonstrates that each predictor, even when controlled, continues to be significantly related to the criterion variable.

Because job title in the single order analysis frequently demonstrated a curvilinear function, further examination is instructive. The reader should note that in the adjusted deviations, there is a rather linear function apparent with caseworkers and aides reporting more organizational alienation than social workers who, in turn, report more organizational alienation than therapist/counselors. As before, therapist/counselors are no more likely to report alienation than administrators/supervisors. If one recalls that there is a disproportionate drop in the number of administrative staff who supplied information, it could be contended that with more data an even stronger linear correlation might be found.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The findings lend support for the utility of using a Marxian framework for understanding alienation among social service workers. There is reason to believe, like Thompson (1979), that objective alienation may be measured fruitfully using survey techniques. In this study, three types were operationalized, two that relate to societal alienation and one that relates to organizational alienation. Analysis of responses to items making up these measures demonstrates that social service workers report a good amount of objective alienation. On almost all items, most workers give responses indicating that they must deal with a good amount of alienating work circumstances. The use of such objective measures appears to lead to the kind of prediction Marxian theorists have assumed but which frequently has not been found when more subjective measures have been used (Archibald, 1976).

The real test of theory, however, is its ability to predict. It was predicted that the experience of structural alienation would vary as a function of the way social service workers are integrated around the means of service. While most predictions held, support for some was not found. No support is found for a hypothesis linking the sexual status of workers with the experience of any of the three forms of structural alienation measured.

Perhaps, however, the major contradiction to the Marxian hypothesis is that the integration of social service workers does not appear to be significantly related to alienation deriving from market problems, problems relating to job security. This is a troublesome finding that requires further analysis. Two possible explanations may be advanced. The first suggests that the results are spurious and stem from the historical situation surrounding the mailing of the questionnaire. The survey was distributed immediately after major cutbacks in the public services and it may be that those who survived the cuts were experiencing a sense of security that the worse was over and so underestimated the importance of market problems. Similarly, the survey was mailed immediately following President Reagan's election but before any specific cuts were made. This might have made large sectors of the private, but federally dependent, services more apprehensive than they might otherwise have been. It may be that this combination of under and overestimation might have reduced the differences that might otherwise exist.

A second possible explanation is that the results are not spurious but an artifact of the internalization of market values

among social service workers. As some have noted (Blauner, 1964; Seeman, 1967), workers in the twentieth century have become injured to the market system such that they do not expect job security.

Negative findings aside, strong support for the relationship between integration into services and the other two forms of structural alienation was found. Statistically significant relationships are reported between type of practice, type of setting, educational background, membership in professional associations, ACSW membership, union membership and job title and measures of objective alienation deriving from problems of community support and problems of autonomy and creativity on the job.

The findings on type of practice suggest that there might be significant class differences among social service workers in that private practitioners report significantly less alienation than those working in agencies. The small number of exclusively private practitioners in the sample did not allow for a full analysis of this possibility.

Multivariate analysis indicates that type of setting and educational background contribute in an especially strong way to our understanding of the dynamics of objective alienation. People with graduate degrees are more likely to find the kind of position that insulates them from alienation, thus there is support that professionalization diminishes alienation. The data also indicate that in spite of their dependence on federal funding, private agencies have been able to maintain professional working conditions to a far greater extent than public agencies. A Marxian explanation would stress that their underlying historical purpose, that of offering charity, frees them from the kind of public debate and stigmatization that public agencies must endure.

Job title or rank does not contribute significantly to our understanding of alienation deriving from problems of community support. When education and practice setting are controlled, those in administrative positions are as likely as others to perceive a lack of community support. This makes sense since administrators (although not necessarily supervisors) must deal with the community just as much as line workers, albeit at different levels.

Job title, on the other hand, does contribute significantly to our understanding of organizational alienation. Those in high organizational positions, who administer policy, make decisions and control line staff, and possibly counselor/therapists, who represent autonomous line workers within services, will experience less organizational alienation than lower level line workers.

These results may only be put forth tentatively. The sample is not a random one, although it makes up a large number of workers in a particular metropolitan area, and there are losses in numbers deriving from the delicacy of the subject matter. Nevertheless, if the results hold up to further scrutiny, they help make sense of a number of seemingly diverse phenomena in the social services: increasing concern over burn-out, continuing flight of MSW's from the poor and from the public services, continuing concern for professional status, the struggle for licensing among "clinical" social workers, the resilience of private agencies, and the growth of undergraduate education. Each of these concerns may be interpreted as attempts to call attention to the difficulties being faced on jobs and to escape into positions that give greater promise for community support, autonomy and creativity.

The question is whether the choices made by social service workers or by the associations and unions that represent them are choices which promise an end to alienating work conditions. From a Marxian perspective, many of the choices being made appear of doubtful benefit to the worker, the society and the client being served. They appear to lead to increasing hierarchical relations among social service workers generating conflict and competition which can only lead to a weakening of the profession as a whole and of its moderating influence over the negative aspects of capitalism.

Table 1: Sample

		N	%
Type of Practice	Pv't Practice		
	Full Time	18	3.47
	Part Time	51	9.84
	Agency Practice	422	81.47
	NR	27	5.21
Type of Setting	P'vt Setting	121	23.4
	Public Setting	331	63.9
	NA (Pv't Practice)	30	5.8
	NR	36	6.9
Sex of Respondent	Male	145	28.0
	Female	329	63.5
	NR	44	8.5
Education	Graduate Degree	285	55.0
	Some Grad. Studies	23	4.4
	BA, BS, BSW	116	22.4
	Some College	41	7.9
	No College	19	3.7
	NR	34	6.2
Professional Assn. Member	Yes	288	55.6
	No	209	40.3
	NR	19	3.9
ACSW	Yes	154	29.7
	No	345	66.6
	NR	19	3.7
Job Title	Admin/Supervisor	122	23.5
	Therapist/Counselor	59	11.4
	Social Worker	108	20.8
	Caseworker	156	30.1
	NR	63	14.1
Union Member	No	300	57.9
	Yes	199	38.4
	NR	19	3.7

Table 2: Societal Alienation Variables^a

Variable Name	Items ^c	Mdn	% high alienation	NR
COMMUNITY SUPPORT	community support	3.40	28.2	32
	low community status	2.83	20.2	17
	limited resources	4.22	42.3	32
	severe economic problems	5.05	61.6	26
MARKET PROBLEMS	job stability	2.48	15.4	12
	stable funding	3.55	30.6	27

- a. N = 518
- b. The designation "high alienation" includes those responses, after recoding to account for direction, of "descriptive" or "very descriptive" of alienating work circumstances.
- c. The items appear as they appeared in the questionnaire. The reader should note that in scoring each item, the scores were recoded so that a score of one equalled no alienation while a score of six equalled very high alienation.

Table 3: Organizational Alienation^a

	Items ^c	Mdn	% high alienation	NR
ORGANIZATIONAL ALIENATION	paper work	5.34	68.4	10
	choice of clients/persons	4.58	65.0	19
	large work load	4.98	60.8	30
	frequent changes	4.48	49.6	24
	participation in policy	3.43	35.8	26
	time enough to work	3.64	31.1	7
	flexible procedures	3.42	30.7	12
	routine work	3.74	28.9	6
	unclear expectations	3.55	26.1	12
	access to administration	2.78	21.5	48
	a rules manual	2.21	20.0	23
	comfortable work areas	2.58	18.4	3

- a. N = 518
- b. The designation of "high alienation" includes those responses, after recoding to account for direction, of "descriptive" or "very descriptive" of alienating work circumstances.
- c. The items appear as they appeared in the questionnaire. The reader should note that in scoring each item, the scores were recoded so that a score of one equalled no alienation while a score of six equalled very high alienation.

Table 4: Market Problems and Integration Into Social Services

NATURE OF INTEGRATION	GROUP	n ^c	x	t/F ^a	p ^b
Type of Practice	Private Practice	48	3.3	-.85	0.39
	Agency Practice	413	3.2		
Type of Setting	Private Setting	115	3.1	.72	0.47
	Public Setting	327	3.2		
Education	Graduate Degree	256	3.3	1.13	0.34
	Some Graduate	23	3.2		
	BA/BS/BSW	114	3.1		
	Some College	41	2.9		
	No College	18	3.2		
Sex	Male	135	3.1	.89	0.38
	Female	309	3.2		
Member of Professional Assn	Yes	257	3.2	.40	0.69
	No	207	3.2		
ACSW	Yes	143	3.2	.13	0.90
	No	323	3.2		
Job Title	Admin/Supervisor	120	3.3	.70	0.55
	Therap./Counselor	57	3.1		
	Social Worker	104	3.1		
	Caseworker	155	3.1		
Union Member	No	267	3.2	.16	0.55
	Yes	199	3.2		

- a. For readers not familiar with "t" or "F," the "t" has been computed on variables of more than two groups.
- b. Statistical significance requires a probability of .05 or less. None of the test statistics presented reach statistical significance.
- c. Where n's do not sum to 518, the difference is accounted for by missing cases.

Table 5: Community Support and Integration Into Social Services

NATURE OF INTEGRATION	GROUP	n ^c	x	t/F ^a	p ^b
Type of Practice	Private Practice	49	3.2	5.26	0.00
	Agency Practice	375	3.9		
Type of Setting	Private Setting	102	3.2	9.32	0.00
	Public Setting	304	4.1		
Sex	Male	122	3.8	0.03	0.98
	Female	288	3.8		
Education	Graduate Degree	233	3.5	17.37	0.00
	Some graduate	23	4.4		
	BA/BS/BSW	107	4.3		
	Some College	36	4.0		
	No College	17	4.3		
Member of Professional Assn.	Yes	233	3.5	8.54	0.00
	No	194	4.2		
ACSW	Yes	125	3.3	7.58	0.00
	No	304	4.0		
Job Title	Admin/Supervisor	121	2.4	3.28	0.02
	Therap./Counselor	59	1.9		
	Social Worker	108	2.2		
	Caseworker	155	2.4		
Union Member	No	243	3.5	9.32	0.00
	Yes	186	4.2		

- a. The "t" has been computed on variables with only two groups, while "F" has been computed on variables of more than two groups.
- b. Statistical significance requires a probability of .05 or less.
- c. Where n's do not sum to 518, the difference is accounted for by missing cases.

Table 6: Organizational Alienation and Integration Into Social Services

NATURE OF INTEGRATION	GROUP	n ^c	x	t/F ^a	p ^b
Type of Practice	Private Practice	42	3.31	4.80	0.00
	Agency Practice	362	3.86		
Type of Setting	Private Setting	104	3.26	10.27	0.00
	Public Setting	194	4.02		
Sex	Male	115	3.75	0.99	0.32
	Female	276	3.85		
Education	Graduate degree	218	3.50	23.69	0.00
	Some graduate	23	4.12		
	BA/BS/BSW	106	4.18		
	Some College	36	4.17		
	No College	14	3.97		
Member of Professional Assn.	Yes	226	3.51	10.33	0.00
	No	182	4.17		
ACSW	Yes	117	3.37	8.13	0.00
	No	182	4.17		
Job Title	Admin/Supervisor	100	3.50	32.63	0.00
	Therap./Counselor	51	3.48		
	Social Worker	99	3.73		
	Case Worker	142	4.23		
Union Member	No	229	3.52	9.91	0.00
	Yes	180	4.16		

- a. The "t" has been computed on variables of only two groups while the "F" has been computed on variables of more than two groups.
- b. Statistical significance requires a probability of .05 or less.
- c. Where n's do not sum to 518 the difference is accounted for by missing cases.

Table 7: Community Support and Integration Into Social Services (MCA)

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	x ²	F	p
Main Effects	162.399	5	32.48	27.56	0.00
Education	17.95	1	17.95	15.23	0.00
Type of Setting	53.61	1	53.61	45.49	0.00
Job Title	4.26	3	1.42	1.20	0.31

Multiple Classification Analysis

Grand Mean 3.46

Variables	Group	n	Deviation from Grand Mean	Eta	adjusted deviations	BETA
Education	Grad degree	223	-0.44	0.40	-0.25	0.22
	No Grad "	181	0.55		0.31	
Type of Setting	Private	107	-0.88	0.42	-0.65	0.32
	Public	297	0.32		0.24	
Job Title	Admin/Sup	106	-0.23	0.35	-0.04	0.11
	Therp/Coun	56	-0.27		-0.11	
	Soc Wkr	99	-0.44		-0.14	
	Caseworker	143	0.58		0.17	

N = 414

R = .508

R² = .258

Table 8: Organizational Alienation and Integration Into Social Services (MCA)

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	x ²	F	p
Main Effects	69.006	5	13.80	39.44	0.00
Education	6.086	1	6.07	17.34	0.00
Setting	14.032	1	14.03	40.10	0.00
Job Title	11.390	3	3.80	10.85	0.00

Multiple Classification Analysis

Grand Mean 3.82

Variables	Group	n	Deviation from Grand Mean	Eta	adjusted deviations	BETA
Education	Grad degree	203	-0.28	.43	-0.16	.24
	No Grad "	171	0.34		0.19	
Setting	Private	99	-0.56	.46	-0.35	.29
	Public	175	0.20		0.13	
Title	Admin/Sup	93	-0.34	.47	-0.23	.26
	Therp/Coun	50	-0.37		-0.23	
	Soc Wkr	95	-0.10		-0.08	
	Caseworker	136	0.43		0.19	

N = 374

R = .592

R² = .351

FOOTNOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1976 Archibald, Peter W. "Using Marx's Theory of Alienation Empirically" in R. Felix Geyer and D. R. Schweitzer, eds. Theories of Alienation (London: Nijhoff).
- 1973 Bell, Daniel, The Coming of Post-Industrial Society (New York: Basic Books).
- 1964 Blauner, Robert, Alienation and Freedom (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press).
- 1974 Braverman, Harry, Labor and Monopoly Capital (New York: Monthly Review Press).
- 1977 Corrigan, P., "The Welfare State As An Arena of Class Struggle," Marxism Today, March 1977, 87-93.
- 1979 Edward, Richard, Contested Terrain (New York: Basic Books).
- 1968 Epstein, I. and K. Conrad, "The Empirical Limits of Social Work Professionalism," The Management of the Human Services, R. Sarri and Y. Hasenfeld (eds.) (New York: Columbia University Press).
- 1957 Greenwood, E., "Attributes of a Profession," Social Work, 2, July, 44-55.
- 1951 Mills, C. Wright, White Collar (New York: Oxford University Press).
- 1979 Murdia, R. "Task Structure and Work Alienation," Indian Journal of Social Work, 40, 2: 165-175.
- 1971 Piven, F. and Cloward R., Regulating the Poor (New York: Random House).
- 1967 Rummel, R.J., "Understanding Factor Analysis," Conflict Resolution, 11, 4, Dec., 562-3.
- 1959 Seeman, Melvin, "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, 54, Dec. 783-91.
- 1967 _____, "On The Personal Consequences of Alienation in Work," American Sociological Review, 32, April, 273-85.

- 1979 Thompson, S. Gotch, "An Investigation of the Proletarianization of Labor Using Survey Data" (Tuskegee Institute, Alabama 36088).
- 1966 Wilensky, H.L., "Class, Class Consciousness and American Workers" in Labor in a Changing America, W. Haber (ed.) (New York: Basic Books).
- 1977 Wright, E.O. and L. Perrone, "Marxist Class Categories and Income Inequality," American Sociological Review, 42, February, 32-55.