



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Master's Theses

Theses and Dissertations

1963

Temperament Traits of Public Welfare Caseworkers

Eugene Skoff
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Skoff, Eugene, "Temperament Traits of Public Welfare Caseworkers" (1963). *Master's Theses*. Paper 1848.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/1848

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Copyright © 1963 Eugene Skoff

TEMPERAMENT TRAITS OF PUBLIC
WELFARE CASEWORKERS

by
Eugene Skoff

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts
January
1963

LIFE

Eugene Skoff was born in Clinton, Indiana, March 18, 1925.

He was graduated from Morton High School, Cicero, Illinois, in June 1943 and from Loyola University in February 1959 with the degree of Bachelor of Science. He began his graduate studies at Loyola University in Psychology in September 1959.

During World War II the author served with the 13th U.S. Army Airforce in the Southwest Pacific Theatre of War. He was attached to the 70th and 68th Fighter Squadrons serving at Guadalcanal, New Guinea, and the Philippine Islands. He was discharged from active duty January 1946.

From 1949 to 1955 the author was employed as a commercial artist by the Visking Corporation in Chicago, Illinois. From December 1959 to the present he has been employed as a caseworker for the Cook County Department of Public Aid in Chicago, Illinois.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Statement of the Problem	1
B. Objectives	2
II. RELATED LITERATURE	3
III. THE TEST SITUATION	7
A. Description of the Job	7
B. The Subjects	8
1. The Population	8
2. The Sample	8
C. Temperament Requirements on the Job.	9
D. Description of the Thurstone Temperament Schedule.	10
E. The Criterion	13
1. The Merit Rating	14
2. Avoidance of Rating Pitfalls	14
3. Reliability of the Merit Rating	14
IV. PROCEDURE	15
A. Collection of the Data	15
B. Treatment of the Data	15
V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	17
A. Results	17
B. Discussion	18
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	20
A. Summary	20
B. Conclusions	21
BIBLIOGRAPHY	33

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

In the public welfare agency where this research was conducted two criteria are used for the selection of caseworker staff. The first requirement is that the applicant possess a bachelor's degree from an accredited university; the second is that the applicant successfully pass a civil service examination. This examination is a test of the applicant's general knowledge of the behavioral sciences. Because of the confidential nature and inaccessibility of civil service examinations, the predictive value of these tests cannot be determined. The general assumption seems to be that the possession of a degree and of a passing score on the exam is indicative of successful performance as a caseworker.

As most employees are selected for their particular job by some criteria of academic achievement, ability, interest, experience, etc., it may be said that each begins his employment with one or more common denominators of success potential. Therefore it would seem that the investigator must look to the more dynamic variables which in the final analysis distinguish between successful and unsuccessful job performance. The variables under consideration in the present study are personality variables. It is understood that personality is highly complex, and care must be taken in a practical setting to identify those aspects that have particular relevance to job performance.

Objectives

The investigator is confronted with several dimensions of personality that might relate to successful occupational adjustment. One such dimension that has particular application and implication in industry is that of temperament. Such then is the general objective of the present study - to further examine those relatively permanent traits or characteristics called temperament and their relationship to occupational adjustment. The specific aim of this study is to determine what temperament traits distinguish between effective and ineffective caseworkers employed in a public welfare agency.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

A careful search of the literature failed to disclose any studies in which public welfare caseworkers were evaluated in terms of temperament. However, the following studies are of some relevance.

Shea and Fenlason by means of the Leahy-Fenlason Rating Scale for social workers suggest that imagination, judgment, objectivity, patience, resourcefulness, sympathy, and tolerance are important personality traits of social workers.¹⁶

Lewis found a relationship between occupational interests and personality tendencies of social workers as measured by the Kuder Preference Record and the MMPI. The Persuasive and Social Service scales of the Kuder appeared to be valid for social workers.¹²

The importance of temperament has been demonstrated by several validation studies presented in the Examiner Manual of the Thurstone Temperament Schedule. Among those occupations on which the schedule has been validated are teachers, office workers, retail store employees, sales supervisors, and managers of small retail stores. The following studies are presented in the Examiner Manual.¹⁸

In a study by Ryans, teacher performance was equated with scores made on the Schedule. Two-Hundred seventy-five teachers were rated by trained observers on various performance criteria. A high and a low group were selected on each criterion. Mean scores were tested for significant differences.

Four dimensions of temperament discriminated significantly between effective and ineffective teachers namely, Vigorous, Impulsive, Dominant, and Sociable.

In another study, 723 male and female office workers were divided into high and low groups in terms of performance ratings; mean differences were tested for significance. The Schedule failed to discriminate between good and poor office workers except in the area of Active.

Department store managers selected good and poor retail sales employees on various criteria of job performance such as sales ability, cooperation, customer service, and general effectiveness. The 1274 employees were then given the TTS, and mean differences were tested for significance. Temperament traits significantly distinguished between good and poor employees in all seven areas of temperament. It was also found that different job aspects also demanded different temperament qualities for successful job performance. That is, different temperament traits distinguished between good and poor groups on each of the criteria.

In a fourth study, 86 supervisors were rated by their superiors using general effectiveness as a criterion of performance. Mean differences of the Schedule scores of the good and poor groups were tested for significance. It was found that all areas of temperament with the exception of Reflective predicted successful performance.

Seventy-seven retail store managers were rated in terms of good and poor on various criteria. Mean scores differed significantly in the areas of Stable and Sociable for good and poor managers on the criteria of operating efficiency. In addition, Stable discriminated between employees on the criterion of human relations. Vigorous and Stable means were also significant

on the criterion of general effectiveness. Using the same sample, a correlation of test scores and success scores resulted in significant correlations especially on the trait of Stable.

In the final study, temperament scores were correlated with the criterion of sales ability. Significant correlations were obtained on all traits except Vigorous and Reflective.

In an unpublished master's thesis¹³ an attempt was made to determine if the Thurstone Temperament Schedule could be used as an effective aid in supervisory evaluation. Correlations were computed between merit ratings of 78 supervisors and test scores on the Schedule. The obtained correlations were not of sufficient significance to warrant the use of the Schedule as a supervisory evaluation aid. Failure to establish significance was attributed to the heterogeneity of the sample, the different departmental interpretations of the merit rating, and possibly an invalid merit rating.

Raino¹⁴ used the Thurstone Temperament Schedule and the Maudsley Medical Questionnaire in an attempt to develop a procedure for the selection of foremen. He found no significant differences between the research and selection situation for traits of Stable, Social, Dominant, and Impulsive on the Schedule and neuroticism as measured by the MMQ. There also were no significant differences for traits of Active, Vigorous, and Reflective. The author concludes that in a selection situation there is a trend to higher scores on variables shown to have high correlation to the criteria. He explains that the subjects are aware of the variables for "good" foremen thus indicating a need to establish a neutral motivational situation.

Sheddan and Witmer¹⁷ correlated the job efficiency of 61 caseworkers with

a battery of tests consisting of the Ohio State Psychological Test, Moss Social Intelligence Test, the Thurstone Personality Schedule, and a Relief Attitudes Scale. A correlation of .72 was obtained with the test battery and job efficiency as measured by supervisory ratings.

A critical incident technique was used to determine what phrases were descriptive of most proficient and least proficient caseworkers. On the basis of these critical incidents a merit scale was constructed. The rating scales of 630 caseworkers were correlated with an Attitude Test. The prediction of success among employed caseworkers was more effective than predictions made by the entrance exam.⁸

CHAPTER III

THE TEST SITUATION

Description of the Job

A detailed list of the job duties of a caseworker can be found in Table I of the Appendix.

In general, caseworkers are responsible for determining initial and continued eligibility of persons applying for or receiving public assistance. The caseworker assists these individuals to become self-supporting and provides for assistance in such a manner as to maintain and strengthen the family unit by utilizing the resources available within the community. In addition, casework requires a broad knowledge of the behavioral sciences and a comprehensive knowledge of pertinent local, state, and federal legislation relative to public welfare programs. The job requires extensive public contact, ability to work with people, the exercise of good judgment, and the ability to make important decisions.

The caseworker is responsible for the conduct of the following welfare programs: Aid to Dependent Children, Old Age Assistance, Disability Assistance, Blind Assistance, and General Assistance.

The minimum academic requirement is a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university.

The Subjects

1. The Population

In order that an accurate perspective of the total population be maintained, a description of a typical county organizational setup may be in order. The typical county welfare agency consists of about ten district offices all under the jurisdiction of a central administrative office. Each district office is assigned to service a specific area within the county. As pointed out earlier, all caseworkers are selected on the basis of the same criteria; assignment to a district office is made on the basis of an existing vacancy. Within the district office, members of the casework staff are assigned to an immediate supervisor. Each supervisory unit consists of about four or five workers. Job duties, job requirements, and welfare programs serviced are identical for each district office. The same merit rating is used in all offices for staff promotion. In sum, the typical county welfare staff is a highly homogeneous group.

2. The Sample

The sample participating in this study consisted of 63 caseworkers in one of the district offices. This number represents 68% of the present casework staff. Thirty-four male workers and twenty-nine female workers participated in the study. The sample consisted of 39 Negroes and 24 Caucasians. Ages ranged from 21 years old to 58 years old. About 79% of the caseworkers were within the 21-35 year age group; about 36% were in the 21-25 year group.

Employment tenure of the subjects ranged from six months to ten years. About 50% of the caseworkers were with the agency from six months to one and one-half years. Another 24% were with the agency between nineteen months and

two and one-half years. The only condition for participation in the study was that a caseworker had been assigned to the district office for at least six months. The basis for this stipulation was two-fold. Firstly, some of the caseworkers were newly assigned and had only recently completed a short training period. These workers had a minimum of experience, and quality of job performance could not as yet be established. Secondly, this time period is required for the supervisor to become sufficiently acquainted with a worker's performance and thus have a basis for accurate ratings.

Temperament Requirements of the Job

An analysis of desirable temperament traits for the job of caseworker was made. This analysis was made on the basis of the writer's extensive on the job experience and familiarity with the job requirements of casework. It was adjudged that the desired traits are:

1. High emotional stability.
 - a. Ability to work under pressure.
 - b. Ability to concentrate in the midst of distraction.
 - c. High frustration tolerance.
 - d. Flexibility.
2. Above average in dominance.
 - a. Capable of assuming responsibility.
 - b. Ability to cope with emergencies.
3. Above average in sociability.
 - a. Ability to meet and deal effectively with the public.
 - b. Ability to cooperate with fellow workers and with interested agencies.
4. Low in impulsiveness
 - a. Ability to use discretion and foresight in making decisions.
 - b. Ability to persevere in the task at hand.

Thus casework requires stable, dominant, and sociable individuals.

Impulsiveness is undesirable as is reflectiveness (as defined in terms of the

TTS). As a result of this analysis of traits and a consideration of the limitations imposed by the test situation, the Thurstone Temperament Schedule was selected as the instrument for the appraisal of these traits.

Description of the Thurstone Temperament Schedule

The TTS is designed to evaluate an individual's relatively permanent temperament traits. It consists of 140 items in question form requiring a "Yes", "?", or a "No" response. Seven areas of temperament are assessed: Active, Vigorous, Impulsive, Dominant, Stable, Sociable, and Reflective. Scores are in terms of the number "right". The Schedule can be self-scored and self-administered; about 20 minutes (no time limit) is required for completion. In general, the TTS is well designed and of high professional quality.

The seven areas of temperament were derived from a factorial analysis of the Guilford-Martin Inventory of Factors GAMIN, the Guilford-Martin Personnel Inventory, and the Inventory of Factors STDCR. The scores from these tests were made by normal individuals, and thus psychotic or neurotic classifications were excluded. In conjunction with the factor analysis, surveys of personality questionnaires and recent research on personality measurement was made. Several thousand items were found to differentiate and describe stable behavior traits. Of these, 320 remained after the elimination of duplicate and inappropriate items. This number was further reduced to only 140 of the most discriminating items and these now constitute the present Schedule.

The Examiner's Manual¹⁸ presents several validation studies. In a study of content validity, the following biserial coefficients were obtained between supervisory forced-choice ratings and actual test performance: Active .95,

Vigorous .93, Impulsive 1.00, Dominant .92, Stable .90, Sociable .90, and Reflective .81.

The test author also presents several studies of predictive validity.¹⁸ These studies have been previously referred to under Related Literature, pp. 3-6. Briefly summarized, validation studies were conducted on teachers, office workers, retail store employees, sales supervisors, and managers of small retail stores. Job performance and supervisor's ratings are used as criteria. Traits of Vigorous, Impulsive, Dominant, and Social significantly discriminated between high and low performance teachers at 1% and 5% confidence levels. The Schedule failed to discriminate between above average and below average rated teachers except on the trait of Active. The Schedule significantly distinguished between good and poor rated retail sales employees on all criteria and all seven areas of temperament; significance was at both 1% and 5% levels of confidence. The TTS scales distinguished between high rated and low rated sales supervisors in all areas except Reflective and Sociable. Significances are reported at the 1% and 5% levels of confidence in the various areas. In a study of retail store managers the TTS traits of Active, Impulsive, Dominant, Stable and Sociable distinguished between the high and low rated managers. With this same group test scores were correlated with success scores; the Stable score was of special relevance. Correlations were significant at the 1% level of confidence. Correlations were also computed between sales ability and the TTS scales. The correlations were significant at the 1% and 5% levels of confidence on all traits except Vigorous and Reflective.

In terms of concurrent validity, the manual is not clear on the time separating the test and the criterion. Some of the predictive validations may also be concurrent.

The reliability of the seven temperament areas was tested by the split-half and the test-retest method.¹⁸ Using the split-half method for men, women, boys, girls, and an employment and guidance group, odd-even correlations were computed. Reliabilities were then estimated by using the Spearman-Brown correction for double length. The range for all groups varied from .45 to .86 with a median .64 for four different groups. Test-retest reliabilities were computed on 81 male executives. The retests were given within six months of the first administration; coefficients ranged from .61 to .82 and were higher than the split-half group.

In an unpublished thesis⁴ higher test-retest and split-half correlations were found than those cited above. (The author does not present actual correlations.)

Van Steenberg in Buros states that "the manual like the Schedule, is of high standard, informative and objectively written The Schedule should prove useful for employment managers and counselors, though it would be desirable to have a number of additional validity studies published."⁴

A description of each of the temperament areas obtained from the Examiner's Manual is given as follows:¹⁸

- ACTIVE** A person scoring high in this area usually works and moves rapidly. He is restless whenever he has to be quiet. He likes to be "on the go" and tends to hurry. He usually speaks, walks, writes, drives, and works rapidly even when these activities do not demand speed.
- VIGOROUS** A person with a high score in this area participates in physical sports, work requiring the use of his hands and the use of tools, and outdoor occupations. The area emphasizes physical activity using large muscle groups and great expenditure of energy. This trait is often described as "masculine" but many women and girls will score high in this area.

- IMPULSIVE** High scores in this area indicate a happy-go-lucky, daredevil carefree, acting-on-the-spur-of-the-moment disposition. The person makes decisions quickly, enjoys competition, and changes easily from one task to another. The decision to act or change is quick regardless of whether the person moves slowly or rapidly (**ACTIVE**), or enjoys or dislikes strenuous projects (**VIGOROUS**). A person who doggedly "hangs on" when acting or thinking is typically low in this area.
- DOMINANT** People scoring high on this factor think of themselves as leaders, capable of taking initiative and responsibility. They are not dimineering, even though they have leadership ability. They enjoy public speaking, organizing social activities, promoting new projects, and persuading others.
- STABLE** (Emotionally stable) Persons who have high Stable scores usually are cheerful and have an even disposition. They can relax in a noisy room and they remain calm in a crisis. They claim they can disregard distractions while studying. They are not irritated if interrupted when concentrating, and they do not fret about daily chores. They are not annoyed by leaving a task unfinished or by having to finish it by a deadline.
- SOCIABLE** Persons with high scores in this area enjoy the company of others, make friends easily, and are sympathetic, cooperative, and agreeable in their relations with people. Strangers readily tell them about personal troubles.
- REFLECTIVE** High scores in this area indicate that a person likes meditative and reflective thinking and enjoys dealing with theoretical rather than practical problems. Self-examination is characteristic of reflective persons. These people are usually quiet, work alone, and enjoy work that requires accuracy and fine detail. They often take on more than they can finish, and they would rather plan a job than carry it out.

The Criterion

The job effectiveness of each caseworker was evaluated by means of a performance rating. Five job factors were rated: Job Skills, Work Habits, Quality of Work, Quantity of Work, and Ability to Work with People. On each of these factors, the caseworker was evaluated as either Outstandingly Good, Very Good, Satisfactory, Reasonably Satisfactory, or Poor. A Sample of this rating

may be found in Table II of the Appendix.

As supervisors had not received any training in the use of the rating, it was necessary that steps be taken to insure an accurate rating. Due to work pressures it was not possible to obtain time to hold training and practice sessions in the use of the merit rating. However, an instruction sheet was devised and accompanied each rating sheet. See Table III in the Appendix for sample. The purpose of these instructions was to avoid common pitfalls in merit ratings such as the halo effect, central tendency error, leniency error, and experience contamination. As the supervisors were not aware of the nature of the temperament test, criteria contamination was thus avoided.

The performance of each caseworker is known only to his immediate supervisor. Therefore, it was not possible to establish the reliability of the rating by obtaining independent judgements from other supervisors. After the merit ratings were obtained, a one month time period was allowed to lapse. The supervisors were then requested to re-rate each of their workers. The supervisors were not aware that a re-rate was to be conducted. This request was made on the pretext that the writer "goofed" by an error in coding. In order to insure anonymity, all workers were identified by a code number. The code number on the merit rating corresponded to the worker's code number on the temperament test for purposes of comparison.

The coefficient of correlation between the first rating and the second rating was .80. Thus it was concluded that the merit rating was sufficiently reliable to be used as a job performance criterion.

CHAPTER IV

PROCEDURE

Collection of the Data

Each caseworker who participated in the study was requested to sign a release which would authorize the writer to obtain the worker's merit rating from his supervisor. After all ratings had been obtained, a month time period was allowed to lapse. The supervisors were then requested to re-rate their workers for purposes of establishing the reliability of the merit rating. As mentioned earlier, a reliability coefficient of .80 was obtained.

Due to the variation in each caseworker's visiting schedule (caseworkers spend two days of every week in the field visiting their clients) it was not possible to administer the temperament test to the entire group at one time. The tests were therefore given on an individual basis. After each worker completed the test, it was immediately returned to the writer for scoring and tabulation. The test was then returned to the worker for his personal information.

Treatment of the Data

On the basis of the merit ratings, the caseworkers were divided into a High Group and a Low Group. The High Group included caseworkers who were rated outstandingly good on the merit rating. The Low Group included caseworkers whose performance was rated reasonably satisfactory or poor. This division into a High Group and a Low Group was made for each of the job factors on the

merit rating.

Schedule scores of caseworkers rated high in performance were compared with those rated as low. Thus, on each of the job factors on the merit rating there was a High and a Low group. The significance of differences between the two groups was tested with the t test. The results are presented in Table IV of the Appendix; the data are presented in Table V.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Only two temperament traits significantly distinguished between the High and the Low performance groups. These traits were Vigorous and Stable.

In terms of the factors Job Skills and Quantity of Work, the High and Low Group differed significantly on the trait of Vigorous. The group rated as Low in Job Skills scored a mean of 9.7 which was higher than the mean of 6.7 obtained by the High group. The mean difference was significant at the 5% level of confidence. Similarly, the group rated as Low in terms of Quantity of Work scored a higher mean, 9.8, on the trait of Vigorous than did the High group whose mean on this trait was 6.1. Again, the mean difference was significant at the 5% confidence level.

Turning now to the temperament trait of Stable, it was found that this trait significantly distinguished between the High and Low performance group on all the job factors except Ability to Work with People.

The group rated High on the factor of Job Skills had a mean score of 13.2 on the trait of Stable; the Low group had a mean of 8.9. The t of 2.72 was significant at the 5% level of confidence.

The group rated High on the factor of Work Habits had a mean of 13.6 on the trait of Stable; the Low group had a mean of 10.0. The obtained t of 2.43 was significant at the 5% confidence level.

The High group on the job factor, Quality of Work, scored a mean of 13.0 on the trait of Stable; the Low group's mean was 9.8. The t of 2.26 was significant at the 5% level of confidence.

Finally, the group which was rated High on the factor of Quantity of Work had a mean of 13.7 on the Stable trait; the Low group had a mean of 9.2. The t of 4.59 was significant at the 1% level of confidence.

Discussion

As indicated in the results, workers who rated Low in terms of Job Skills and Quantity of Work scored significantly higher on the trait of Vigorous than did the High group. This would seem to suggest that the more vigorous case-workers are poor in the area of job skills and the amount of work turned out. However, if we re-examine the description of the trait Vigorous, we find that it involves the expenditure of physical energy such as in the area of sports, use of tools, and in outdoor occupations. An analysis of the High and Low group in terms of sex indicates the following: Of the caseworkers rated High on Job Skills, 73% were female. Seventy-two percent of the workers in the Low group were males. Similarly, the group rated as High in Quantity of Work again consisted of about 73% females; the Low group consisted of about 58% males. Therefore, as Vigorous is predominantly a masculine trait and as the greater percentage of females composed the High group, it might be inferred that the significant difference may be an artifact of the temperament test rather than based on a difference of the actual variables involved.

The trait of Stable distinguished between effective and ineffective case-workers on all job criteria except Ability to Work with People. This indicates

that emotional stability is common to all four job factors.

Emotional Stability, as described in the Examiner Manual of the TTS, is characteristic of individuals with a cheerful and an even disposition, those who remain calm in crises, and those who can work under pressure and distraction. Further, if interrupted while concentrating, stable persons do not become irritable, do not fret about daily job routine or obstacles which may arise in the course of the performance of their job duties. Thus, the trait of Stable highly permeates most job factors. Stable caseworkers have a good knowledge of their job; they organize, plan, and execute their duties well. In addition, emotionally stable caseworkers are flexible and possess initiative. Their work is thorough and accurate. As a consequence, stable caseworkers consistently maintain a higher volume of work output than their lesser stable co-workers.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This study was an effort to determine what temperament traits distinguish between effective and less effective caseworkers employed by a public welfare agency. In addition, an effort was made to bring to attention other variables which demand consideration in caseworker selection.

Sixty-three caseworkers participated in the study. On the basis of "fresh" merit ratings obtained from their immediate supervisors, caseworkers were divided into High and Low performance groups on each of the five job factors listed on the merit rating. The Thurstone Temperament Schedule was used as an index of temperament traits. Schedule scores of caseworkers rated high in performance were compared with those rated as low. Thus, on each of the job factors on the merit rating there was a High and a Low group. The significance of differences between the two groups was tested with the t test.

The results indicated that only two areas of temperament, Vigorous and Stable, significantly distinguished between good and poor job performance. Caseworkers rated as Low on Job Skills and Quantity of Work had significantly higher mean Vigorous scores than did the workers rated High. Because of the masculine nature of the Vigorous trait and because of the high percentage of females in the High group, it was suggested that these findings might be an artifact of the test rather than a difference based on the true variables involved.

The results further indicated that the trait of Stable significantly distinguished between effective and ineffective caseworkers on all job factors except Ability to Work With People.

Conclusions

On the basis of the results obtained and within the limits imposed by this research design, the following conclusions seem warranted:

1. Certain aspects of temperament are demonstrably related to success in the job of caseworker. Among these is the trait of emotional stability as measured by the Thurstone Temperament Schedule.
2. The importance of stability is made doubly evident in a practical sense in an examination of job skills, work habits, quality of work, and quantity of work of caseworkers who possess this trait.
3. Stable caseworkers are more able to consistently maintain a high standard of performance even under adverse environmental conditions and under psychological stresses imposed on them by their job.
4. Factors which logically should have been significant but turned out not to be were the traits of Sociable, Dominant, and Impulsive.
5. The development of a test battery which included a consideration of temperament would seem to further improve the selection of caseworker personnel.

As was pointed out earlier in the discussion of Subjects, the sample selected for this study represents one district office in a population of ten. If proper sampling procedures had been possible, the results of this study might justifiably be generalized to the other nine offices. However, this preclusion does not diminish the value of the results nor does it condemn them to sterility. In our analysis of the population, reference was made to the uniformity of this population. The uniformity was in terms of selection procedures, job duties and requirements, temperament requirements, organizational and administrative structure, and promotional evaluation. On the basis of this uniformity it is highly suggestive that the results and conclusions obtained in the sample would have particular relevance for the entire population. Confirmation of this

suggestion may be borne out by future research.

Caution is directed in using only one predictor as a criterion of successful work performance; additional predictors should be developed. To this end, a battery of tests would probably have higher validity than a single test.

The advantages and rewards of a test program are many. Improved selection and placement of personnel results in greater occupational adjustment, personal satisfaction, and productive success. A test program will also tend to reduce turnover, training costs, and labor problems.

TABLE I

JOB DUTIES OF A CASEWORKER

1. Investigate applications for Public Assistance and General Assistance.
2. Redetermine eligibility on 5 categories of assistance including computations of budgets.
3. Make plans for Nursing Home care.
4. Submit reports to the governor's office on complaints by clients.
5. Record in long hand interviews and investigations.
6. Make plans for Homemaker and Housekeeping Services.
7. Compute detailed budgets on responsible relatives.
8. Make detailed studies on suitability of the home for children and report to Family Court.
9. Appear in court actions in Family Court and Criminal Court.
10. Submit to Resource Consultant reports on personal injuries.
11. Change addresses.
12. Answer very time-consuming complaints by telephone, both clients and interested persons.
13. Make burial plans.
14. Review and analyze cases for visits and district office interviews.
15. Investigate lost warrants and replacement of same by emergency checks.
16. Keep desk organization and maintain controls on visits and dispositions.
17. Meet emergency needs arising due to fires and non-payment of promised contributions.

18. Select cases for camp placements of children and adults.
19. Submit cases for Christmas gifts from private sources.
20. Refer to Family Support Consultant cases of defaulting fathers.
21. Counsel and motivate teen-agers and adults for employment.
22. Participate in reviews and special studies where indicated.
23. Interpret changes in policy and program to clients and to other persons in the community.
24. Make investigations on active cases for other states.
25. Follow up and secure additional data for consultants including Family Court representatives.
26. Refer suspicious cases to Investigation and Frauds.
27. Compute Excess Assistance and submit reports thereon.
28. Write letters to employers, courts, state penitentiaries, state hospitals, medical agencies, other counties, and other states.

TABLE II

MERIT RATING

Check one of the following symbols which describes the case-worker's performance.

- A - Outstandingly Good
- B - Very Good. Better than job requires
- C - Satisfactory. Meeting requirements of job.
- D - Reasonably Satisfactory. Not meeting all job requirements
- E - Poor. Does not meet the job requirements.

FACTORS	A	B	C	D	E
1. JOB SKILLS.....					
2. WORK HABITS.....					
3. QUALITY OF WORK.....					
4. QUANTITY OF WORK.....					
5. ABILITY TO WORK WITH PEOPLE.					

SUGGESTED GUIDE TO ASSIST EVALUATOR

1. JOB SKILLS
 - a. Knowledge of policy and procedure.
 - b. Knowledge and utilization of resources.
 - c. Ability to secure and present data.
 - d. Organization and planning of work.
2. WORK HABITS
 - a. Promptness
 - b. Flexibility
 - c. Initiative
 - d. Attendance
3. QUALITY OF WORK
 - a. Caliber of work
 - b. Accuracy
 - c. Thoroughness of work
4. QUANTITY OF WORK
 - a. Volume of work output
 - b. Consistency of production
5. ABILITY TO WORK WITH PEOPLE
 - a. Emotional stability
 - b. Relations with co-workers
 - c. Relations with supervisors
 - d. Relations with recipients (if known).

TABLE III

INSTRUCTION SHEET FOR USING THE MERIT RATING

The validity and reliability of this Rating is dependent on the objectivity and accuracy of your evaluation. To attain these ends, the caseworker nor anyone else will know his rating. Once you have destroyed the slip of paper containing the caseworker's name, he is identified only by the code number on the rating form; this number corresponds to the number on the caseworker's personality test. Do not remove the name until you have completed the evaluation of each of your workers.

The following instructions are of the utmost importance. Read them carefully and refer to them freely while you are doing the evaluations.

1. Rate all the caseworkers on one job factor at a time.
2. Do not rate a caseworker on a factor unless you have actually observed his performance on that factor. That is, do not guess, avoid supposition, or emotional bias.
3. Do not rate a factor on the basis of how you rated another factor.
4. Do not rate on the basis of a single dramatic incident. Consider the entire previous six months working period.
5. Consider the caseworker's length of experience in relationship to each factor.
6. Do not avoid giving a very high or a very low rating where it is warranted.

TABLE IV

A - JOB SKILLS
 B - WORK HABITS
 C - QUALITY OF WORK
 D - QUANTITY OF WORK
 E - ABILITY TO WORK
 WITH PEOPLE

		A	B	C	D	E
ACTIVE	MEAN HIGH GROUP	10.1	10.0	9.8	10.6	10.0
	MEAN LOW GROUP	9.1	10.0	10.3	10.3	9.2
	DIFFERENCE	1.0	0.0	.5	.3	.8
	S.E. DIFFERENCE	1.36	1.22	.91	.98	1.06
	t	.73	1.22	.54	.30	.75
	SIGNIFICANCE	-	-	-	-	-
VIGOROUS	MEAN HIGH GROUP	6.7	9.0	7.1	6.1	9.3
	MEAN LOW GROUP	9.7	7.9	8.5	9.8	7.7
	DIFFERENCE	3.0	1.1	1.4	3.7	1.6
	S.E. DIFFERENCE	1.44	1.44	1.52	1.37	1.53
	t	2.08	.76	.92	2.70	1.07
	SIGNIFICANCE	5%	-	-	5%	-
IMPULSIVE	MEAN HIGH GROUP	10.6	9.3	10.6	10.0	10.4
	MEAN LOW GROUP	10.1	10.1	10.4	10.5	8.9
	DIFFERENCE	.5	.8	.2	.5	1.5
	S.E. DIFFERENCE	1.45	1.87	1.31	1.48	1.08
	t	.34	.42	.16	.33	1.38
	SIGNIFICANCE	-	-	-	-	-

TABLE IV (cont.)

		A	B	C	D	E
DOMINANT	MEAN HIGH GROUP	7.9	8.3	8.4	7.8	9.2
	MEAN LOW GROUP	8.8	9.7	9.7	9.1	10.0
	DIFFERENCE	.9	1.4	1.3	1.3	.8
	S.E. DIFFERENCE	1.51	1.44	1.43	1.47	1.55
	t	.59	.97	.90	.88	.51
	SIGNIFICANCE	-	-	-	-	-
STABLE	MEAN HIGH GROUP	13.2	13.6	13.0	13.7	12.3
	MEAN LOW GROUP	8.9	10.0	9.8	9.2	10.3
	DIFFERENCE	4.3	3.6	3.2	4.5	2.3
	S.E. DIFFERENCE	1.54	1.48	1.41	.98	1.56
	t	2.72	2.43	2.26	4.59	1.47
	SIGNIFICANCE	5%	5%	5%	1%	-
SOCIABLE	MEAN HIGH GROUP	12.9	11.5	13.2	12.6	12.8
	MEAN LOW GROUP	11.7	12.2	11.7	12.0	11.6
	DIFFERENCE	1.2	.7	1.5	.6	1.2
	S.E. DIFFERENCE	1.24	1.32	1.16	1.13	1.09
	t	.96	.53	1.29	.53	1.10
	SIGNIFICANCE	-	-	-	-	-
REFLECTIVE	MEAN HIGH GROUP	8.7	10.8	10.6	9.8	9.7
	MEAN LOW GROUP	9.2	8.9	9.2	9.6	9.3
	DIFFERENCE	.5	1.9	1.4	.2	.4
	S.E. DIFFERENCE	1.50	1.16	1.13	1.26	1.01
	t	.33	1.63	1.23	.15	.39
	SIGNIFICANCE	-	-	-	-	-
	NO. HIGH GROUP	11	14	13	11	26
	NO. LOW GROUP	22	22	25	25	15

TABLE V
DATA SHEET

SUBJ.	SCORES ON TEMPERAMENT TEST							MERIT RATING SCORE				
	A	V	I	D	E	S	R	1	2	3	4	5
1	7	15	9	14	17	15	9	4	5	4	4	5
2	9	10	10	11	16	16	7	3	3	3	4	3
3	15	5	9	14	3	13	12	4	4	4	4	4
4	14	8	13	8	14	17	14	5	5	5	5	5
5	13	17	13	13	8	13	10	4	4	4	3	5
6	12	15	17	19	15	18	7	3	3	3	3	2
7	3	4	6	7	16	11	3	4	3	4	4	4
8	8	8	14	5	8	11	14	3	3	3	3	4
9	8	10	9	8	12	11	7	3	4	4	3	4
10	11	10	7	7	5	11	11	3	4	5	3	4
11	4	2	5	3	10	10	9	4	4	4	4	5
12	8	10	7	5	5	14	13	4	4	4	3	5
13	13	5	15	8	15	15	11	4	3	5	5	4
14	7	4	11	6	2	4	7	3	2	2	2	3
15	6	6	12	14	14	11	10	5	4	5	5	5
16	7	3	6	5	14	7	8	4	4	4	4	5

TABLE V
DATA SHEET (cont.)

SUBJ.	A	V	I	D	E	S	R	1	2	3	4	5
17	11	12	12	16	15	12	12	4	4	4	3	5
18	10	13	9	3	2	7	10	3	4	4	4	4
19	10	6	10	17	11	14	12	3	3	3	3	4
20	11	4	9	12	10	8	12	4	3	3	4	5
21	14	6	16	12	16	15	2	5	4	4	4	5
22	14	3	8	2	8	6	11	4	5	3	3	4
23	14	10	17	12	14	15	8	2	2	3	2	3
24	6	2	11	5	13	14	7	5	4	5	4	5
25	10	19	8	3	1	11	4	3	3	4	3	4
26	8	10	6	8	12	8	10	4	5	4	4	4
27	8	16	11	17	14	17	12	3	4	3	4	4
28	5	9	6	7	8	14	10	5	5	5	4	5
29	8	6	9	6	3	10	7	2	2	3	2	4
30	7	13	6	4	12	11	3	5	5	4	4	4
31	7	8	17	9	19	17	8	5	5	5	5	5
32	15	4	13	8	10	12	12	5	5	4	3	5
33	13	11	6	10	9	9	13	4	3	3	3	2
34	7	17	15	14	13	16	15	4	4	5	4	5
35	11	8	8	5	12	15	11	4	4	4	4	5
36	5	9	9	13	18	15	8	3	3	4	3	4
37	13	3	11	8	10	13	12	5	4	5	5	4

TABLE V
DATA SHEET (cont.)

SUBJ.	A	V	I	D	E	S	R	1	2	3	4	5
38	9	1	5	2	6	11	10	3	3	4	3	3
39	15	6	12	8	4	15	7	3	3	3	3	5
40	10	5	3	1	12	6	15	5	5	5	5	5
41	9	6	12	9	6	13	8	4	4	4	3	5
42	8	4	5	13	16	13	8	4	3	4	4	3
43	15	4	13	5	8	11	11	3	4	3	4	4
44	5	12	3	15	10	12	13	4	4	4	4	3
45	12	18	8	13	11	12	15	2	3	2	2	3
46	5	5	7	8	2	9	9	3	4	3	4	4
47	9	11	13	9	11	14	7	3	4	3	3	5
48	10	6	9	4	6	7	11	4	4	4	4	3
49	7	4	6	1	2	2	11	3	3	3	4	3
50	5	15	8	10	14	13	11	2	3	2	3	3
51	15	6	7	11	9	11	10	4	4	3	4	4
52	4	15	10	11	17	12	8	3	5	3	3	3
53	10	0	6	4	13	11	9	4	4	5	5	5
54	6	4	6	4	13	10	4	4	4	3	5	4
55	12	10	12	13	16	15	13	4	5	5	5	5
56	9	8	9	16	14	15	7	4	4	3	4	3
57	15	7	10	7	3	14	4	4	3	3	3	3

TABLE V
DATA SHEET (cont.)

SUBJ.	A	V	I	D	E	S	R	1	2	3	4	5
58	12	8	6	6	8	12	14	4	4	4	5	4
59	14	12	15	10	13	10	13	4	5	3	3	4
60	14	10	9	11	17	12	3	5	5	5	5	5
61	13	5	14	13	14	16	4	4	3	3	4	5
62	9	4	4	10	15	6	10	4	5	4	4	5
63	14	12	14	17	13	15	14	4	3	4	4	5

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bellows, Robert M. Psychology of Personnel in Business and Industry. New York: Prentice & Hall, Inc., 1954.
2. Bender, J. F. "Emotional Adjustment of Workers." Person. J., 1944, 22, 301-307.
3. Blum, Milton L. Experimental Industrial Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952.
4. Buros, Oscar K. (ed.) The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook, Highland Park, N.J. Gryphon Press, 1959.
5. Cronbach, Lee L. Essentials of Psychological Testing. New York: Harper, 1960.
6. Edwards, Allen L. Statistical Analysis. New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc., 1950.
7. Fleishman, Edwin A. Studies in Personnel and Industrial Psychology. Homewood, Ill. Dorsey Press, Inc., 1961.
8. Gardiner, Charles S., Hall, Henry E., & Parker, Lee J. "Identification and Measurement of Caseworker Characteristics: Part II." Publ., Personnel Rev., 1955, 16, 153-159.
9. Ghiselli, Edwin E. & Brown, Clarence. Personnel and Industrial Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., Inc., 1955.
10. Gray, J. Stanley. Psychology in Industry. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., Inc., 1952.
11. Harrel, Thomas W. Industrial Psychology. New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc., 1958.
12. Lewis, John. "Kuder Preference Record and MMPI Scores for Two Occupational Groups," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1947, 11, 194-201.
13. Paone, Francis. Supervisory Evaluation Through Temperament Testing. Loyola University, 1954.
14. Raino, Kullervo. "The Effect of the Selection Situation on Response to Questionnaires." Nord. Psykol., 1956, 81, 164-166.

15. Selltiz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1961.
16. Shea, A. L. and Fenlason, A. F. "A Critique of the Leahy-Fenlason Scale for Social Workers," Social Work Techniques, 1938, 3, 55-59.
17. Sheddon, B. R., & Witmer, L. R. "Employment Tests for Relief Visitors." J. Appl. Psychol., 1939, 23, 270-279.
18. Thurstone, L. L. The Thurstone Temperament Schedule, manual. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1953.

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Eugene Skoff has been read and approved by three members of the Department of Psychology.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the thesis is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts.

January 25, 1963
Date

Edmund P. Marx
Signature of Adviser