

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

1995

A study of perceptions of the "glass ceiling" effect among male social workers

Angela Schweig

Robert W. Sehi

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Schweig, Angela and Sehi, Robert W., "A study of perceptions of the "glass ceiling" effect among male social workers" (1995). *Theses Digitization Project*. 1008.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/1008>

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

A STUDY OF PERCEPTIONS OF THE
"GLASS CEILING" EFFECT AMONG
MALE SOCIAL WORKERS

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the
Requirements for the Degree
Master of Social Work

by
Angela Schweig
Robert W. Sehi

June 1995

A STUDY OF PERCEPTIONS OF THE
"GLASS CEILING" EFFECT AMONG
MALE SOCIAL WORKERS

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino


by
Angela Schweig
Robert W. Sehi
June 1995

Approved by:



Dr. Teresa Morris, Project Advisor, Social Work

6/8/95
Date



Dr. Teresa Morris, Chair of Research Sequence

6/8/95
Date

ABSTRACT

Using a randomized block design, this study examined the problem of the "glass ceiling" for women in the social work profession by measuring male social workers' perceptions of salary inequity, job performance, status differential, and promotional opportunities. One hundred and eighteen members of the NASW in Southern California were drawn at random from the membership mailing list and asked to respond to a survey questionnaire based upon paired hypothetical vignettes in which one protagonist is male and the other is female. Both univariate and bivariate descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. The significance of this study is its potential to disclose hidden gender bias against promotion of women to social work administrative positions.

The data in this study partially supported both hypotheses. The greatest demonstration of significance was in the relationship of performance evaluation to the respondents' arenas of practice, living arrangement, and social work position. When the sex of the protagonist was controlled, arena of practice was a predictor of greater promotional opportunity and performance evaluation for the male than for the female. Based on the respondents' living arrangements, lower salaries were awarded to the male protagonists than to the female.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We wish to thank Tamara Sehi, who has fed us, cajoled us, encouraged us, humored us, and has earned conjoint Masters Degree in Social Work. The next one is yours!

We are also thankful for our partnership with its frustrations, humor, late nights that blended into early mornings, and the sense that in all of this we maintained our sanity.

Carpe Diem!

L'Chaim!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| ABSTRACT | iii |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES | vi |
| INTRODUCTION | |
| Problem Statement | 1 |
| Problem Focus and Literature Review | 2 |
| RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD | |
| Paradigm | 7 |
| Sampling | 7 |
| Instrument and Data Collection | 8 |
| DATA ANALYSIS | 10 |
| RESULTS | |
| Demographic Characteristics | 12 |
| Hypothesis One | 13 |
| Hypothesis Two | 13 |
| DISCUSSION | |
| Significant Findings | 20 |
| Significant Findings in Relationship to the Literature | 21 |
| Limitations of the Study | 22 |
| Conclusions and Implications for Social Work Practice | 23 |
| APPENDIX A: Questionnaires | 25 |
| APPENDIX B: Informed Consent | 39 |
| APPENDIX C: Debriefing Statement | 40 |
| REFERENCES | 41 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1. Sociodemographics of Respondents by Vignette | 14 |
| Table 1. (Continued). Sociodemographics of Respondents | 15 |
| Table 2. Qualities of Responses by Vignettes | 16 |
| Table 3. Association of Indicators to Demographics | 17 |
| Table 4. Association of Indicators and Demographics Controlling for Protagonist Sex | 19 |
| Table 5. Length of Time Given for the Protagonists to Receive LCSW | 20 |

Introduction

Problem Statement

This study examined the “glass ceiling” effect in the social work profession. It examined self-reported perceptions of male social workers regarding gender equity in social work administration. Specifically, it described the contribution of male social worker’s perceptions to the limited promotion potentials of female social workers to administrative positions.

The professional literature of social work is replete with reports that present evidence of the “glass ceiling.” By definition, “glass ceiling” in Title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 (P.L. 102-166) addresses the under representation of women in managerial and decision making positions (Gibelman & Schervish, 1993). Discrimination on the basis of gender has been reported over the past three decades (Zietz & Erlich, 1976; Belon & Gould, 1977; Knapman, 1977; York, Henly, & Gamble, 1987; Fortune & Hanks, 1988; Gibelman & Schervish, 1993). Specific areas of study have been salary inequity, status differential, perception of job performance, and promotional opportunities, and status differential. Status differential is especially reflected in the three other characteristics of the “glass ceiling.”

Although the “glass ceiling” is recognized in the social work literature, the preponderance of studies of this effect is a result of business and other professions outside the social work arena (“Ten Years Later,” 1990; Saltzman, 1991; Gordon, 1992; “Mixed Reflections”, 1993). Regardless of the arena of study, there is little in the literature that explores male perceptions of the constituents parts of the “glass ceiling.” This study’s intent is to measure (a) male social worker’s perceptions of the four indicators of the “glass ceiling” and (b) how those perceptions might impact female social workers’ equal opportunity

for promotion to administrative positions.

The importance of this study lies in its implications for the ethical mandate of the social work profession “to act to prevent and eliminate discrimination against any person or group on the basis of...sex...personal characteristic, condition, or status” (NASW, 1990, p. 956). Social work has historically supported and advocated for equal rights for vulnerable and under represented populations. Social work has been in the forefront of combating inequalities of gender by working against the feminization of poverty and towards comparable worth (DiNitto, 1991). Indeed, Encyclopedia of Social Work discusses the necessity for social workers to address sex discrimination and inequality in economics, labor force participation, occupational segregation, comparable worth, public assistance, and the distribution of income and wealth. Interestingly, the encyclopedia offers very little on sex discrimination or the “glass ceiling” effect in the social work profession. The significance of this study is it’s examination of male social workers’ hidden gender bias regarding perceptions of the four indicators of the “glass ceiling.”

Problem Focus and Literature Review

Using a positivist paradigm, this study measured sex biases of male social workers toward salary and status equity, job performance, and promotional opportunity as presented on a self-report questionnaire. The social work role which was addressed is administration. The “glass ceiling” effect is an administrative and management problem addressed at that level. The subjects of the study were male social workers who are members of part of a region of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) in California.

Like nursing, teaching, day care, and library science, social work is historically a female dominated profession (Glick, 1991) However,

administrators in these fields, as in social work, are predominantly male. Several studies using the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) data base have examined issues of sexism, gender inequity, and salary and status differentials between male and female social workers. Gibelman and Schervish (1993) present findings that show that from 1961 to 1991 the percentage of women members of NASW rose from 68 to 77 percent. However, they also show that only 22.7 percent of women were in administrative or management positions. During the same period, male membership declined from 32 percent to 23 percent. However, 67.3 percent of male members were in administrative or management positions. The authors identify this phenomenon as the "glass ceiling." Their study replicates many of the findings of previous studies using the NASW data base. The authors conclude that although the "glass ceiling" in social work exists, the reasons for it remain unclear (Gibelman and Schervish, 1993). The study is the only article in the social work literature that uses the term "glass ceiling." However, four indicators of the phenomenon appear repeatedly in the literature.

Salary Inequity. Fanshel (1976) examined NASW membership questionnaires from 1971-1972 and 1973-1975, investigating under-representation of female social workers in leadership positions relative to males and salary differences between male and female social workers. He found that 37 percent of the men are in administration, compared to about 18 percent of the women. He also found in the 1971-72 survey that 24 percent of the men had salaries over \$20,000 where only 8 percent of the women had such salaries. He also examined the correlation between marital and child care responsibilities and salary differential, concluding that although such variables may contribute to status differences, they do not account for them.

Belon and Gould (1977) found that even when intervening variables such as educational level, number of years in present job, subsequent experience, type of agency, and full time or part time work were controlled for, the worker's sex was the strongest predictor of salary differences. From this they concluded "despite professional commitment to eradicate discrimination on the basis of sex, agencies have failed to measure up to the standards set by the NASW Code of Ethics" (p. 469). Controlling for job position, experience, and education, York, Henly, and Gamble (1987) found that gender was the best predictor of salary. Fortune and Hanks (1988) examined career patterns and salary inequities among MSW graduates which revealed that male clinicians moved into non-clinical positions more often than women and advanced in salary faster.

Promotional Opportunity. Knapman's (1977) study confirms Fanshel's. She examined four levels of social work practice, direct service (level 1), some staff supervision (level 2), branch and program directors (level 3), and executive directors (level 4) and found that 68 percent of the women are in level 1, while almost 50 percent of the men are in levels 2, 3, and 4. She also found that as the number of men entering the social work increased, the discrimination against women also increased. She concluded that female social workers must wait longer for promotions than male social workers and that fewer women than men were hired initially as supervisors.

Perception of Job Performance. Zietz and Erlich (1976), in a California NASW study, examined practitioners' perspectives on sexism related to career development, job mobility, and day-to-day bias. Their key conclusions are a) "the picture that emerges is one of wide-spread perceived sexism accompanied by a serious credibility gap, occasioned by a rather consistent pattern in which men reported less sexism than women" (p. 436) and b) male social workers'

perceptions are critical to an understanding of entrenched sexism in social agencies. Austin, Kravetz, and Pollock (1985), also found significant differences between women's self-perceived competence as social work administrators and their actual experience as administrators. Most of the respondents believed that women social work administrators must be more competent than men in the same position.

Status Differential in Relation to Sex-Role Stereotyping. Status differential between men and women based on sex-bias is the most difficult of the four indicators to assess and report. It is often reported in relation to other indicators of gender-bias and is frequently reported as resulting from sex-bias and sex-stereotyping. Glick (1991) investigated how occupational stereotypes relate to sex discrimination in the prestige and salaries accorded to "men's" and "women's" jobs and in hiring and promotional decisions. He drew a distinction between the sex type of the job and the gender type of the job. He identified sex type as the ratio of men to women job holders and gender type as the personality traits associated with competent job holders. Participants in his study were asked to rate jobs separately according to the sex type and gender type of the job.

The study revealed that even jobs dominated by women, as a group, rated as requiring masculine traits as much as feminine ones. Social work was rated 5.21 for feminine traits and 4.92 for masculine traits (both on a 7 point Likert scale). The profession's prestige rating was 3.09, and its salary rating was 2.84 (both on a 5 point Likert scale). The author concludes five things: (a) the best predictor of job prestige is the degree to which masculine personality traits are associated with the job, (b) feminine traits are valued to some degree in the work place, but masculine traits are over four times more valued, (c) highly feminine

jobs are likely to be low in prestige, not because they are associated with feminine traits, but because they are not associated with masculine traits, and (d) feminine traits are associated with enhanced prestige but not with enhanced salary, (e) similarity of gender is a predictor of promotional opportunity (Glick, 1991). Similarly, Frank (1988) found that men's ratings of women managers indicate that they do not perceive women as having attributes necessary for demanding management positions. Indeed, "female descriptions were more commonly associated with attributions for management failure" (p. 116). The author concluded that there is indeed a status differential and that "an effective 'old boys network' generally promotes its own" (p. 115). Geller and Hobfoll (1993) found that men rated other men more highly than they rated women in performance evaluations and were more likely to be supportive of male supervisors due to gender similarity. They conclude that women are at a disadvantage in the work place both in perceptions of job performance and the availability of social support., and these disadvantages create a status differential, also known as, "a good old boy network," which contributes to the "glass ceiling" (p. 420). However, Powell (1982) concluded that sex-role identity is a better predictor of promotional opportunity and advancement than similarity of gender between a supervisor and an employee.

All of these studies examine a part of the "glass ceiling" phenomenon. This study examines perceptions of male social workers only and how those perceptions impact the "glass ceiling." The study addresses two hypotheses:

1. On the basis of the four indicators of the "glass ceiling," there are differences in perception between two groups of male social workers presented with vignettes and survey questions where one protagonist is male and the other is female. The female protagonist elicits less-favorable responses than the male.

2. The respondents' demographic characteristics impact their perceptions of the "glass ceiling." The respondents' arena of practice, social work position, salary, and length of employment have a more unfavorable impact on the respondents' perceptions of the female vignette than of the male.

Research Design and Method

Paradigm

The paradigm of the study is positivist. Positivism allows the researcher to form time- and context-free generalizations. It is essential for the inquirer to adopt a non interactive posture with the subjects of study. The methodological implications of this paradigm include questions and hypothesis stated in advance and subject to manipulation by the researcher for empirical falsification. The design of this study is correlational with a randomized block design. In such a design, there exists a single parent population. That parent population is divided into two groups with characteristics roughly matched to each other. Both groups are subjected to the same tests and measures wherein the independent variable is controlled.

Sampling

The population for this study is male members of the National Association of Social Workers in two counties in California. The sample was selected from this population. The researchers assigned each potential participant a number from 1 to 236 which corresponded to the NASW mailing list of male members. Two groups were created using a random toss of a twenty-sided game die and counting off numbers on the list. The odd- numbered group received the male protagonist questionnaire. The even- numbered group received the female protagonist questionnaire. This sampling frame was used because it is the most complete list of social workers. Men were used exclusively for two reasons.

First, there is evidenced in the literature that female subjects tend to give high ratings of discrimination in similar studies. Second, the researchers wished to minimize the amount of emotional investment subjects might have in the issues presented. Previous studies have shown that men become less emotionally involved in and identify less with issues of sex discrimination than women.

Instrument and Data Collection

Instrument. The instrument was a thirty-three item self-report inventory (SRI). This instrument measures all four indicators of the “glass ceiling.” (See Appendix A.) The format consisted of closed-ended questions answered variously on a Likert type scale, a semantic differential scale, and interval scales. The Likert scale ranged from one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree). The semantic differential scale consisted of paired antonyms covering five intervals. Questions regarding each indicator were randomly mixed and asked in several different fashions. Demographic data included age, ethnicity, length of employment, income, employment level, academic degree, and marital status. These were recorded as a descriptive picture of the respondents. This instrument was created for this study. The vignette and survey questions were created in consultation with professional social work administrators in public agencies. The instrument was pretested on volunteers from a convenience sample of CSUSB students and professional social workers known to the researchers.

Strengths and Weaknesses. The two advantages of using a SRI are: a) large amounts of information can be solicited in a uniform manner, and b) a large sample population can be surveyed simply and in a short space of time. Participants could respond to the thirty-three items in approximately ten minutes without time-consuming face-to-face contact with the researchers. The major

weaknesses of SRI's involve reliability and validity. Reliability and validity are generated from consistent test and retest answers over time. Reliability addresses consistency of answers to an instrument across time and across similar populations. Validity addresses the extent to which an instrument actually measures what it proposes to measure. Because this is the first use of the questionnaire, reliability and validity are not addressed. Another major weakness of mail-out surveys is the possibility of a low completion rate.

Other weaknesses of SRIs are their tendency to miss reporting on relevant issues because the items are preselected by the researcher. SRIs also may not capture the internal or motivational characteristics of the respondent. Therefore, this study does not address any causative relationship between social worker awareness of the components of the "glass ceiling" and the existence of the "glass ceiling."

A potential flaw of a serial case study or two vignette design is that it may lead to an underestimation of the extent of bias. Previous serial studies of sex discrimination have found that it is easier to perceive bias when the participant is presented with an aggregate picture (i.e., evaluation of both male and female social worker's attributes together) than when information is presented and evaluated separately or serially. The researchers believe that this potential flaw is compensated for in the current study by the use of two randomly assigned groups of respondents rather than one aggregate group receiving both vignettes.

Procedure. Data were collected using a one-time only mail out survey. The initial mailing was followed by a one-time mail out reminder postcard. The expected time duration for return of the surveys was limited to six weeks. The anonymous questionnaires were returned by mail to a post office box.

Protection of Human Subjects. To maintain the confidentiality and

anonymity of human subjects, personal names were not collected on completed questionnaires. A document labeled "informed consent" constituted the front page of the survey. It described the purposes, procedures, risks, and benefits of participation of the study and requested the signature of the respondent as evidence of consent to participate and understanding of the study. Upon receiving the completed questionnaires, the "informed consent" sheets were removed and maintained separately from the questionnaire by one of the researchers. Questionnaires were maintained by the other researcher. Subjects were given, through separate documentation, a debriefing statement with the telephone number of the faculty project adviser at CSUSB. Through this contact, subjects could obtain information about the project or discuss the survey. There were no anticipated risks to humans as a result of completing this questionnaire.

Data Analysis

The principal concept of this study is the relationship between the perceptions of male social workers and the "glass ceiling" effect in the social work profession. Four constructs define the "glass ceiling." They are salary inequity between men and women, status differential, perception of job performance, and unequal promotional opportunities.

Using the student ware version of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), descriptive statistics were computed in order to subject the hypothesis to empirical testing. Univariate analysis of the data for each separate respondent group was confined to measures of central tendency applicable to ordinal variables. Descriptive variables identified the protagonists' strengths and weaknesses as a clinician, his/her promotional opportunity, potential salary, and potential status upon promotion. Individual variables were aggregated in order to measure the four components of the "glass ceiling." Bivariate analysis of

questionnaire responses (without demographic data) between the groups were limited to the T-test and the chi-square (χ^2).

The initial demographics summary represented an aggregate of the entire group of respondents. Bivariate analysis within each group compared demographic data to response items measuring the four indicators of the “glass ceiling” effect. Paired statistics were the four indicators of the “glass ceiling” which were compared to the respondents’ academic degree, arena of practice, social work position, years of employment, ethnic group, age, level of licensure, salary, and living arrangement.

The researchers anticipated a negative relationship between the two samples. The independent variable in the between group comparison was the gender of the protagonist in the vignette. The dependent variables were salary inequity, status differential, promotional opportunity, and performance evaluation. It was anticipated that there would be a relationship between all variables based on the gender of the protagonist in the vignette. It was anticipated that the participants in the study would respond more favorably when the protagonist was male than when the protagonist was female. It was also anticipated that the respondents’ length of employment, primary arena of practice, and salary would be biased toward the male protagonist.

The first hypothesis regarding difference in perceptions in the two groups of respondents required frequencies of all variables to obtain an overall profile of the sample. Means, medians, modes, and range of ordinal data such as respondent assessment of personal qualities, strengths and weaknesses, performance ratings, and promotional salary were calculated. Individual variables were aggregated into the four indicators of the “glass ceiling”, and Likert scales were condensed into possibilities. Frequency tables were

calculated for these variables. This hypothesis also required comparisons between the two groups on the basis of the sex of the protagonist in the vignette. Measures necessary included frequencies for each group and a comparison of mean scores on ordinal factors, both the individual variables and the aggregate variables.

The second hypothesis regarding the impact of respondents' demographics on their perception of the "glass ceiling" required crosstabulation of respondents' demographics to the aggregate variables. A crosstabulation controlling for protagonist sex was calculated. Mean scores of ordinal measures of the aggregate variables were also compared. Frequencies were calculated for each group based on responses to questions regarding length of time the protagonists should be given to complete licensure. Finally, tests measuring concordant, discordant, and inverse concordant and discordant pairs were conducted to assess the consistency of responses to the questionnaire.

Results

Demographic Characteristics

Two-hundred and thirty-six questionnaires were mailed. Of those, 118 were returned completed and seven were returned as undeliverable which yielded a 52 percent response rate. Sixty of the returned questionnaires were of the male vignette, and 58 were female. Diverse ethnicity was present in the responses, with 8 African-American, 3 Asian or Pacific Islander, 81 Caucasian, 8 Hispanic, 7 Native-American, and 8 other. Most of the respondents were in direct-service positions in public agencies (both 52.54 percent). Sixty-nine percent had been in social work longer than ten years. Almost 79 percent had domestic partners. Demographic characteristics are reported in Table 1. Eight-one percent (N=96) had Master's degrees; 5.9 percent (N=7) had doctorates.

Two of the respondents had no social work degree. The remainder had baccalaureate degrees. The ages of the respondents ranged from 22 years to 91 years, and the mean age was 49.26 years. Licensed clinicians represented 59.3 percent (N=70) of the sample. Another 9.3 percent (N=11) identified themselves as ACSWs only. Social Worker-Associates comprised 10.2 percent (N=12) of the sample, and 20.3 percent (N=24) had no social work degree. Respondents' salaries ranged from \$15,000 annually to more than \$50,000 annually. The largest number of respondents (N=77) reported their salaries to be greater than \$50,000 per year.

Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis proposed that there would be a difference in perceptions between the two groups of respondents and that the responses would be less favorable toward the female (See table 2). For each indicator, a greater frequency of favorable responses was given to the male vignette. The female vignette elicited greater frequencies of both neutral and unfavorable responses.

Comparison of the mean scores of the individual variables were significant ($p < .10$) for estimated current salary, assessment of strengths and weaknesses, requirements to obtain licensure, and length of time given to complete licensure. Means scores were lower for the female on estimate of current salary and the length of time given to complete licensure. However, mean scores were lower for the male in assessment of strengths and weaknesses and in the requirement to obtain licensure.

Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis proposed that the respondents' demographics would impact their perceptions of the "glass ceiling." Arena of practice, social

Table 1

Sociodemographics of Respondents by Vignette

| <i>Respondents Ethnic Group</i> | Male Vignette | | Female Vignette | | Total | |
|---|---------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| African-American | 3 | 5.17 | 5 | 8.77 | 8 | 6.96 |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 2 | 3.45 | 1 | 1.75 | 3 | 2.61 |
| Caucasian | 41 | 60.69 | 40 | 70.18 | 81 | 70.43 |
| Hispanic/Latino | 4 | 6.90 | 4 | 7.02 | 8 | 6.96 |
| Native American/ Alaskan Native | 4 | 6.90 | 3 | 5.26 | 7 | 6.09 |
| Other | 4 | 6.90 | 4 | 7.02 | 8 | 6.95 |
| Total | N=58 | 100.00 | N=57 | 100.00 | N=115 | 100.00 |
| <i>Respondents Primary Arena of Practice</i> | | | | | | |
| Private Practice | 11 | 18.33 | 6 | 10.34 | 17 | 14.41 |
| Public Agency | 30 | 50.00 | 32 | 55.17 | 62 | 52.54 |
| Private Agency | 10 | 16.67 | 14 | 24.14 | 24 | 20.34 |
| Community | 1 | 1.67 | 1 | 1.72 | 2 | 1.69 |
| Education | 4 | 6.67 | 5 | 8.62 | 9 | 7.63 |
| Other | 4 | 6.67 | 0 | 0.00 | 4 | 3.39 |
| Total | N=60 | 100.00 | N=58 | 100.00 | N=118 | 100.00 |
| <i>Respondents Household Living Arrangement</i> | | | | | | |
| Divorced | 5 | 8.33 | 4 | 6.90 | 9 | 7.63 |
| Married | 47 | 78.33 | 46 | 79.31 | 93 | 78.81 |
| Widowed | 1 | 1.67 | 1 | 1.72 | 2 | 1.69 |
| Never Married | 7 | 11.67 | 7 | 12.07 | 14 | 11.86 |
| Total | N=60 | 100.00 | N=58 | 100.00 | 118 | 100.00 |

Table 1 (Continued)

Sociodemographics of Respondents

| Respondent's Social Work Position | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|---------|
| Direct Service | 62 | 52.54 |
| Supervisor | 16 | 13.56 |
| Administrator | 20 | 16.95 |
| Educator | 3 | 2.54 |
| Retired | 12 | 10.17 |
| Not in Social Work | 4 | 3.39 |
| Not Reported | 1 | .85 |
| TOTAL | N=118 | 100.00 |
| | | |
| Respondent's Years in Social Work | | |
| 0 - 5 | 19 | 16.10 |
| 6 - 11 | 15 | 12.71 |
| 11 - 24 | 45 | 38.14 |
| 25 - 36 | 27 | 22.88 |
| Over 37 | 10 | 8.47 |
| Not Reported | 2 | 1.69 |
| TOTAL | N=118 | 100.00 |
| | | |
| Respondent's Years in Current Job | | |
| 0 - 5 | 60 | 50.85 |
| 6 - 11 | 21 | 17.80 |
| 11 - 24 | 20 | 16.95 |
| 25 - 36 | 10 | 8.47 |
| Over 37 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Reported | 7 | 5.93 |
| TOTAL | N=118 | 100.00 |

work position, salary, and length of employment were predicted to have a less favorable impact on the female protagonist than on the male. Frequencies of responses to the aggregate variables representing the "glass ceiling" effect were compared to the sociodemographics of the respondents using the Pearson chi-

Table 2

Qualities of Responses by Vignettes

| | Male | Vignette | Female | Vignette |
|--------------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|
| | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| <i>SALARY INEQUITY</i> | | | | |
| FAVORABLE | 21 | 35 | 11 | 19 |
| NEUTRAL | 26 | 43 | 31 | 53 |
| UNFAVORABLE | 13 | 22 | 16 | 28 |
| | N=60 | 100 | N=58 | 100 |
| <i>STATUS DIFFERENTIAL</i> | | | | |
| FAVORABLE | 30 | 50 | 23 | 40 |
| NEUTRAL | 13 | 22 | 15 | 26 |
| UNFAVORABLE | 17 | 28 | 19 | 34 |
| | N=60 | 100 | N=57 | 100 |
| <i>PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITY</i> | | | | |
| FAVORABLE | 28 | 48 | 20 | 35 |
| NEUTRAL | 12 | 20 | 13 | 23 |
| UNFAVORABLE | 19 | 32 | 24 | 42 |
| | N=59 | 100 | N=57 | 100 |
| <i>PERFORMANCE EVALUATION</i> | | | | |
| FAVORABLE | 16 | 27 | 8 | 15 |
| NEUTRAL | 15 | 25 | 15 | 27 |
| UNFAVORABLE | 29 | 48 | 32 | 58 |
| | N=60 | 100 | N=55 | 100 |

square. The Pearson chi-square revealed a statistically significant relationship ($p < .10$) between all four aggregate variables and the respondents' arena of social work practice and their household living arrangements. The chi-square also revealed a significant relationship between both salary inequity and performance evaluation and the respondents' social work positions. Chi-square test results are summarized in Table 3. Chi-square tests comparing the aggregate glass ceiling variables to the respondents' sociodemographics revealed statistical significance in arena of practice, social work position, salary, living arrangements, and years in social work when controlling for protagonist's sex. The respondents' arena of practice was statistically significant in determining salary inequity, status differential, promotional opportunity and performance evaluation in both the male and female vignette. However, promotional opportunity and performance evaluation were less favorable toward the male vignette. There was a significance in the

Table 3

Association of Indicators to Demographics

| Pearson Value | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| | Arena of Practice | Living Arrangement | Social Work Position |
| | X^2 | X^2 | X^2 |
| Salary Inequity | 41.1 | 22.6 | *31.8 |
| Status Differential | 29.4 | 24.8 | *19.9 |
| Promotional Opportunity | 33.1 | 22.2 | *26.9 |
| Performance Evaluation | 45.0 | 35.5 | 35.8 |
| Degrees of freedom | 20 | 12 | 24 |

X^2 Values Where $p < .09$

*Where $p > .10$

relationship between the respondents' social work positions and both salary inequity and performance evaluation. Although status differential and promotional opportunity were not found to be statistically significant with regard to the respondents' social work position, a pattern appeared in the data in which the female protagonist was favored over the male in both. The respondents' salary was significant in determining salary inequity, status differential, and performance evaluation. Respondents with larger salaries perceived greater promotional opportunity for the male protagonist than the female. The relationship between the respondents' years in social work practice was significant only in determining promotional opportunity. The respondents perceived the male to have greater promotional opportunity than the female.

Statistically significant results, not anticipated in the hypothesis, were in the relationship between the respondents' living arrangements and both salary inequity and performance evaluation. The respondents' perception of salary inequity indicates that they perceived the male protagonist to be paid less than the female. There was a significant relationship between the living arrangements and performance evaluation for both male and female. Chi-square values comparing the "glass ceiling" variables and the respondents' sociodemographics are summarized in Table 4.

In order to assess status differential, the respondents were asked to specify the number of months they would afford the protagonist to receive the LCSW. Frequencies of responses were compared between whether the protagonist was or was not promoted controlling for protagonist sex. Whether or not the protagonist was promoted had no affect on the number of months allowed to complete licensure. In both cases the male protagonist was given up to 24 months and the female protagonist given up to 12 months.

Table 4

Association of Indicators and Demographics Controlling for Protagonist Sex

| | Arena of Practice | | Social Work Position | | Salary | | Living Arrangement | | Years in Social Work | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|------|----------------------|------|--------|------|--------------------|------|----------------------|-------|
| | ♂ | ♀ | ♂ | ♀ | ♂ | ♀ | ♂ | ♀ | ♂ | ♀ |
| Salary Inequity | 30.5 | 26.7 | 20.4 | 53.9 | 36.1 | 51.1 | 32.6 | 6.0 | | |
| Status Differential | 30.0 | 29.0 | | | 40.0 | 38.5 | | | | |
| Promotional Opportunity | 32.1 | 24.2 | | | | | | | *104.7 | 143.5 |
| Performance Evaluation | 42.8 | 23.5 | | | *29.6 | 53.8 | 19.3 | 14.1 | | |
| Degrees of Freedom | 20 | 16 | 20 | 24 | 36 | 32 | 12 | 8 | 108 | 120 |

χ^2 Values where $p < .09$

*Where $p > .10$

Larger values reflect a bias against the vignette

Frequencies are summarized in Table 5.

Finally, the researchers wished to assess the internal consistency of responses to the questionnaire. Tests measuring concordant, discordant, and inverse concordant pairs were Spearman's Correlation, Pearson's R, Kendall's Tau-b and Tau-c. Where these tests were predicted to reveal a negative correlation between responses, a negative correlation was found. Where they were predicted to reveal a positive correlation between responses, a positive correlation was found. Both Pearson's R and Spearman's Correlation was found to have a significance of $p < .09$. This does not propose that the questionnaire is reliable or valid over time or across populations, but the results revealed that the questions were answered consistently.

Table 5

Length of Time Given for the Protagonists to Receive LCSW.

| <i>IF PROMOTED</i> | MALE | | FEMALE | |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|
| MONTHS | Frequency | Percent | Frequency | Percent |
| 0-6 | 17 | 28.3 | 15 | 25.86 |
| 7-12 | 17 | 28.3 | 25 | 43.10 |
| 13-24 | 22 | 36.67 | 11 | 18.97 |
| 25-37 | 3 | 5.00 | 4 | 6.90 |
| 37-48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 48+ | 1 | 1.67 | 0 | 0 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.17 |
| TOTAL | N=60 | 100 | N=58 | 100 |

| <i>IF NOT PROMOTED</i> | MALE | | FEMALE | |
|------------------------|------|-------|--------|-------|
| 0-6 | 8 | 13.33 | 6 | 10.34 |
| 7-12 | 20 | 33.33 | 28 | 48.28 |
| 13-24 | 21 | 35.10 | 13 | 22.41 |
| 25-37 | 5 | 8.33 | 7 | 12.07 |
| 37-48 | 4 | 6.67 | 0 | 0 |
| 48+ | 2 | 3.33 | 0 | 0 |
| Missing | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6.90 |
| TOTAL | N=60 | 100 | N=58 | 100 |

Discussion

Significant Findings

The data in this study partially supported both hypotheses. First, the data show that there are significant differences between the two groups of respondents based on all four indicators of the “glass ceiling.” However, two of the “glass ceiling” variables contradicted the hypothesis, and two supported it.

The greatest demonstration of significance was in the relationship of performance evaluation to the respondents' arenas of practice, living arrangement, and social work position. Although several demographic variables were solicited, only arena of practice, social work position, salary, living arrangement, and years in social work were significant predictors of one or more of the indicators of the "glass ceiling."

Both hypotheses predicted that the female vignette would elicit negative responses across all variables. However, when the sex of the protagonist was controlled, arena of practice and living arrangement demonstrated a relationship with one or more of the "glass ceiling" variables that contradicted the hypotheses. Arena of practice was predictor of greater promotional opportunity and performance evaluation for the male than for the female. Living arrangement was a significant predictor of the difference in the perception of salary inequity between the male and female vignette. Based on the respondents' living arrangements, lower salaries were awarded to the male protagonists than to the female.

Significant Findings in Relationship to the Literature

The current study reveals that male social workers perceive salary inequity to penalize male social workers. The study also reveals that the respondents' living arrangement had a significant effect on their assessment of salary inequity. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents in the current study are or have been married or have a domestic partner. They perceive salary inequity to penalize male social workers.

Previous studies of female social workers found that they believed they must be more competent than men in the same position. In this study, male social workers position and salary were significant predictors of a bias against

women in both status differential and performance evaluation. Therefore, we can conclude that the male social workers' who participated in this study believe that women in social work must be more competent than men in the same positions.

Previous studies correlating status differential with promotional opportunity found survey rating of women managers indicate that they are not perceived as having attributes necessary for demanding management positions. The current study requested that respondents rate the protagonists behavior toward peers as inferior or superior, aggressive or assertive, and hierarchical or collegial. No significant difference was found. These findings cannot corroborate the previous study.

Limitations of the Study

One significant limitation of this study is in the strength of the survey questionnaire. Because no tested instrument measuring the "glass ceiling" was available the survey was created specifically for this study. Although correlations of ranked data revealed that the questions were answered consistently, there is no indicator which demonstrates either the reliability or the validity of the questionnaire.

Because the instrument is an self-report inventory (SRI), it suffers from all of the weakness of SRIs. These include their tendency to miss reporting on relevant issues because the items are preselected by the researcher. SRIs also may not capture the internal or motivational characteristics of the respondent. Although this survey proposes to measure male social workers' perception of the "glass ceiling", no attempt is made to address any causative relationship between social worker awareness of the components of the "glass ceiling" and the existence of the "glass ceiling."

Subjects in the study were necessarily limited to male social workers and

only to members of the NASW. Due to the time constraints of the study, the design could not incorporate hypotheses regarding female social workers' perceptions of the "glass ceiling" and how these perceptions might contribute to the "glass ceiling." Convenient use of the NASW membership list necessarily eliminates social workers who are not members of that organization.

Additional limitations of the study were the time constraints and costs. Data collection was necessarily limited to a six week period. A longer data collection period might have allowed for a larger sample. Printing and mailing costs caused a significant limitation in the number of persons who could be surveyed.

Conclusions and Implications for Social Work Practice

All previous studies found on the "glass ceiling" in social work practice used less than current archival data. Therefore, the findings of this study are only a beginning examination of the contribution of male social workers' perceptions of the "glass ceiling." The sample population of this study shares all the pertinent characteristics of the general population of NASW members. The size of the sample contributes to the generalizability of the study. Significant findings of this study lead to the following conclusion. Although there are some significant differences in salary inequity, status differential, promotional opportunity, and perception of job performance on the basis of sex, the findings of this study are generally inconclusive. The female vignette did not elicit entirely negative responses when compared to the male vignette. The researchers conclude that there are significant weaknesses in the questionnaire and that the four indicators of the "glass ceiling" proposed in this study may not be the appropriate measurement.

The participants' responses may have been influenced by the political

zeitgeist. Because affirmative action policies and programs are being attacked at administrative and policy levels, the respondents may have identified strongly with the male social worker in the vignette. They may have projected similar issues in their practice arenas onto the male protagonist. In addition, they may be sensitive to politically correct terminology and behavior. Therefore, they may have given politically correct responses, but not necessarily honest ones, to the female vignette.

Further study must be conducted with a stronger instrument. A new instrument needs to be developed and proved with test/retest validity over time. Specific implications for social work practice, taking into account the limitations of the current study, include:

1. Sex-biased perceptions do exist. It is important to create more refined measures and to understand why variables such as arena of practice, the social work position, salary, and living arrangement have a greater influence on the bias than such variables as education, degree, and level of licensure.
2. Because 53 percent of the respondents were direct-service providers and only 31 percent were in administrators or supervisors it is imperative that a larger sample of administrators and supervisors be studied because it is they who have the power to create or break the "glass ceiling."
3. This study was limited to the perceptions of male social workers. It is important for future research and planning in administration that the perceptions of female social workers regarding the "glass ceiling" be studied. It is unjust to conclude that male social workers perceptions are the only biases which contribute to the "glass ceiling."

Appendix A
Questionnaires

This vignette and the questions that follow measures how male social workers rate desirable qualities in a mid-level manager. Please read this vignette and answer the questions on the following page.

Vignette 1

Tim is a 35 year old psychiatric social worker (PSW I), married with two children. The older child is in elementary school and the younger child is 6 months old. Tim has just celebrated his five year anniversary as an employee of the department of mental health. He has recently returned to work after a three month paternity leave. His salary is at the median for Southern California (\$32,500).

The department is currently interviewing for a full-time clinic supervisor. The position requires two years experience, licensure or license eligibility, and a passing score on a scaled panel interview. Although Tim meets the employment requirement, he has not completed the requirements for licensure. Tim is being encouraged by his peers to apply for the position. They feel that his interview score will be high enough to offset the licensure requirement.

Tim has demonstrated the following strengths on his last two performance evaluations. He has demonstrated the ability to work independently. He has the ability to integrate leadership skills and counseling skills in a team management model. He also possess a flexible leadership style that adjusts to the given situation, and he is able to accept criticism and to present criticism effectively. However, the following weaknesses were noted. Tim appears to have an inability to effectively delegate authority and responsibility and yet maintain accountability. He has consistent difficulty meeting the time delimiters on

required reports.

Clients of the clinic have reported that Tim is warm, genuine, empathic, respectfully confrontive, and available. His colleagues and supervisors experience him as decisive, ambitious, determined, assertive, independent, and focused.

The county has been in a salary and hiring freeze for the past two years. Tim's work schedule has been a 5X8 work week. A promotion to clinic supervisor would change his work week to a 4X10. He is hoping for the promotion because of financial needs and because it would permit him to spend more time with his family.

Please answer the following questions by checking the appropriate response. Please do not leave any unanswered questions.

**Do not
write in
this space**

1. If the range of salary for a PSW I is \$25,000 to \$37,500, estimate Tim's salary without a 5 year anniversary raise. 1. _____
 1. () \$25,000 to \$28,999
 2. () \$29,000 to \$31,999
 3. () \$32,000 to \$34,999
 4. () \$35,000 to \$37,500

2. If the range of salary for a PSW I is \$25,000 to \$37,500, estimate Tim's salary with a 5 year anniversary raise. 2. _____
 1. () \$25,000 to \$28,999
 2. () \$29,000 to \$31,999
 3. () \$32,000 to \$34,999
 4. () \$35,000 to \$37,999
 5. () \$38,000 to \$41,999

3. The strengths noted on Tim's performance evaluations should enable him to become a clinic supervisor 3. _____

Strongly
Agree

Strongly
Disagree

1

2

3

4

5

4. Tim's behavior towards his peers is: 4._____

Inferior _____ Superior
1 2 3 4 5

5. Tim's behavior towards his peers is: 5._____

Aggressive _____ Assertive
1 2 3 4 5

6. Tim's behavior towards his peers is: 6._____

Hierarchical _____ Collegial
1 2 3 4 5

7. The strengths noted on Tim's performance evaluation should not enable him to become a clinic supervisor. 7._____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

8. If Tim gets the promotion, his next salary grade should be PSW II, not an exempt/clinical supervisor. 8._____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

9. Tim's next logical promotion should be clinic supervisor. 9._____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

10. Tim possesses qualities desirable in a mid-level manager. 10._____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

11. The qualities that the client's find in Tim are qualities indicative of mid-management skills. 11. _____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

12. The fact that Tim does not meet all the requirements for a clinic supervisor should be overlooked. 12. _____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

13. The qualities that Tim's colleagues find in him will have a positive impact on his promotional opportunity. 13. _____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

14. The weaknesses noted on Tim's performance evaluation should prevent him from becoming a clinic supervisor. 14. _____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

15. Upon promotion Tim's salary range should increase to: 15. _____

- 1. () \$35,000 to \$37,999
- 2. () \$38,000 to \$40,999
- 3. () \$41,000 to \$43,999
- 4. () \$44,000 to \$46,999
- 5. () \$47,000 to \$49,999
- 6. () \$50,000 or more

16. Rate Tim's overall chance of being promoted. 16. _____

Low Medium High
(1) (2) (3)

17. The qualities that Tim's colleagues find in him will have a negative impact on his odds of promotion. 17._____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

18. If Tim becomes a clinic supervisor, how long should be given to complete his licensure? 18._____
(nearest # of months) _____

19. If Tim is not promoted how long should he be given to complete his licensure? 19._____
(nearest # of months) _____

20. If Tim has not completed licensure within the time you have chosen should he be: 20._____

- 1. () Given an extension
- 2. () Demoted
- 3. () Terminated

21. The weaknesses noted on Tim's performance evaluation should not prevent him from becoming a clinic supervisor. 21._____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

22. I would promote Tim to clinic supervisor. 22._____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

DEMOGRAPHICS

23. What is your highest degree in social work? 23._____

- 1. () Baccalaureate
- 2. () Masters
- 3. () Doctorate
- 4. () No social work degree

24. What is your primary arena of practice? 24._____
1. () Private practice
 2. () Public agency
 3. () Private agency
 4. () Community organization
 5. () Education
 6. () Other
25. What is your primary responsibility in your current social work position? 25._____
1. () Direct service provider
 2. () Supervisor
 3. () Administrator
 4. () Educator
 5. () Retired
 - 6 () Not currently in social work
26. How many years have you been employed in your current position (nearest year)? _____ 26._____
27. How many total years have you been employed in social work? (nearest year) _____ 27._____
28. What is your ethnic group? 28._____
1. () African-American
 2. () Asian or Pacific Islander
 3. () Caucasian
 4. () Hispanic/Latino
 5. () Native American/Alaskan Native
 6. () Other
29. What is your age? _____ 29._____
30. What is your license or certification. 30._____
1. () LCSW or equivalent
 2. () ACSW
 3. () Clinical Social Worker-Associate
 4. () None

31. What is your salary? 31. _____

1. () \$15,000-18,000
2. () \$18,999-22,000
3. () \$22,999-25,000
4. () \$25,999-28,000
5. () \$28,999-31,000
6. () \$31,999-34,000
7. () \$34,999-37,000
8. () \$37,999-40,000
9. () \$40,999 and over

32. Household living arrangement 32. _____

1. () Divorced
2. () Married/domestic partner
3. () Separated
4. () Widower
5. () Never married
6. () Other

33. How long did it take you to fill out this questionnaire?
_____ minutes. 33. _____

Vignette 2

This vignette and the questions that follow measures how male social workers rate desirable qualities in a mid-level manager. Please read this vignette and answer the questions on the following page.

Christine is a 35 year old psychiatric social worker (PSW I), married with two children. The older child is in elementary school and the younger child is 6 months old. Christine has just celebrated her five year anniversary as an employee of the department of mental health. She has recently returned to work after a three month maternity leave. Her salary is at the median for Southern California (\$32,500).

The department is currently interviewing for a full-time clinic supervisor. The position requires two years experience, licensure or license eligibility, and a passing score on a scaled panel interview. Although Christine meets the employment requirement, she has not completed the requirements for licensure. Christine is being encouraged by her peers to apply for the position. They feel that her interview score will be high enough to offset the licensure requirement.

Christine has demonstrated the following strengths on her last two performance evaluations. She has demonstrated the ability to work independently. She has the ability to integrate leadership skills and counseling skills in a team management model. She also possess a flexible leadership style that adjusts to the given situation, and she is able to accept criticism and to present criticism effectively. However, the following weaknesses were noted. Christine appears to have an inability to effectively delegate authority and responsibility and yet maintain accountability. She has consistent difficulty meeting the time delimiters on required reports.

Clients of the clinic have reported that Christine is warm, genuine,

empathic, respectfully confrontive, and available. Her colleagues and supervisors experience her as decisive, ambitious, determined, assertive, independent, and focused.

The county has been in a salary and hiring freeze for the past two years. Christine's work schedule has been a 5X8 work week. A promotion to clinic supervisor would change her work week to a 4X10. She is hoping for the promotion because of financial needs and because it would permit her to spend more time with her family.

Please answer the following questions by checking the appropriate response. Please do not leave any unanswered questions.

**Do not
write in
this space**

1. If the range of salary for a PSW I is \$25,000 to \$37,500, estimate Christine's salary without a 5 year anniversary raise. 1. _____

- 1. () \$25,000 to \$28,999
- 2. () \$29,000 to \$31,999
- 3. () \$32,000 to \$34,999
- 4. () \$35,000 to \$37,500

2. If the range of salary for a PSW I is \$25,000 to \$37,500, estimate Christine's salary with a 5 year anniversary raise. 2. _____

- 1. () \$25,000 to \$28,999
- 2. () \$29,000 to \$31,999
- 3. () \$32,000 to \$34,999
- 4. () \$35,000 to \$37,999
- 5. () \$38,000 to \$41,999

3. The strengths noted on Christine's performance evaluations should enable her to become a clinic supervisor. 3. _____

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|----------------------|
| Strongly Agree | | | | | Strongly Disagree |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |

4. Christine's behavior towards her peers is: 4. _____

Inferior _____ Superior
1 2 3 4 5

5. Christine's behavior towards her peers is: 5. _____

Aggressive _____ Assertive
1 2 3 4 5

6. Christine's behavior towards her peers is: 6. _____

Hierarchical _____ Collegial
1 2 3 4 5

7. The strengths noted on Christine's performance evaluation should not enable her to become a clinic supervisor. 7. _____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

8. If Christine gets the promotion, her next salary grade should be PSW II, not an exempt/clinical supervisor. 8. _____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

9. Christine's next logical promotion should be clinic supervisor. 9. _____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

10. Christine posses qualities desirable in a mid-level manager. 10. _____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

11. The qualities that the client's find in Christine are qualities indicative of mid-management skills. 11._____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

12. The fact that Christine does not meet all the requirements for a clinic supervisor should be overlooked. 12._____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

13. The qualities that Christine's colleagues find in her will have a positive impact on her promotional opportunity. 13._____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

14. The weaknesses noted on Christine's performance evaluation 14._____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

15. Upon promotion Christine's salary range should increase to: 15._____

- 1. () \$35,000 to \$37,999
- 2. () \$38,000 to \$40,999
- 3. () \$41,000 to \$43,999
- 4. () \$44,000 to \$46,999
- 5. () \$47,000 to \$49,999
- 6. () \$50,000 or more

16. Rate Christine's overall chance of being promoted. 16._____

Low Medium High
(1) (2) (3)

17. The qualities that Christine's colleagues find in her will have a negative impact on her odds of promotion. 17._____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

18. If Christine becomes a clinic supervisor, how long should be given to complete her licensure? 18._____
(nearest # of months) _____

19. If Christine is not promoted how long should she be given complete her licensure? (nearest # of months) _____ 19._____

20. If Christine has not completed licensure within the time you have chosen should she be: 20._____

- 1. () Given an extension
- 2. () Demoted
- 3. () Terminated

21. The weaknesses noted on Christine's performance evaluation should not prevent her from becoming a clinic supervisor. 21._____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

22. I would promote Christine to clinic supervisor. 22._____

Strongly Agree _____ Strongly Disagree
1 2 3 4 5

DEMOGRAPHICS

23. What is your highest degree in social work? 23. _____
1. () Baccalaureate
 2. () Masters
 3. () Doctorate
 4. () No social work degree
24. What is your primary arena of practice? 24. _____
1. () Private practice
 2. () Public agency
 3. () Private agency
 4. () Community organization
 5. () Education
 6. () Other
25. What is your primary responsibility in your current social work position? 25. _____
1. () Direct service provider
 2. () Supervisor
 3. () Administrator
 4. () Educator
 5. () Retired
 - 6 () Not currently in social work
26. How many years have you been employed in your current position (nearest year)? _____ 26. _____
27. How many total years have you been employed in social work? (nearest year) _____ 27. _____
28. What is your ethnic group? 28. _____
1. () African-American
 2. () Asian or Pacific Islander
 3. () Caucasian
 4. () Hispanic/Latino
 5. () Native American/Alaskan Native
 6. () Other

29. What is your age? _____ 29. _____

30. What is your license or certification. 30. _____

- 1. () LCSW or equivalent
- 2. () ACSW
- 3. () Clinical Social Worker-Associate
- 4. () None

31. What is your salary? 31. _____

- 1. () \$15,000-18,000
- 2. () \$18,999-22,000
- 3. () \$22,999-25,000
- 4. () \$25,999-28,000
- 5. () \$28,999-31,000
- 6. () \$31,999-34,000
- 7. () \$34,999-37,000
- 8. () \$37,999-40,000
- 9. () \$40,999 and over

32. Household living arrangement 32. _____

- 1. () Divorced
- 2. () Married/domestic partner
- 3. () Separated
- 4. () Widower
- 5. () Never married
- 6. () Other

33. How long did it take you to fill out this questionnaire? 33. _____
_____ minutes.



Appendix B
Informed Consent

Dear NASW Member:

Enclosed are a brief vignette and questionnaire that attempts to measure how social workers rate desirable qualities in a mid-level manager. The questionnaire has been mailed to two hundred randomly selected members of Region F. The present study is being conducted with the approval of the Department of Social Work, California State University, San Bernardino, CA. This research effort is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Social Work degree by Angela Schweig and Robert Sehi.

Although many social workers are being surveyed, **your participation is critical to the success of the study.** Since each unreturned questionnaire reduces the generalizability of the study a high response rate is necessary to identify your views accurately and lend value to the study.

Please be assured your responses are completely anonymous. The vignette and questionnaire you receive are numbered. Please **do not** include your name on the questionnaire. The mailing list and completed surveys will be maintained separately. At the close of the data collection period the mailing list will be destroyed. There is no way for anyone to identify who returned any given questionnaire. Also, there are no correct or incorrect responses in this survey. As a practicing social worker your views are important, regardless of their nature. A summary of the findings of the study will be reported to you at the close of the project.

You have the right to choose not to participate in this study or to withdraw your responses at any time before April 15, 1995. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There will be no remuneration for your participation; there is no financial gain to the researchers.

If you have questions regarding the nature and content of this study, please contact Teresa Morris, Ph.D., faculty project adviser at California State University, San Bernardino, CA. She may be contacted by telephone at (909) 880-5561.

In the interest of contributing to the knowledge base of the evaluation of social work practice, in the interest of assisting two potential social workers in completing their degree program, and to contribute to the success of this survey would you kindly take about 30 minutes from your already busy schedule to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope.

Please try to return this questionnaire as soon as possible and **no later than March 10, 1995.** Please keep one copy of this letter for your files.

Angela Schweig

Robert Sehi

My signature represents my informed consent to participate in the above described study.

Participant's Name _____ Signature _____ Date _____

DEPARTMENT
OF
SOCIAL WORK
909/880-5501



Appendix C
Debriefing Statement

Dear Study Participant:

Thank you for your participation in the study conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Social Work degree by Angela Schweig and Robert Sehi. The research was conducted with the approval of the Department of Social Work, California State University, San Bernardino, CA. One of the facets the questionnaire sought to measure was how male social workers rate desirable qualities in a mid-level manager.

Another purpose of the study was to examine the "glass ceiling" effect in the social work profession. It examined the self-reported perceptions of male social workers regarding gender equity in social work administration. Specifically, it measured the responses of two groups of social workers to four markers of the "glass ceiling" effect. Those markers were salary inequity, status differential, perception of job performance, and promotional opportunities.

Two sets of vignettes were mailed randomly. The only difference in the vignettes was the gender of the protagonist. The gender of the protagonist was correlated with the four markers of the "glass ceiling" effect and with demographic data about the respondents. A summary of the results is included with this debriefing statement.

Please be assured your responses are completely anonymous. There is no way for anyone to identify who returned any given questionnaire.

If you have questions regarding the nature, content, or results of this study please contact Teresa Morris, Ph.D., faculty project adviser at California State University, San Bernardino, CA. She may be contacted by telephone at (909) 880-5561.

Thank you again for your participation.

Angela Schweig

Robert Sehi

DEPARTMENT
OF
SOCIAL WORK
909/880-5501

References

- Austin, C.D., Kravetz, D., and Pollock, K.L. (1985). Experiences of women as social welfare administrators. Social Work, 30(2), p. 173-179.
- Belon, C.J., and Gould, K.H. (1977). Not even equals: Sex-related salary inequities. Social Work. 22(6), p. 466-471.
- Crosby, F., Clayton, S., Alksnis, O., and Hemker, K. (1986). Cognitive bias in the perception of discrimination: The importance of format. Sex Roles, 14(11/12), p. 637-646.
- DiNitto, Diana M., (1991). Social welfare: Politics and public policy (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Fanshel, D. (1976). Status differentials: Men and women in social work. Social Work. 21(6), p. 448-454.
- Fortune, A. E., and Hanks, L.L. (1988). Gender inequities in early social work careers. Social Work. 33(3), p. 221-226.
- Frank, E. (1988). Business students' perception of women in management. Sex Roles, 19(1/2), p. 107-118.
- Geller, P. and Hobfoll, S. (1993). Gender differences in preference to offer social support to assertive men and women. Sex Roles, 28(7/8), p. 419-431.
- Gibelman, M., and Schervish, P.H. (1993). The glass ceiling in social work: Is it shatter proof? Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work, 8 (4), p. 442-455.
- Glick, P. (1993). Trait based and sex based discrimination in occupational prestige, occupational salary, and hiring. Sex Roles, 25(5/6), p. 351-377.
- Gordon, M. (1992, Sep). Discrimination at the top. Working Women. p. 68-72.
- Knapman, S.K. (1977). Sex discrimination in family agencies. Social Work. 22(6), p. 461-465.
- Mixed Reflections of the glass ceiling. (1993, Jul). U.S. News and World Report. p. 14.

National Association of Social Workers. (1987). Encyclopedia of social work (18th ed.). Silver Spring: MD: Author.

Powell, G. (1982). Sex role identity and sex: An important distinction for research on women in management. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 3, p. 67-79.

Saltzman, A. (1991, Jun). Trouble at the top. U.S. News and World Report. p. 40-48.

Ten years later, the glass ceiling gleams. (1990, Sep). Newsweek. p. 52.

York, R.O., Henley, H.C., and Gamble, D.N. (1987). Sexual discrimination in social work: Is it salary or advancement? Social Work. 32(4), p. 336-339.

Zietz, D., and Erlich, J.L. (1976). Sexism in social agencies: Practitioners' perspectives. Social Work. 21(6), p. 434-439.