



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN**
UNIVERSITY

The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

Volume 1
Issue 4 *Summer*

Article 10

July 1974

Relief vs. Rehabilitation: Conflicting Goals within the American Social Welfare System

Matthew Silberman
Bucknell University

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



Part of the Social Policy Commons, Social Welfare Commons, and the Social Work Commons

Recommended Citation

Silberman, Matthew (1974) "Relief vs. Rehabilitation: Conflicting Goals within the American Social Welfare System," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 4 , Article 10.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol1/iss4/10>

This Article is brought to you by the Western Michigan University School of Social Work. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN**
UNIVERSITY

RELIEF VS. REHABILITATION: CONFLICTING GOALS
WITHIN THE AMERICAN SOCIAL WELFARE SYSTEM*

Matthew Silberman
Bucknell University

There are two distinct orientations within the American social welfare system. The first orientation is a bureaucratic one in which heteronomous agencies are committed to a set of externally imposed regulations designed to provide relief to individuals who require some form of assistance in order to survive (Blau, 1965; Friedlander, 1968: 258-284; Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1965:233-282). Assistance usually takes the form of monetary grants. The second orientation is professional in character (Meyer, 1959). In many agencies, priority is given to the provision of the rehabilitative services to which professionally trained social workers are committed in principle and to which non-professionals, after years of dedication to the humanitarian tradition, may also be committed (Thomas, 1959; Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1965:283-334). Most directors of public assistance agencies agree that too much emphasis is given to financial assistance and not enough to family counselling, child welfare, mental health and addiction programs.¹ Since there are limited resources available to each agency, agencies that give priority to rehabilitative services must be organized to maximize the amount of time and personnel allocated to these services and minimize the amount of time and personnel allocated to providing financial assistance.

Based on a questionnaire administered to a stratified national sample of directors of county public assistance agencies, this paper reports the results of research designed to study the distribution of agency activities implementing either relief or rehabilitation goals. The purpose of the paper is to analyze the effects of bureaucratization and professionalization on the distribution of these activities and on the evaluation of agency effectiveness in helping to meet clients' needs. Since the questionnaire was designed and administered prior to the current development of the separation of rehabilitative services and relief activities into differentiated administrative systems, the findings reported in this study are specific to problems associated with the delivery of unseparated social services. Once the development of separated social services is complete, it should be possible to compare the effects of differentiated and undifferentiated administrative systems on the delivery of social services to the economically deprived.

*This paper is based on research conducted while the author was a Research Associate at the University of Michigan School of Social Work. This research was supported in part through a research grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Grant No. CRD-425-C1-9. Rosemary C. Sarri was the principal investigator; John Tropman and Wolfgang Grichting were senior research associates. An additional research grant from Bucknell University permitted the author to complete the analysis presented in this paper. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1973 annual meetings of the American Sociological Association.

The Function of Social Welfare

The primary purpose of any welfare system is to maintain normative integration, which can be achieved by means of regulatory mechanisms and/or by means of socialization and resocialization techniques. Piven and Cloward (1971:3-41) argue that the purpose of relief legislation throughout its history has been to maintain order and thus to contribute to economic stability. Starvation and suffering breed discontent, which often leads to the kind of political and social unrest that disrupts the organization of economic institutions. To the extent that the American social welfare system is organized to implement relief goals, it contributes to the maintenance of order in American society by assuring that a minimum of financial assistance is provided to the poor.

In addition to the relief approach to social welfare, there exists in Western culture a tradition of humanitarianism, of helping people in need to live a better life (Meyer, 1959:335; Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1965:140). The social work profession, which represents the institutionalization of humanitarian values, contributes to the regulation of society by "helping toward a mutual adjustment of individuals and their social environment" (Friedlander, 1968:4); i.e., "rehabilitating" those individuals who are not "adjusted" to society. Thus, it is the function of the social work profession, like any professional group, to integrate or reintegrate members of a society into that society (Parsons, 1960:155).

Whether social welfare policy is designed to provide relief or rehabilitation, it contributes to the maintenance of order in society. The relief approach focuses on preventing disorder through financial assistance, whereas the rehabilitative approach provides services designed to help individuals realize their aspirations without either disrupting society or withdrawing from it.

The Organization of the American Social Welfare System

Public assistance agencies are primarily organized to provide relief in the form of monetary grants to various categories of individuals who are economically deprived (Friedlander, 1968:258). Various bureaucratic regulations and procedures are established to provide economic assistance where necessary. Services beyond this minimum depend on the availability of resources in each agency, the structure of the agency, and the ability of caseworkers to use these resources constructively.

There are two types of bureaucratic regulations and procedures associated with financial assistance that illustrate the relationship between relief and the bureaucratization of the welfare system. The first is "eligibility determination." It is the duty of public assistance personnel to be "convinced that an individual in economic need has a rightful claim on society for public assistance" (Friedlander, 1968:284). The caseworker who rigidly adheres to procedures for determining eligibility for financial assistance is less

likely to provide other services to his clients (Blau, 1965:658). To a large extent, the activities of public assistance personnel consists of routinely determining their clients' eligibility for financial assistance (Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1965:293).

The second type of regulation relating financial assistance activities to bureaucratization reflects the existence of a well-developed hierarchy of authority in the welfare system. In social work jargon, these regulations concern the "accountability" of agencies to higher level administrative units such as local welfare boards, state welfare departments, etc. (Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1965:241). This has several consequences, all of which seem to enhance the bureaucratization of welfare agencies. Accountability requires extensive, detailed record-keeping by caseworkers (Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1965:241). By increasing the visibility of decision-making, the likelihood increases that bureaucratic rules will be adhered to. Furthermore, there is an unusually high degree of close supervision in welfare agencies (Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1965:238). The purpose of close supervision is to ensure that workers adhere to regulations imposed from outside and within the agency. The influence of the bureaucratic milieu on the organization of work in welfare agencies is accentuated by the fact that welfare workers are trained as "professionals" to rely on "close personal professional supervision" (Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1965:304). (This is in sharp contrast to the emphasis on independence and individual responsibility among other professional groups; Blau and Scott, 1962:62-63; Hall, 1969:81-91.)

The professional training of caseworkers is designed to focus diffuse humanitarianism on specific efforts to provide rehabilitative social services; e.g., family counselling and child welfare. Within public assistance programs there has been increasing recognition of the need to provide "skilled, rehabilitative casework service" in addition to income maintenance (Wilensky and Lebeaux, 1965:294). To the extent that agency policy and worker orientation are focused on social service, Wilensky and Lebeaux (1965:245) argue that there is a tendency for the bureaucracy to break down. In order to provide casework service workers find it necessary to avoid strict adherence to regulation. One of the most important reasons for this is the fact that each is faced with a limited amount of resources (facilities, time, personnel, etc.). The allocation of resources to financial activities is necessarily at the expense of social service, vers versa. Limited resources constrain organizations to employ more efficient, bureaucratic modes of activity. Thus, in general, it can be expected that the more limited the amount of resources available at a given agency, the smaller will be the proportion of its resources allocated to social service activities. H 19

Agency directors were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of their agencies' policies by estimating the proportion of clients they were able to help. Different orientations should produce different criteria for evaluation. The more bureaucratic the agency, the more the amount of money disbursed is expected to influence the evaluation of

effectiveness. On the other hand, professionally oriented directors are expected to evaluate the effectiveness of their agencies in terms of their ability to deliver social services.

METHOD

In 1969, a questionnaire entitled "To Provide Hope" was administered by mail to a stratified national sample of directors of local public assistance agencies. (In some of the larger agencies, refusals to answer resulted in follow-up letters permitting an administrator other than the director to answer the questionnaire, should the director be unable to do so himself.) The researchers were interested in studying the local organizational unit directly involved in administering public assistance programs. In most cases this is the county welfare agency. However, in some states, several counties are joined into larger district units for the purpose of administering public assistance programs. In a few others, one or two counties are subdivided into small administrative units. The county was the basic sampling unit. When two or more counties in the same welfare district were selected, only one questionnaire was administered. If a county was selected in which several agencies were located, all were included in the sample.

The sample was stratified according to region and location (urban vs. rural) in order to provide adequate representation of differing problems and procedures in the welfare system. The County and City Data Book, 1962 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1962:2) was used to define nine regional divisions: New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, West North Central, South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central, Mountain, and Pacific. In the Data Book, a county may be designated as being within a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1962:XI-XIII). Agencies so designated are defined in this study as "urban." All others are defined as "rural." Thus, our definition of urban includes many suburban as well as inner-city agencies located in any given metropolitan area. Twenty counties were selected at random from each urban regional stratum and each rural regional stratum. Since there are fewer than twenty Mountain counties, only 10 were selected from this stratum, making a total of 350 counties selected (Sarri, et al., 1970:100-104). Since the local agency does not always correspond to the county sampling unit, 340 questionnaires were administered. Of these, 199 were returned, a response rate of 58.5%. In some states, child welfare programs are administered by separate local agencies. In such cases, questionnaires were sent to the local child welfare agency as well as to the local public assistance agency. Forty-one of the 70 questionnaires were returned. These provide a limited basis for comparing the effect of different programs on the structure of agency activities.

The unit of analysis employed in this paper is the local welfare agency. The analysis proceeded on the assumption that there was little to gain from introducing complex weighting procedures to take into account different sample probabilities in the different strata or sample probabilities altered by the lack of correspondence between

sampling unit and unit of analysis. The reader should be aware of possible biases that may be introduced by oversampling urban agencies in general and, in particular, by oversampling urban agencies in predominantly rural areas and rural agencies in predominantly urban areas. The absence of important differences between urban and rural agencies (the latter to be discussed in detail further on in this paper) obviates the necessity of weighted statistics when compared to the clarity gained from presenting unweighted data.

Various statistical tests are employed where appropriate in order to assess whether the differences and relationships expected between variables are statistically significant. Not all differences and relationships are expected to be significant. The reader should note that when statistically significant findings are reported, these findings were expected. Similarly, when differences and relationships between variables are not reported as statistically significant, these findings were also expected. The reader should also note that not all the respondents answered every question. Since non-responses were excluded from the analysis, the reported sample size will be different from one table to the next. Although nearly three-fifths of the sample returned the questionnaire, there were several respondents who answered only the most basic questions about caseload and staff size and ignored the remainder of the questionnaire. These non-responses are reflected (by exclusion) in the sample size reported in each table.

FINDINGS

Professionalism and Bureaucratic Constraints

Directors of welfare agencies tend to be committed to the ideals of the humanitarian, service tradition (see Table 1).² Despite this commitment to helping clients, directors are unable or unwilling to reallocate resources to rehabilitative services and away from financial assistance programs. Since the regulations of the welfare bureaucracy are often not consistent with the goals of the social work profession or the goals of the majority of directors, the director must

TABLE 1. AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF RESOURCES (TIME AND PERSONNEL) ALLOCATED TO SOCIAL SERVICES, BY TRAINING OF DIRECTOR

Resource Allocation	M.S.W.	No M.S.W.	Difference
	%	%	%
Actual Allocation	48.9 (51)	47.5 (122)	1.4
Ideal Allocation	79.4 (47)	73.0 (112)	6.4*

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of responses to the questions. Non-responses are excluded from the analysis.
*p < .05 (t-test).

be willing to go beyond existing provisions if he is to realize his professional objectives. Despite the fact that there is a tendency for professionally trained directors to be even more committed to providing rehabilitative social services, there is no difference in the actual distribution of activities in agencies directed by professionals and nonprofessionals (Table 1). The constraints of the welfare bureaucracy have a greater impact on the allocation of resources within an agency than do the professional goals of its director (see Table 2).³

In view of the value orientation of the professionally trained social worker, it is not surprising that, on the average, agency directors with professional training rate their agencies as less effective than their counterparts in other agencies (see Table 3).⁴ Their agencies provide as much service to clients as the others, but the professionals are less satisfied with the results. Rather than assuming that agencies directed by professionals are "really" less effective, these data suggest that it is more reasonable to assume that professionally trained social workers tend to employ different criteria in evaluating effectiveness.

TABLE 2. AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF RESOURCES ALLOCATED TO SOCIAL SERVICES, BY DEPARTMENT OBJECTIVE AND DIRECTOR'S PERSONAL PREFERENCE CONCERNING THE AFDC PROGRAM

Departmental Policy Regarding the AFDC Program	Department Objective	Personal Preference
	(% of Resources)	(% of Resources)
To Concentrate on Legally Defined Obligations to Clients	40.6 (79)	42.0 (42)
To Go Beyond Existing Provisions to Help Clients	54.4 (89)	49.6 (125)
Difference	13.8***	7.6*

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of responses to the questions. Non-responses are excluded from the analysis.

*p < .05; ***p < .001 (t-tests).

TABLE 3. AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF CLIENTS HELPED COMPLETELY, BY TRAINING OF DIRECTOR

	M.S.W.	No M.S.W.	Difference
	%	%	%
Clients Helped	43.0 (46)	52.3 (103)	9.3*

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of responses to the questions. Non-responses are excluded from the analysis.

*p < .05 (t-test).

Limits on Resources, Bureaucratization, and Effectiveness

It seems surprising at first to find that the more limited the resources available to the agency and/or the less these resources are allocated to social service activities, the more likely agency administrators are to rate their agencies as effective in helping clients (see Tables 4 and 5). Thus, public assistance agencies are seen as more effective than child welfare agencies, and agencies with heavier workloads are seen as more effective than agencies with lighter workloads.⁵

TABLE 4. AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF CLIENTS HELPED COMPLETELY, BY TYPE OF AGENCY

	Public Assistance	Child Welfare	Difference
	%	%	%
Clients Helped	57.6 (39)	43.3 (41)	14.3*

NOTE: Only the data from states that separate child welfare services from public assistance activities are reported. (Child welfare agencies are social service agencies without financial assistance responsibilities.) Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of responses to the questions. Non-responses are excluded from the analysis.

*p < .05 (t-test).

TABLE 5. AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF RESOURCES ALLOCATED TO SOCIAL SERVICES AND AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF CLIENTS COMPLETELY HELPED, BY WORKLOAD OF AGENCY

	Agency Workload					Range
	≤20 Welfare Workers		>20 Welfare Workers		Range	
	≥1000 Applications	<1000 Applications	≥1000 Applications	<1000 Applications		
Resources Allocated to Social Services	(Heavy) %	(Medium) %	(Medium) %	(Light) %	%	
Clients Helped						
	34.6 (11)	* 49.4 (70)	50.5 (62)	60.1 (7)	25.5**	
	67.0 (11)	* 46.3 (61)	50.9 (58)	46.3 (7)	20.7*	

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of responses to the questions. Non-responses are excluded from the analysis.

*p < .05; **p < .01 (t-tests for the differences between adjacent means and the range).

Since understaffed agencies are forced to organize their activities in the most efficient, bureaucratic manner, more effort is bound to be devoted to financial assistance than to social service. Since it is easier to evaluate the effectiveness of the relatively routine, bureaucratic tasks associated with providing relief than the more ambiguous professional services such as child welfare, family counseling, mental health and addiction, it is those agencies that emphasize relief activities that are rated by their directors as more effective in helping clients.

Agency Goal Orientation, Professionalism, and Effectiveness

For most agencies, the primary goal is to provide relief to those who suffer economic deprivation. Nevertheless, about one-third give primacy to the provision of social and rehabilitative services.⁶ Different orientations yield different bases for evaluating effectiveness. Consequently, effectiveness in helping clients is evaluated in terms of the agency's ability to fulfill its primary goal, which may be either relief or rehabilitation. Thus, in agencies where the relief function is given priority (financial aid activities are most adequately served), effectiveness is determined by the amount of effort allocated to perform this function (see Table 6). In agencies where rehabilitation is the primary orientation (service activities are most adequately served), effectiveness is determined by the amount of time and personnel allocated to perform this function. When relief is the primary goal, the amount of funds allocated to the agency becomes crucial in determining what proportion of their clients each agency is

TABLE 6. CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND EFFECTIVENESS, BY PRIMARY GOAL OF THE AGENCY

Type of Resource Allocation	Primary Goal of the Agency	
	Relief	Rehabilitation
Financial Aid	+.199* (82)	-.279* (54)
Social Service	-.179 (79)	+.180 (53)

NOTE: Results are reported for the effect of resource allocation to financial aid and social services on effectiveness. The magnitudes of the correlations are not identical because percentages did not always add up to 100% and some miscellaneous "other" activities also were not included. Since a greater allocation to financial aid means a smaller allocation to social services and vice versa, the direction for each pair of correlations is reversed as expected. Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of responses to the questions. Non-responses are excluded from the analysis.

*p < .05.

able to help completely (see Table 7).⁷ When rehabilitation is the primary goal, the allocation of funds to the agency has little effect on its effectiveness rating.

The direction of the relationship between the amount of resources allocated to different functions in the agency and the percentage of clients judged to have been helped is contingent upon the agency goal that is given priority. An increase in resource allocation to financial assistance significantly increases the reported effectiveness of the agency (measured in terms of the percentage of clients estimated to have been helped) only when the primary goal of the agency is to provide relief. A corollary finding is that an increase in resource allocation to family counselling, child welfare, mental health and drug addiction programs decreases the reported effectiveness of the agency when relief is the primary goal. Furthermore, there is a significant negative correlation between the allocation of resources to financial assistance and effectiveness when rehabilitation is the primary goal. Correspondingly, there is a positive correlation between the allocation of resources to social services and effectiveness when rehabilitation is the primary goal.

TABLE 7. AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF CLIENTS COMPLETELY HELPED, BY PRIMARY GOAL OF THE AGENCY AND ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO THE AGENCY

Primary Goal of the Agency	Adequacy of Funds Compared with Other Agencies			
	Better	Same	Poorer	Range
	(% Helped)	(% Helped)	(% Helped)	(%)
Relief	63.8 (31)	** 44.5 (40)	** 14.1 (10)	49.7***
Rehabilitation	52.6 (23)	52.6 (28)	37.0 (4)	15.6

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of responses to the questions. Non-responses are excluded from the analysis.
p<.01; *p<.001 (t-tests for the differences between adjacent means and the range).

TABLE 8. CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND EFFECTIVENESS, BY TRAINING OF DIRECTOR

Type of Resource Allocation	M.S.W.	No M.S.W.
Financial Aid	-.300* (45)	+.028 (98)
Social Service	+.258* (44)	-.031 (95)

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of responses to the questions. Non-responses are excluded from the analysis.
*p<.05.

Given that professional social work training reflects a relatively strong commitment to the delivery of rehabilitative services, it is not surprising that a positive correlation between the amount of effort allocated to social services and perceived effectiveness exists only when agencies directed by administrators with such training are analyzed separately (see Table 8). When correlations between resource allocation and perceived effectiveness are obtained under four different conditions, reflecting a typology of agencies based on goal orientation of the agency and professional training of the director, we find that correlations exist only for congruent types (see Table 9). The "pure bureaucratic" type (the agency is committed to providing financial assistance and the director has not received an M.S.W. degree) yields a significant positive correlation between the allocation of resources to financial assistance and effectiveness. The "pure service" type (the agency is committed to the delivery of social services and the director has an M.S.W. degree) yields a significant positive correlation between the allocation of resources to social services and effectiveness. In the mixed (incongruent) types of agencies, resource allocation appears to be unrelated to effectiveness. Only in the congruent, "pure" types are agency and director orientations sufficiently alike to create a similar basis for evaluating effectiveness. The evidence presented here demonstrates that in a congruent organizational setting, effectiveness is determined by the ability of the agency to acquire and channel its resources into activities that reflect a goal orientation consistent with the professional commitments of its director.⁸ Effectiveness is undefined when the goals of the agency are inconsistent with the values of its director.

TABLE 9. CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND EFFECTIVENESS, BY PRIMARY GOAL OF THE AGENCY AND TRAINING OF DIRECTOR

Type of Resource Allocation	Primary Goal of the Agency			
	Relief		Rehabilitation	
	M.S.W.	No M.S.W.	M.S.W.	No M.S.W.
	(Incongruent)	(Congruent)	(Congruent)	(Incongruent)
Financial Aid	-.080 (24)	+.277* (58)	-.341 (19)	-.256 (35)
Social Service	-.131 (23)	-.182 (56)	+.495* (19)	+.029 (34)

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of responses to the questions. Non-responses are excluded from the analysis.

*p < .05.

A Comparison of Urban and Rural Agencies

There is no substantial difference in the delivery of social services reported in urban and rural agencies. This is true despite the fact that resources are generally more available in urban areas; i.e., there are more qualified personnel, more funds, and especially more service facilities (see Table 10). The reason for the absence of an effective difference between urban and rural agencies is that gains to large urban agencies through increases in available resources are mitigated by the effects of bureaucratization in these agencies. While social workers in small rural agencies may be more committed to service to clients (Thomas, 1959), there are fewer resources available to realize this objective. The smallest rural agencies and the largest urban agencies show paradoxically similar profiles: relatively less time and personnel are reported to be allocated to service activities and there are relatively high ratings of effectiveness by the agencies' directors (see Table 11).

TABLE 10. RELATIVE ADEQUACY OF FUNDS, PERSONNEL, AND SERVICE FACILITIES, AND PERCENTAGE OF DIRECTORS WITH M.S.W.'S, BY LOCATION

Type of Resources Available to Each Agency	Urban	Rural	Difference
	(% Better Off Than Other Agencies)	(% Better Off Than Other Agencies)	(%)
Funds	47.3 (91)	33.0 (97)	14.3*
Personnel	47.3 (93)	34.4 (96)	12.9*
Service Facilities	58.1 (93)	21.9 (96)	36.2***

	(% With M.S.W.)	(% With M.S.W.)	
Director Has M.S.W.	41.2 (97)	18.2 (99)	23.0***

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses indicate number of responses to the questions. Non-responses were excluded from the analysis.
*p<.05; ***p<.001 (χ^2 -tests).

TABLE 11. PROFILE OF AGENCIES ACCORDING TO SIZE AND LOCATION

	Urban			Rural		
	# Welfare Workers			# Welfare Workers		
	6-20	21-100	>100	≤5	6-20	21-100
	%	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Mean Allocation of Resources to:</u>						
Financial Aid	40.0 (21)	42.4 (38)	46.8 (24)	42.9 (36)	47.0 (37)	39.0 (17)
Social Service	48.3 (21)	51.4 (38)	44.9 (23)	45.8 (35)	45.7 (34)	50.9 (16)
<u>Mean % Completely Helped (Effectiveness)</u>						
	47.6 (13)	50.1 (36)	54.9 (19)	54.1 (28)	48.4 (35)	40.7 (15)
<u>Concentrate on Legally Defined Obligations</u>						
	33.3 (21)	35.7 (42)	60.7 (28)	48.6 (35)	51.3 (39)	52.9 (17)
<u>Director Has M.S.W.</u>						
	22.7 (22)	45.5 (44)	53.8 (26)	5.6 (36)	16.7 (42)	44.4 (18)
<u>Agency Better Off With Respect to:</u>						
Funds	28.6 (21)	46.3 (41)	61.5 (26)	37.1 (35)	29.3 (41)	33.3 (18)
Personnel	42.9 (21)	45.2 (42)	55.6 (27)	26.5 (34)	39.0 (41)	33.3 (18)
Service Facilities	57.1 (21)	54.8 (42)	63.0 (27)	14.3 (35)	25.0 (40)	22.2 (18)

NOTE: There were no rural agencies reported with over 100 workers and no urban agencies reported with fewer than 6 workers. Numbers in parentheses indicate the number of responses to the questions. Non-responses are excluded from the analysis.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we find that bureaucratization is associated with a tendency to rely on the most efficient mechanism for assisting welfare clients; i.e., financial assistance. The vast majority of directors of public assistance agencies would prefer to allocate more of their agencies' resources to rehabilitative social services but are constrained by limited resources and departmental rules and regulations from doing so. Directors who are professionally trained are even more likely to prefer social services over financial assistance than those who have not received an M.S.W. degree, but training has no direct effect on agency activities. Departmental policies regarding the allocation of resources to social services have a greater impact on how services are organized than the personal preferences of the directors.

Professionally trained directors tend to employ different criteria in evaluating the effectiveness of their agencies than those who are not so trained. We find that the greater the proportion of agency resources allocated to social service activities, the higher the percentage of clients perceived by the professionally trained directors to have been completely helped by their agencies. This is especially the case when the primary goal of the agency is to deliver rehabilitative social services. However, when the agency structure is primarily organized to provide economic relief, we find that the greater the proportion of agency resources allocated to financial assistance, the higher the percentage of clients perceived to have been completely helped by the directors who are not professionally trained.

The evaluation of agency effectiveness is determined by the allocation of resources within and to the agency when that allocation is consistent with its primary goal orientation. In general, when the agency is primarily organized to provide relief, the greater the proportion of resources allocated within the agency to financial assistance, the higher the percentage of clients reported by the directors to have been completely helped. Furthermore, when the agency is primarily organized to provide rehabilitative social services, the greater the proportion of resources allocated within the agency to financial assistance, the lower the percentage of clients reported to have been completely helped. We also find that when providing relief is the primary goal of the agency, the more adequate the funds allocated to the agency, the higher the percentage of clients reported completely helped. However, when rehabilitation is the primary goal, the relative adequacy of funds allocated to the agency has little bearing on how the directors rate their agencies as effective in helping clients. Clearly, other than financial criteria are used in these agencies to evaluate agency effectiveness.

To conclude, there are two distinctly different criteria by which agencies are evaluated with respect to their effectiveness in helping clients. Agencies may be evaluated according to whether they are effective in providing economic relief to welfare recipients or they

may be evaluated according to whether they are effective in providing rehabilitative social services. The evaluation of agency effectiveness is determined by the allocation of resources within and to the agency when that allocation is consistent with its primary goal orientation and when its primary goal orientation is consistent with its director's professional training and personal preference. Agencies which are organized primarily to provide economic relief are rated by their directors as more effective in helping clients when agency resources are allocated to financial assistance and the directors are not professionally trained. Agencies which are organized primarily to provide rehabilitative social services are evaluated as more effective when resources are allocated to social service activities and the directors are professionally trained.

The implications of the research reported in this paper for the current development of separation of social services from "income maintenance" (relief) activities should be evident. Social services and income maintenance are being organized or have already been organized into distinctly differentiated administrative systems. In organizing the welfare system such that resources are allocated to administrative units organized to implement one specific goal at a time, instead of two conflicting goals simultaneously, in a manner consistent with the goals of the agency and the professional and personal orientations of the administrator, we can expect to find an increase in the overall evaluation of agency effectiveness. Follow-up research is needed to determine whether the current bifurcation of the welfare system will actually increase its effectiveness in providing both economic relief and rehabilitative social services to welfare clients.

NOTES

1. As many as 90.0% of the directors surveyed agree that the proportion of agency resources allocated to financial assistance activities is too great.

2. Directors were asked to: "Please indicate what percentage (to the next 5 or 10%) of your total effort (time and personnel) is actually allocated to each of the following areas of concern: financial aid, family-centered problems, child welfare services, mental health and addiction," and other miscellaneous social services activities. They were also asked to: "Please indicate ... should ideally be allocated ..." An index of social services was employed using the three major categories to estimate percentage of time and personnel allocated to social service activities: family-centered problems, child welfare services, and mental health and addiction.

3. The directors were asked to: "Please indicate whether [the following statement] agrees with the policy of your department: To concentrate on legally defined obligations toward the client, rather than to go beyond existing provisions to help the clients." Directors were then asked to "indicate your own agreement or disagreement."

4. Directors were asked to: "Please estimate the percentage of those [clients] that you were able to help completely, somewhat, or only a little." This was employed as a measure of the director's

estimate of agency effectiveness.

5. Workload is defined in terms of the total number of "client applications (all programs from all sources) ... made to [the] agency during 1967," and the "total number of welfare workers" in the agency at the time of the survey. Thus, workload is not equivalent to the concept of caseload, but it is merely used to obtain an estimate of the relative pressure on the agencies' resources.

6. Directors were asked to: "Please tell us which of the following nine areas you feel is most adequately (1), second most adequately (2), ... least adequately (9) served by your agency." Two-thirds of the directors listed "financial aid" as the most adequately served and one-third indicated one of eight social service programs. The responses to this question were used as a basis for classifying the primary goal of the agency as relief ("financial aid") or rehabilitation ("other services").

7. The directors were asked, "Comparing your own agency with other county welfare agencies, would you say you are better off than most of them, pretty much like all the others, or are you poorer than most of them with regard to [the] adequacy of funds."

8. Etzioni (1961:12-14) argues that organizations with congruent compliance structures are more likely to be effective in achieving their goals. When the mode of involvement of the participants and the mode of social control are consistent, organizations are better able to respond to external and internal pressure to be effective. The data reported in this study lend some support to Etzioni's thesis since agencies are rated as more effective by their directors when the activities of the agency are consistent with the organizational milieu and the orientations of the director. However, it may not be the case that congruent types are actually more effective as Etzioni has observed, but that congruent types are more easily evaluated as effective as this study suggests.

REFERENCES

- Blau, Peter M.
1965 "Orientation toward Clients in a Public Welfare Agency." Pp. 654-670 in Mayer N. Zald (ed.), Social Welfare Institutions. New York: John Wiley.
- Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott
1962 Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler.
- Etzioni, Amitai
1961 A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organization. New York: Free Press.
- Friedlander, Walter A.
1968 Introduction to Social Welfare. Revised edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Hall, Richard H.
1969 Occupations and the Social Structure. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Meyer, Henry J.
1959 "Professionalization and Social Work." Pp. 319-340 in Alfred J. Kahn (ed.), Issues in American Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Parsons, Talcott
1960 Structure and Process in Modern Societies. Glencoe,
Illinois: Free Press.
- Piven, Frances F. and Richard A. Cloward
1971 Regulating the Poor. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Sarri, Rosemary C., John E. Tropman, Matthew Silberman, Edward J.
Pawlak and Kenneth Badal
1970 Client Careers and Public Welfare Structures. Ann Arbor,
Michigan: University of Michigan, School of Social Work,
Progress Report submitted to the U.S. Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service.
- Thomas, Edwin J.
1959 "Role Conceptions and Organizational Size." American
Sociological Review 24 (February):30-37.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census
1962 County and City Data Book, 1962. Washington: U.S.
Government Printing Office.
- Wilensky, Harold L. and Charles N. Lebeaux
1965 Industrial Society and Social Welfare. Revised edition.
New York: Free Press.