

September 1980

Sowing the Seeds of Trouble: An Historical Analysis of Compliance Structures In Child Welfare

Terry Gibson
Louisiana State University

Mary R. Lewis
University of Houston

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



Part of the Social Work Commons

Recommended Citation

Gibson, Terry and Lewis, Mary R. (1980) "Sowing the Seeds of Trouble: An Historical Analysis of Compliance Structures In Child Welfare," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 7: Iss. 5, Article 5. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.1473>
Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol7/iss5/5>

SOWING THE SEEDS OF TROUBLE: AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS
OF COMPLIANCE STRUCTURES IN CHILD WELFARE

Terry Gibson, D.S.W., Assistant Professor
Louisiana State University School of Social Work

Mary R. Lewis, Ph.D., Professor
University of Houston
Graduate School of Social Work

ABSTRACT

Amirai Etzioni's concept of compliance structures is used as a focus for an historical analysis of the organizational structures through which child welfare services have been offered in the U. S. This article shows how a dual compliance structure arose, both normative and coercive, but with more emphasis on the coercive. The expansion of public child welfare services since 1935, especially foster care and placement services rather than in-home services, has drawn public attention to widespread ineffectiveness. Stress and strain are particularly intense at the service delivery level. Yet the problems and social policies have not been analyzed in terms of building and using congruent or consistent organizational compliance structures and services to implement them. The authors suggest that Etzioni's organizational compliance theory may be a useful starting point for studying specific organizational responses to parental failure in order to clarify the existing confusion about organizational goals, means, and ends in child welfare.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this article is to use Amitai Etzioni's concept of compliance structures as a focus for an historical analysis of the organizational structures through which child welfare services have been offered in the United States. Special attention is given to the rise of foster care in the context of a dual compliance structure which is both coercive and normative. First the present problems of foster care are examined. Then Etzioni's concepts about compliance structures are explained. Using these concepts, the history of child welfare organizations is traced, highlighting the rise of the dual compliance structure. Finally there is a discussion about how present organizational conditions works against the achievement of either the social order or the cultural goals of child welfare legislation.

It is the thesis of this article that inadequate and ineffective foster care services may result either from the nature of their organizational compliance structures or from failure to recognize and make self-conscious distinctions between different compliance structures being used with clients. Also, the normative service delivery structure is less well developed than the coercive. This article will take two perspectives in analyzing some of the structural problems of child welfare:

- (1) Amitai Etzioni's concepts of compliance structures will be used as a framework for an organizational analysis of child welfare services.
- (2) The development of child welfare will be viewed from an historical perspective in order to identify possible causes of long standing organizational strains.

THE PROBLEM

National attention has focused on child welfare in the United States as a result of a series of Congressional hearings beginning in 1975 on H.R. 7200 which contained amendments to Title IV of the Social Security Act. Experts in the field of child welfare testified regarding the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of the foster care program. Themes running throughout these proceedings were that children's needs are not being met, that foster care programs are poorly staffed and administered, and generally fail to provide quality services to children who must live apart from their families. H.R. 7200 would have required states to develop a wide variety of in-home services to prevent out-of-home placements or to facilitate returning the child home. These services included homemaker and housekeeper services, day care, consumer education, respite care, transportation services, family and individual therapy, psychiatric counseling. H.R. 7200 passed the United States House of Representatives on July 18, 1977. It was referred to the Sub-Committee on Public Assistance of the United States Senate Finance Committee in April, 1978, but was never voted out of committee.

The issues were presented succinctly by a recent Secretary of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who called the foster care system a morass.

. . . If we are to fashion a humane and meaningful family policy for America then we must begin with the foster care system,

. . . It is a system which places 350,000 children but too often places them in improper conditions.

. . .Although foster care placements are intended to be temporary, children often remain for long periods. Fifty percent stay in foster care two or more years, 26% have been in foster care for more than five years, 12% remain for more than ten years.

. . .Children are often placed. . .without planning for their future placements or without adequate follow-up to implement proper plans.

. . .Too frequently few efforts are made to reunify children with the natural family or to seek adoption.

. . .Social worker caseloads are often considerably heavy, making individualized attention to foster care children very difficult.

. . .States often do not afford due process to the children of families immeshed in the system. (Califano, 1977, p.106)

The national consciousness that foster care programs are in trouble should not seem surprising or new. The professional social work literature contains eloquent critiques of foster care dating back more than 25 years. Maas and Engler (1959) dramatically illustrated the problems of children locked in the foster care system. More recently Jenkins (1974) described child welfare as "poor services for poor children" (p.19). Rein, Nutt and Weiss (1974,p.24) argued that as foster care is a class bound system, its stability and dysfunction lie in the system's class biases. After observing the operation of the foster care system closely through a five year longitudinal study of over 600 foster children, Fanshel and Shinn (1972) concluded,

. . .We are impressed with the number of apparently irrational elements in the system. We would characterize the foster care system as being isolated from other systems serving social and health needs. We also view the delivery of foster care services as being less than optimally organized and almost impossible to manage soundly. . . (p.26)

All social welfare programs, including foster care, operate within a framework of organizational structure. Structure refers to the conditions, forces and circumstances of an organization that are relatively constant over a period of time. "Structural variables are seen as shaping behavior, and hence as causing behavioral phenomena." (Kilmann, 1977, p.14)

CONCEPTS OF COMPLIANCE STRUCTURE

Etzioni (1961) chose the concept of compliance as a basis of his theory for analyzing and explaining complex organizations.

Compliance refers both to a relation in which a person behaves in accordance with a directive supported by another actor's power, and to the orientation of the subordinated person to the power applied. Compliance is universal, existing in all social units. It is a major element of the relationships between those who have power and those over whom they exercise it. (p.59)

"Power refers to the ability of an individual or group to get some other individual or group to change in some manner." (Filley, House, and Kerry, 1976, p.92) The organizational power system includes the directives the organization issues, the sanctions by which it supports its directives, and persons in power positions. Etzioni classified organizational power into three types based on the nature of rewards which are manipulated: (1) Coercive power rests on the

application or the threat of application of physical sanctions, generation of frustration through restriction of movement, or controlling through force the satisfaction of basic needs. (2) Remunerative power is based on control of material resources and rewards. (3) Normative power is the allocation and manipulation of symbolic rewards and deprivations (Etzioni, 1976, p.5).

Most organizations use all three types of power but emphasize one. Power is differentiated from authority. Power is the ability to act, authority is the right to act.

Organizations can be ordered according to their power structure, taking into account which power is predominant, how strongly it is stressed compared with other organizations. . .and which power constitutes the secondary source of control. (Etzioni, 1961, p.62)

In this theory, involvement refers to the orientation of the participants toward organizational power. Etzioni identified three kinds of involvement: (1) Alienative involvement is an intensely negative orientation in which participants do not have the same values as the organization. (2) Calculative involvement, predominantly found in business-employee relationships, usually results in mildly negative or positive commitment to organizational goals. (3) Moral commitment results in a positive orientation of high intensity and commitment to organizational goals. Organizational goals refer to a state of affairs which the organization is attempting to realize. In addition to three kinds of power and three kinds of involvement in organizations, there are three types of goals which are pursued by organizations. (1) Order goals are found in organizations which attempt to control individuals who are considered deviant by

society. (2) Organizations with economic goals produce goods and services which are purchased by others outside the organization. (3) Organizations which have culture goals are responsible for the creation and preservation of symbolic objects considered valuable and necessary for maintenance of beliefs and values of society (Etzioni, 1961).

The three kinds of power when paired with the three kinds of involvement can result in nine types of compliance structure. Three of these are considered to be congruent, meaning that the type of involvement by the participants is the type expected by the organization in order to attain organizational goals. Examples of congruent types of compliance structure are coercive power/alienative orientation/order goals, a prison; remunerative power/calculative orientation/economic goals, a factory; and normative power/moral commitment/cultural goals, a church. The other six categories are considered incongruent, in which the involvement of the participant differs from the kind of involvement and the type of goals expected by the organization. Etzioni believed that the study of processes involved in the six incongruent types of compliance structures could be useful to explain the nature of organizational conflict and strain.

Etzioni's (1961) dynamic hypothesis states that congruent types of organizations are more effective than incongruent types. "Hence, to the degree that the environment of the organization allows, organizations tend to shift their compliance structure from incongruent to congruent types." (p.69)

Etzioni considered organizations which simultaneously utilize two types of power to have a dual compliance structure and theorized that these organizations would tend to shift toward more congruence.

The next section of this article will provide an historical perspective on the compliance structures which have prevailed in child welfare services and foster care in particular.

The program of foster care which exists now is relatively recent in origin. It was a small part of public child welfare until the early 1960's. Therefore, the history of foster care in a broad sense is the history of child care and public welfare in the United States.

CHILD WELFARE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Nineteenth century organizations concerned with poor and dependent children used coercive power and their purposes were the maintenance of social order and the regulation of deviant members of society. "Social order arises....from a permanent running compromise between constraint and freedom, between the interests of the individual and the goals of society." (Cumming, 1968, p.4) Three methods of relief were available to poor and dependent children in the early 1800's. These were indenture or living out, home relief and almshouses. Numbers of children were bound out or auctioned off to the highest bidder, and sometimes entire families were sold to whomever would assume responsibility for their care (Abbott, 1938, p.4).

An example of an early 19th century charitable group which provided home relief was the Ladies Society for Relief of Poor Widows with Small Children which was founded in New York in 1797. The relationship between members of the Ladies Society and its beneficiaries was an example of coercive compliance. Provision of food and shelter was dependent upon the poor mothers' assumption of a very pious, self-effacing role toward the Ladies Society. The Ladies

Society helped only those mothers who were willing to work and only those of good moral character.

This latter requirement was not left to chance; the means, character and circumstances of each applicant were thoroughly investigated before any help was given and aid was denied any who failed to come up to the good Society's high standard. (Geiser, 1973, p.158)

The New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor was created in 1843 to repress pauperism according to Trattner (1974) who concluded that in the final analysis, members of the AICP no doubt loved the poor less than they feared or even hated them. "In effect, the AICP was less a charitable agency than an instrument for social control, a means of keeping society orderly, stable and quiet." (p.65)

Polier (1941) graphically described the degradation and the service nature expected of poor children who were recipients of home relief.

Children in need of charity were to be fitted for menial service in the community. They were to be taught obedience and docility. They were expected to voice publicly their gratitude and recognition that those who had sheltered them had complete power over their destiny. (p.5)

Children who received charity were expected to conform totally to the requirements of the organizations which helped them. In spite of the stringent moral requirements necessary to receive relief from some charitable organization, home relief was the subject of much criticism because of variable standards and poor and corrupt

local administration, and also because it was widely believed that giving money to poor families would perpetrate idleness, laziness and poverty (Polier, 1941, p.11).

By the mid 1830's, home relief was in decline and it was believed that the almshouse was the best place for dependent children and poor families. By all accounts, conditions in almshouses were deplorable. Geiser (1973) described almshouses as human scrap heaps and in some places, "admission of children under a year of age was tantamount to signing their death certificates." (p.174) However, almshouses served as a way of controlling social deviance by ridding communities of the poor. The result was that "dependent and neglected children were taken from such homes as they had and were confined. . .in places of filth, corruption and degradation. . . . high hopes and promises set forth by proponents of the almshouse system soon proved illusory." (Polier, 1941, p.11)

One exception to the prevailing trend of confining children to almshouses was the work of Charles Loring Brace (1973) who undertook a program of sending homeless New York children to the midwest. During the period 1854-59 a survey showed that several thousand children were given to families who would provide homes for them.

Public reaction against the deplorable and inhumane conditions in which many children were forced to live was never very outspoken. It was not until the 1860's that real efforts were made to move children out of almshouses. However, children went from almshouses to institutions. One type of social control was exchanged for another. The decade of 1874-1884 has been labeled "The Era of Big Buildings" when the belief prevailed that more and better large institutions would be the solution to the problems of dependent children (Van Waters, 1939, p.39). The ideas of control and coercive power continued.

In the terms of Etzioni's theory, 19th century charitable organizations, almshouses and institutions used coercive power in dealing with children and families. Their main purpose was social control and in many almshouses children were denied even the most basic needs of adequate food and shelter. Although many of the officials supervising these organizations were motivated by religious interests, the welfare of poor children as we understand their needs today did not seem to be of primary importance. Etzioni (1961, p.74) noted that in organizations utilizing coercive power, individuals exhibit a high level of alienation, low performance obligations and high subordination. According to this theory, children raised in conditions of degradation could be expected to relate to these organizations in an alienated way.

These examples of charitable organizations, almshouses and institutions represent congruent compliance structures according to Etzioni's theory. The social goals were control of the poor by removing them from the community. Coercive power was used to achieve these goals. Within this context, almshouses and institutions were successful organizations. Societal values of the 19th century supported the goals of these institutions.

CHILD WELFARE DURING THE PROGRESSIVE ERA

Throughout the literature of the 19th century there is little or no mention of the importance of the family as necessary for proper growth and development of the child. This idea was first clearly recognized as a public policy issue in a national forum at the first White House Conference on Children held in 1909. Proceedings from the Conference stated that "home life is the highest and finest product of civilization. It is the great molding force of mind and character. . . Except in unusual circumstances the

home should not be broken up for reasons of poverty." (White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, 1931, p.320)

This Conference served to mobilize the support necessary to enact in 1912 the legislation creating the Federal Children's Bureau, a milestone in the history of child welfare. During this era, limited systems of supervision of children living in foster homes and institutions were developed in some states where progressive child welfare legislation was enacted. (Pers, 1975) For example, in 1911 the first statewide mother's aid legislation was passed in Illinois. This law, and those subsequently passed by other states, "constituted public recognition by the states. . . that it was in the public interest to conserve the child caring functions of mothers." (Abbott, 1938, p.229) This legislation also represented a revolt against the current policy of separating children from their mothers on the grounds of poverty alone and caring for them at greater cost in institutions and foster homes.

The mother's pension movement had successfully challenged the philanthropic division of labor which attributed to public agencies a marginal, negative function, and removed some of the stigma attached to public assistance. But it failed in the opportunity presented to modernize the public welfare system. Equally important, the sponsors of mother's pensions adopted the private charity organization society as the model for a public assistance program. This meant essentially adoption of casework goals aimed at family rehabilitation. (Lubove, 1968, p.111)

There was a gradual recognition by the public that families provided better care for children. This resulted in a movement toward the use of normative means and away from the social control and the use of coercive power predominant in almshouses and large

institutions. Because of these changes, organizations serving children shifted from a congruent compliance structure to a non-congruent one where strategies of coercive power were incompatible with more moral, humanitarian goals. Alms-houses and large institutions experienced gradual decline because of inflexibility. However, the small, charitable and religious organizations which endured and which had been providing relief to poor families and placing children in foster homes, were able to modify their organizational structures to incorporate the new goals of rehabilitation and the new methods of normative power, without giving up the old methods of power and control. This was the beginning of the development of the dual compliance structure of welfare organizations which exists today.

CHILD WELFARE IN THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY

During the early 20th century social work was emerging as a profession concerned about the needs of the poor. The methods of professional social work were based on a normative re-educative philosophy of change which recognized that with proper methods of intervention, poor families might be helped to improve and the destiny of the poor was not fixed and unchanging. The normative re-educative approach "brings direct intervention by change agents into the life of the client." (Chin and Benne, 1976, p. 32) The most important element of this strategy was the emphasis on the involvement of the client in the working out of changes, the idea of mutual involvement. Change was not forced or imposed, but was to be promoted in a benevolent collaborative way. In contrast, coercive approaches to effecting change, along with the use of economic sanctions, emphasized the utilization of power.

The idea that normative power exemplified by professional social work methods should be incorporated into public agencies concerned with provision of financial assistance provoked bitter controversy and philosophical differences. The contradiction and incompatibility apparent between methods being developed in voluntary agencies and the old rigid, punitive public agency methods was clearly stated in a report by the Charity Organization Society.

Administration of relief within the homes of the poor. . . required deep, abiding personal and sympathetic interest (normative power) in sharp contrast to the mechanical, wasteful, unconstructive and harmful procedures of public agencies; the latter, taking account simply of natural needs, fostered that degradation of character manifested in pauperism. (Lubove,1968,p.103)

From 1911 to the early 1930's the conflict between voluntary and public agencies went on unabated. During this time when the profession of social work was emerging, many social workers who were identified with voluntary agencies strongly opposed gradual government intrusion into the province of relief giving. One authority (Porter,1931) during this period noted the apparent incompatibility in the prospect of social treatment amidst the harsh realities of poverty.

For dealing with such (economic) problems, social case work, whether administered under public or private auspices, is a wholly inadequate substitute for broad constructive programs of economic adjustment. (p.51)

Stated another way, normative power is not sufficient to deal with problems of poverty.

Another issue basic to this discussion is changes in the selectivity of clients. Prior to the mother's aid legislation, both public and private agencies had considerable discretion over the clients they served. If, for some reason, the clients were unwilling or uncooperative, they were not dealt with. For voluntary agencies, selectivity functioned to reduce incongruence of compliance structure by insuring that only persons who conformed with the goals of the organization (moral compliance) would be handled by the agency. Laws which entitled mothers to aid under specified circumstances resulted in increasing numbers of women demanding aid who may or may not have needed services, along with pensions. Having to accept all eligible clients for services, some of whom were committed to organizational goals and others who were not, forced an organizational dilemma.

Public organizational tendencies toward noncongruence and ineffectiveness increased as numbers of clients who were openly hostile to the basic societal goals of the organization became eligible for services. As the proportion of alienated clients increased the use of normative power would be less effective.

In discussing child welfare, Lurie (1939) stated that

the traditional child care agency which provides case work services will have little success in overcoming problems of inadequate community resources, family economic security and other demoralizing tendencies in the community.
(p.614)

Here again is the recognition of the inability of normative methods to deal with economic problems of alienated clients.

Public agencies, which provided financial assistance and services to an increasing number of needy clients fell heir to many of the private agencies' unwanted and insoluble cases. Taussig (1939) described the tendency of private agencies to reduce their caseloads.

Custodial cases, old cases, short time cases. . .fell to the lot of the inexperienced and harrassed public agency worker. It is safe to say that a second or third generation of these families can be found in any large agency today. (p.385)

In family agencies, intake was becoming more and more selective in character, with the tendency to select those particular situations where the services of the agency, consisting now largely of skills and resources of professional case workers, could be introduced successfully. The environment of charitable organizations in the 1930's, both public and private, was characterized by continuing conflict and disagreement. Many of these organizations pursued two disparate goals, social control and rehabilitation by the use of two disparate kinds of power, coercive and normative.

Keith-Lucas (1941,p.1) clearly describes the dilemma with respect to the new professional social work ideology in the protective services. He noted that in the early days, social workers saw their responsibility to the community as paramount. However, during the 1920's and 1930's, the client's needs were increasingly important. Thus, a caseworker was confronted with inconsistency and confusion in trying to provide services to neglected and abused children and trying to uphold responsibility to the community.

Thus, there is a convergence of two philosophically antithetical forces--the new ideals and goals of social work and the old repressive and degrading methods by which charitable organizations had historically dealt with the poor.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT OF 1935

The impetus which caused public welfare organizations to shift more toward a normative/moral compliance structure and away from coercive power was the passage in 1935 of the Social Security Act. This Act had two major implications for the welfare of children. First, federal funds were appropriated to assist states in the provision of financial assistance to needy dependent children. Second, funds were appropriated for the development of services for the protection and care of dependent children in predominately rural areas. Services were limited to rural areas because of resistance by the Catholic Church to public intervention in family services. (Gilbert, 1975, p. 122) The Act made no provision for care of dependent children not living with their own families or for protective services to children in cities. Initially, little money was actually made available and many states set grant levels for children very low. (Piven & Cloward, 1971, p. 116)

Even with its limitations, this legislation had the effect of initiating the beginning of a dual compliance structure for public welfare organizations. The Depression had the effect of moving more social workers into public employment, especially to the new public assistance programs, where the idea of services was becoming more and more important for the amelioration of poverty. "Casework and 'services' were implicit in public assistance from the beginning, though not specifically legislated" according to

Gilbert (1975,p.121) who noted that when the Social Security Act was passed the doctrine and practice of social work was fixed in a professional mold antithetical to a modern public administrative style necessary for provision of financial aid.

It was here that the seeds of trouble were sown and the future inability of public welfare organizations to function effectively was impaired by the imposition of incongruent compliance structures.

The shift toward normative/moral compliance structure in public welfare considerably increased organizational stresses and strains. In 1930 one author (Arnold, 1940) discussed several major problems which were developing in the child welfare field as a result of the passage of the Social Security Act. There was a severe shortage of trained staff.

Another problem...is the absorption of state and local (child welfare services) agencies with the administrative problems of public assistance...since the child welfare program is primarily a service program, it will suffer particularly because of this absorption. (p.2)

Even though services for children were gradually being emphasized, the other purpose of public agencies was not completely forgotten, which was regulation and maintenance of social order by controlling through coercive power the behavior of alienated poor persons who deviated from moral values of the times.

In response to widespread dissatisfaction with the AFDC program, particularly as it related to the unmarried mother, suitable home laws were adopted by a number of states in the 1940's and 1950's.

As a result of these laws, a needy child living with persons of "unsuitable moral character" was made ineligible for financial support. Illegitimate pregnancy was usually a factor if suitability of a home was questioned. (Kadushin, 1967, p.187) Restrictive legislation of this type is another example of the use of coercive power in welfare organizations. Social workers attempting to improve lives of poor and dependent children were continually confronted with the contradiction implicit in providing needed services and promoting public morality at the same time. The dependent child was often caught in the middle of this conflict. Pers (1975,p.459) noted that state discretion in the area of "suitable home laws" created a dangerous situation for needy children. Major difficulties resulted from attempting to deal with these social problems within the context of a dual compliance structure.

THE 1962 AND 1967 AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The Social Security Act Amendments of 1962 established as national policy two purposes for public welfare, financial aid and social services. Although Congress had previously authorized services, this was the first time that costs of these services would be reimbursed by the federal government. (McEntire & Haworth, 1967,p.22) In relation to child welfare, the amendments provided additional resources to states for removing children from unsuitable homes and placing them in foster care. Also mandated was extension of child welfare services to all counties in the U. S. by 1975.

The amendments encouraged social work professionalism and "...unambiguously favored services over income supports, especially

for prevention and rehabilitation in AFDC, the most controversial program." (Gilbert,1975,p.127) McEntire & Haworth (1967,p.27) considered the combination of financial assistance and services in basic law a major problem, particularly in regard to administrative organization. Major policy questions not dealt with in the law related to whether services should be separated from eligibility determination, the professional qualifications of social workers, and the inadequacy of the traditional social work model (verbal-insight) for helping public assistance clients.

The profession of social work actively promoted the service components of the amendments. However, foster care services expanded far more than in-home services did. The dual compliance structure became firmly entrenched in public welfare but there was little awareness of this at the service delivery level.

Also, it was during this period that relatively large numbers of children were being moved into foster care.

The 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act intensified the conflict between culture and order goals. On one hand, there was increased funding and more recognition of the importance of social services in improving the quality of family life, a culture goal. In particular, day care was defined as an element of public assistance for the first time in American history. On the other hand, a work incentive plan (WIN) with coercive overtones was enacted which made work training compulsory for able-bodied welfare recipients and AFDC mothers with school age children (Lewis,1974,p.430).

The trend toward movement of more children into the foster care system continued as AFDC eligibility was extended to many children

previously placed in foster homes by court order. This had the effect of making it easier for states to finance and maintain children in foster homes than to develop in-home services.

The contradictions inherent in the goals of the 1967 amendments can be summarized as follows: 1) There was increased funding and recognition of the importance of social services (culture goal). 2) There was a mandatory work or work-training requirement for mothers of school age children unless certain specified conditions were met (order goal). 3) Incentives for states to move children back to their own families from foster care were decreased by the provision of more financial aid for children in foster homes previously not covered by federal regulations and failure to develop in-home services. Thus, the passage of the 1967 amendments highlighted the tension between culture and order goals and contributed to increased stress in public welfare organizations.

TITLE XX

Another Social Security Amendment, Title XX, which became effective in 1975, gives the states more authority in determining the types of services they wish to offer. Provisions are made for the establishment of goals for children in foster care which hopefully will promote better services and lead to more viable alternatives to out of home care. Neil Gilbert (1977) noted that Title XX emphasized the trend toward universality of services, planning, maintenance and care oriented services rather than just reduction of dependency. Thus, the emphasis on services (normative power) continues. However, it is not clear what the total impact of Title XX will be. Mott (1977) noted that ". . .thus far there is little indication that the states are doing anything other than maintaining their existing programs with just a few variations. Foster care,

for instance, is still being emphasized at the expense of services that would keep the family together." (p.66)

CURRENT ORGANIZATIONAL STRAINS IN CHILD WELFARE

This historical analysis of the evolution of child welfare services in general, but foster care in particular, has shown that the use of both normative and coercive compliance structures has become intertwined over the years. Foster care is used primarily where there is a concern about child abuse and neglect. This concern arises from basic normative and cultural goals concerning child rearing and family life. Where a child's life is threatened, a social control goal becomes inevitable. Therefore, a dual compliance structure may be unavoidable where protective services are concerned.

Although coercion is used to remove children from their homes and place them in temporary care, the child welfare agency aims to use normative approaches to improve the natural family's situation so that the child can be returned home. There are many pressures on child welfare workers to use normative approaches. Legal tradition and cultural norms favor the rights of biological parents. If a child is in danger, the child welfare agency bears the burden of proof to show that parental care fell below the minimally acceptable standard. What is minimally acceptable varies from community to community. Although it is clear that the court can remove a child from his home because of neglect or abuse, the legal basis for terminating parental rights is vague in many states. This militates against continued use of coercion against natural parents. Yet the rights of natural parents must be terminated before a child can be adopted by new parents. Attitudes romanticizing the natural

family may be reinforced by professional education which teaches innovative ways of providing in-home services which are not yet incorporated into agency structures.

Several factors make it almost impossible for child welfare workers to reunite some families using normative approaches. A normative approach requires in-home supportive services such as homemakers, day care, twenty-four-hour crisis intervention, emergency temporary shelters, crisis nurseries and other preventive services. Although the 1967 Social Security Amendments stated a policy goal of providing in-home services, these services are expanding very slowly. At present they exist only as pilot projects in those states which have them at all. There are no federal funds specifically earmarked for in-home services to prevent family breakdown. The AFDC foster care funds may be used only for foster care maintenance payments, not for services to enable a child to remain in his own home. Most states have not chosen to use the planning flexibility in Title XX to develop in-home services. Consequently, child welfare organizations have not developed the organizational means to achieve the goal of keeping children in their own homes through a normative compliance structure.

The most widely publicized approach to getting children out of foster care drift is the Permanent Planning Project at Portland State University in Oregon (U.S.DHEW, 1978). This project focuses on assertive, time-limited work with parents of children who have been in foster care more than one year and advocates laws making it easier to terminate parental rights in order to insure permanent homes for children. Although they use rehabilitative in-home services which exist, they emphasize the appropriate use of coercive authority if necessary to prevent a child from drifting in foster care.

The Oregon Project attempts to reconcile some of the strains in the dual compliance structure by emphasizing reasonable but clearly coercive means to attain a permanent home for each child. This makes the compliance structure more congruent with present organizational realities.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Etzioni's theory suggests that organizations which attempt to combine two types of power to accomplish two different kinds of goals at the same time will have difficulty achieving either one. This historical analysis of child welfare, shows that through the nineteenth century, organizations serving children used coercive means and were clear that their goals were the maintenance of social order and the regulation of deviant members of the society. The organizational compliance structures were congruent. The use of coercive methods was condoned by society. Ready children were served primarily in almshouses and institutions. A type of foster care began to develop in a few places under private auspices.

During the early twentieth century there was public policy recognition at the national level and in some states of the importance of the family as necessary for the proper growth and development of the child. Mothers' aid legislation in some states represented a revolt against separating children from mothers on the grounds of poverty alone and caring for them at greater cost in institutions and foster homes.

The developing social work profession encouraged the use of normative, re-educative, in-home services worked out with the active, mutual involvement of the client. These methods were more congruent

with clients who came voluntarily to receive services from private agencies than they were in public agencies serving poor alienated people with inadequate and non-comprehensive service delivery system or income maintenance programs.

The Social Security Act of 1935 and each set of major amendments to the sections dealing with children have stated the public policy goal of enabling children to remain in their own homes. Yet foster care, an out-of-home service, has expanded rapidly while in-home services such as those emphasized in H.R. 7200 remain undeveloped. This article has explained how a dual compliance structure has arisen in child welfare.

Previous amendments to the Social Security Act have not addressed the elements in the policies which lead to more confusion about this dual compliance structure. To the extent that children move into foster care as a result of neglect and abuse, the use of power in child welfare organizations is intrinsic. Parents referred for child welfare services in these circumstances can be expected to relate to the organizational structure in alienated ways because of the nature of their problems. Etzioni suggests that coercion is necessary to engage the alienated client.

The ideal of using a normative compliance structure cannot be attained without in-home services in order to reduce excessive foster care placements. However, the coercive use of foster care has been historically more acceptable as a necessary part of protective services than the use of in-home services.

The national attention currently focused upon the problems in foster care makes it more urgent to find a conceptual framework which holds some potential for clarifying the social policy issues,

explaining the organizational dilemmas, and proposing solutions which will lead to greater effectiveness in the delivery of child welfare services. Etzioni's organizational compliance theory may be a useful starting point for studying specific organizational responses to parental failure and clarifying the existing confusion about organizational goals, means and ends in child welfare.

REFERENCES

Abbott, Grace

1938 The Child and the State, Vol. II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Arnold, Mildred

1940 "What Are Some of the Weaknesses of the Social Security Program at This Time?" Child Welfare 19:1-2.

Brace, Charles Loring

1973 The Dangerous Classes of New York. New York: NASW Classic Series.

Califano, Joseph A., Jr.

1977 Testimony before the Senate Committee on Finance, Subcommittee on Public Assistance. Hearings on the Public Assistance Amendments of 1977, July 12, 1977, 95th Congress, 1st session. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Chin, Robert and Kenneth D. Benne

1976 "General Strategies for Effecting Changes in Human Systems" in W. G. Benne, K.D. Benne, R. Chin, & K. E. Corey (eds.), The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Cumming, Elaine

1968 Systems of Social Regulation. New York: Atherton Press.

Etzioni, Amitai (ed.)

1961 A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

- 1976 A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press.
- Fanshel, David and Eugene B. Shinn
1972 Dollars and Sense in the Foster Care of Children. New York: Child Welfare League of America.
- Filley, Alan C., Robert J. House, and Steven Kerry
1976 Managerial Process and Organizational Behavior, 2nd ed. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman & Co.
- Geiser, Robert L.
1973 The Illusion of Caring. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Gilbert, Charles E.
1975 "Welfare Policy" in Fred I. Greenstein & Nelson W. Polsby (eds.), Policies & Policymaking. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Gilbert, Neil
1977 "The Transformation of Social Services." Social Service Review 51:624-642.
- Jenkins, Shirley
1974 "Child Welfare as a Class System" in Alvin L. Schorr (ed.), Children and Decent People. New York: Basic Books.
- Kadushin, Alfred
1967 Child Welfare Services. New York: Macmillan.
- Keith-Lucas, Alan
1941 "The Case Worker in Protective Complaint Work: Responsibility in the Approach." Child Welfare 20:1-3.
- Kilmann, Ralph
1977 Social Systems Design. New York: North-Holland.
- Lewis, Mary R.
1974 "Day Care under the Social Security Act." Social Service Review 48:428-437.
- Lubove, Roy
1968 The Struggle for Social Security, 1900-1935. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Lurie, Harry L.

- 1939 "Reexamination of Child Welfare Functions in Family & Foster Care Agencies" in Fern Lowery (ed.), Readings in Social Case Work, 1920-1938. New York: Columbia University Press.

McEntire, Davis and Joanne Haworth

- 1967 "The Two Functions of Public Welfare: Income Maintenance & Social Services." Social Work 12:22-31.

Maas, Henry S. and Richard E. Engler

- 1959 Children in Need of Parents. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mott, Paul E.

- 1977 American Families in Transition: Approaches to Family Policy. Washington, D.C.: National Conference on Social Welfare.

Pers, Jessica S.

- 1975 "Somebody Else's Children: A Report on the Foster Care System in California" in Foster Care: Problems and Issues, Part I. Joint Committee Hearings before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Children and Youth and the House Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Select Education December 1, 1975, 94th Congress, 1st Session. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard Cloward

- 1971 Regulating the Poor. New York: Pantheon Books.

Polier, Justine Wise

- 1941 Everyone's Children, Nobody's Child. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Porter, Rose

- 1931 The Organization and Administration of Public Relief Agencies. New York: Family Welfare Association of America.

- Rein, Martin, Thomas E. Nutt, and Heather Weiss
 1974 "Foster Family Care: Myth and Reality" in Alvin L. Schorr (ed.), *Children & Decent People*. New York: Basic Books.
- Taussig, Frances
 1939 "The Continuing Concern of Family Agencies with Economic Need" in Fern Lowery (ed.), *Readings in Social Case Work, 1920-1938*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Trattner, Walter
 1974 *From Poor Law to Welfare State*. New York: Free Press.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, & Welfare, Office of Human Development Services
 1978 *Overcoming Barriers to Planning for Children in Foster Care*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Van Waters, Miriam
 1939 "Philosophical Trends in Modern Social Work" in Fern Lowery (ed.), *Readings in Social Case Work, 1920-1938*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- White House Conference on Child Health and Protection
 1931 *White House Conference, 1930, Addresses and Abstracts of Committee Reports*. New York: Century Co.