



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN**
UNIVERSITY

The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

Volume 20
Issue 2 June

Article 8

May 1993

Characteristics of Social Welfare Stasis and Change: A Comparison of the Characteristics of Two Child Welfare Agencies in the 1920s

Eve P. Smith
University of Windsor

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



Part of the Public Administration Commons, Social Welfare Commons, and the Social Work Commons

Recommended Citation

Smith, Eve P. (1993) "Characteristics of Social Welfare Stasis and Change: A Comparison of the Characteristics of Two Child Welfare Agencies in the 1920s," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 20 : Iss. 2 , Article 8.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol20/iss2/8>

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



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN**
UNIVERSITY

Characteristics of Social Welfare Stasis and Change: A Comparison of the Characteristics of Two Child Welfare Agencies in the 1920s

Eve P. Smith
University of Windsor

This article describes and compares two child welfare agencies of the 1920's with regard to qualities that influenced or inhibited their ability to change. While one agency gave up its institution in favor of foster home care and mother's pensions; the other continued to provide only institutional care. Four characteristics may account for the difference. They are the organizations' networks; amount of "sunk costs" associated with change; ideologies and interests of organization leadership and the agencies' "boundary spanning" activities. If further studies confirm these, then we may encourage organizational changes so that contemporary agencies may meet emerging client needs.

It is important to identify characteristics that promote or hinder change because social welfare agencies need the capacity to implement new programs. In today's environment, agencies that can keep up with the emerging needs of client populations or new development of knowledge and skills will be better able to meet the needs of the populations they serve. A chance investigation of the archives of two New York Child Welfare Agencies, one that gave up a congregate institution in favor of the more progressive family and small group care in 1926, and another that continued to provide institutional care into the 1960's, revealed contrasting patterns of attributes. These two agencies began in the same city around the same period in the 19th Century, and served a similar population of children. They differed insofar as the character of their networks; the amount of resources they would lose if they changed; the ideologies and interests of their leadership and their organizational "boundary-spanning" activities. Both agencies existed in

a policy environment that provided mixed messages regarding the appropriateness of institutional care, but each responded differently to those messages.

This article consists of a brief description of the child welfare policy environment of the 1920's and a description of each agency. It then presents a conceptual explanation of why one agency gave up its institution in favor of family care while the other continued to maintain its "orphanage." Finally, there is a discussion of the implications of this theory for the current social welfare system.

Policy Messages: Foster Care Vs. Institutionalization

The controversy regarding whether dependent children should be placed in institutions or with families began in the last third of the nineteenth century, but was supposed to have been settled in favor of families at the first White House Conference on Dependent Children in 1909. Again in 1919, the issue was discussed and the Washington and Regional Conferences on Child Welfare "emphatic[ly]" endorsed the statement, "The carefully selected foster home is for the normal child the best substitute for the natural home." (Hart, 1919, pp. 239-241)

In reality, however, there was a "wide diversity of opinion." While many professionals and family advocates were endorsing foster family care and denouncing institutions, the number of institutions and institutional inmates was increasing. In 1910, a U.S. Census Bureau study reported that 110,000 children lived in 1,151 institutions (*Benevolent Institutions*, pp. 26-27).¹ By 1923, the number of institutions had increased to 1,558 and the number of child inmates to 142,971. (U.S. Census Bureau, 1927, p. 14) Even the policy makers and professionals were issuing mixed messages, however. While they repeatedly called for a halt to placing normal children in orphanages, their professional organizations supported their improvement and therefore, their continuation. Out of concern for institutionalized children, the Children's Bureau published standards for institutional operation. After 1923, the Child Welfare League of America, which had previously excluded institutions from membership, accepted those that met professional standards.

The New York Federation of Institutions Caring for Protestants urged the professionalization of institutional care and services. Government and philanthropists supported the status quo by paying for institutional care and by limiting funding for alternatives. Enough poor parents were willing to place their children in institutions and, in many cases, pay the board bills.

Concurrent with mixed policy and clear funding messages, advocates' opposition to the institutionalization of normal children was documented in professional journals and the popular press; and in the development of special organizations. Henry Dwight Chapin, M.D., for example, wrote in *Survey* magazine in 1918 ("Family vs. Institution," p. 488) that the United States was an "institution ridden" country, and cited experts who substantiated his position that families were superior: Professor Boas of the Jewish Bureau of Social Research, who found that "children in boarding homes showed a much better physical development than children in institutions. . . ." and prison warden Mott Osbornes who said that "an undue proportion of his prison wards had their early training in institutions." In *Review of Reviews*, (1929) a popular periodical, Chapin said that "The obsession of certain rich men to build and endow orphan asylums, to perpetuate their names, should not be encouraged. . . ." The *Literary Digest* (Dec. 17, 1921, 29-30) described a highly successful "experiment" by the board of trustees of Hancock County, Ohio, in which children were boarded out rather than institutionalized. Sophie Irene Loeb, a reporter, not only produced many anti-institutionalization articles but also organized the Child Welfare Committee of America, Inc., an organization of prominent Americans, and held two conferences (1925 and 1928) at which professionals and politicians voiced their opposition to institutionalization and preference for maintaining children in families, preferably their own.

The Case Studies

The Society for the Relief of Destitute Children of Seamen and the Orphan Asylum Society of Brooklyn (the two case study organizations used in this article) were founded in the same period and had many similarities. Despite their resemblance,

however, their courses diverged greatly in the 1920's. Following are descriptions of the history, organization and attributes of each agency.

Case 1: Society for the Relief of Destitute Children of Seamen

The Society for the Relief of Destitute Children of Seamen was initiated by a group of "ladies" in 1846 to relieve "the destitute condition of the families of our Seamen." In explaining why they chose to care for seamen's children, the ladies said:

No class is proverbially more improvident than sailors, often absent upon long voyages, careless in expenditures of their money, particularly exposed to hardships and danger, yet frequently manifesting a nobleness of disposition and self-sacrificing character; so that we are more ready to feel an interest and sympathy for their neglected and often deserted offspring. . . ." (Manual, 1966)

They established the "home" in Staten Island because it was "removed from the temptation and expense incident to a city residence," was "convenient of access," and possessed "salubrity of air." During the first year, the Society cared for 24 children. In 1852, they built a congregate institution that would eventually house approximately 100 children, whom they kept until they were either returned to their parents, adopted, indentured or sent West at about age 12. From early in their history, the ladies expressed a preference for family care but believed it impossible to implement. Institutional care, they believed, was a "necessary evil."

In 1914, the orphanage housed 91 children who were kept until age 13, if they were boys, and 14 if they were girls. The "Board of Women" had grown to 29, including five officers, and there was also a Board of Counselors, consisting of "seven male members," whose duty it was to advise the managers "in reference to the business transactions of the Society." (*Sixty-eighth Annual report*, pp. 30-31) Funding came from charitable contributions, investments, collections from steamship passengers,² and payments by parents and guardians, but not from public funds. The board fee for each child was one dollar per week, to be paid monthly, in advance, and parents were "permitted

to see their children on the last Thursday of each month,"³ when they were "required to pay their dues." If they did not pay for three successive months, however, the institution would make

" . . . a strict inquiry . . . into the circumstances of the case. If found delinquent when able to pay, the child or children (would) be returned or kept in the Home at the discretion of the Board of Managers." (*Sixty-eighth Annual report*, p. 29)

The Annual Report of 1925, when the number of children in the Home had dropped from approximately 100 to about 50, is devoted to an explanation of the Board of Managers' action to close their congregate institution. In part, it reads:

First there was the inadequacy of our building as conditions changed the old building became a problem. Modern sanitation, fire regulations, the increasing need of constant and safe supervision of the children have involved us in an ever-growing anxiety and expense . . .

In the second place, there was the inadequacy of the average person who applied for the positions offered in our building, on the lines we were following, to meet the needs of the child, in the light of the rapidly developing science of child-welfare . . .

We seriously considered, in conference with an architect, the remodeling of our solidly constructed old building; with discouraging results. We tried varying types of workers who would consider the work in the old building, also with discouraging results . . .

A crisis came in the spring. Large and expensive repairs became essential if we were to continue in the old building, and a general upheaval in our staff of workers forced us to a decision.

Before making the decision to give up their institution, the Board consulted with recognized experts in the field, including Dr. Hastings Hart, of the Russell Sage Foundation, Mr. H. W. Hopkirk of the Child Welfare League of America, Mrs. Martha Falconer of the Federation of Institutions Caring for Protestants, and Mr. Henry Wright, a consultant in institutional planning. They first decided to forsake the old congregate institution for a decentralized cottage plan, then modified that plan, and built one cottage for 12. The remaining children were placed

in boarding homes or their own mothers were given private mother's pensions and other support.

Miss Mary Townsend Marsh shepherded this change. She had been a member of the Board since 1878 and had devoted much of her life to the Society. She was a progressive and committed leader. A memorial to her 51 years of Board membership recorded on October 1, 1930 notes that:

... When in 1922 our old methods were proved inadequate to meet the needs of the present time, she studied the system adopted by other homes and great as was her love for the past and its traditions, she carried out with courage and conviction a broad minded policy, which under her leadership and guidance, has brought our society (or work) to a position where it can meet the needs and problems of the present day.

The Board hired a "trained family case worker," Miss Annie E. McCord, a graduate of Wellsley College, class of 1901, and the New York School of Philanthropy in 1907. Her job was to place the children, some permanently and others temporarily, while the cottage was being built. She was also to "conduct all business connected with applications, interviews with parents and etc." (Board Minutes, Oct. 1930, 7). Her own view of her role, however, was more extensive. To her Wellsley College Class in 1926 she wrote:

While my work was ostensibly to place the children, fundamentally it has meant an organization piece of work, i.e., changing an old type institutional society into a modern case working group...

The Board opened itself to further changes. It decided that its one *fixed* plan for the future concerned itself with policy development rather than physical housing. At the Annual Meeting, December 4, 1925, Laura Effingham Pritchard, Recording Secretary said:

(Our policy)... is to give individual care to the individual child and to keep him or her under our protection, greater or less as the case may demand, throughout the years of growing up and of beginning life as a wage-earner. To do this properly we must be prepared to take charge of the child and place him in the most

suitable home, using our organization and funds to maintain him; perhaps keeping him under our own roof, perhaps putting him in another institution, or boarding him out with foster parents; or, again, by means of mothers' aid, making it possible for him to remain with his own family." (*Annual Report, 1925*, pp. 5-6)

The Board also expressed its intent to dispense with out-moded practices while retaining what was good and useful:

The masonry may go, without regret, as we might toss out our grandmother's crinolines, but the traditions of the love and service that have built it up must be always, please God, preserved. (*Annual Report, 1925*, pp. 7-8)

The agency made continuing progress during the 1920's. Under Annie McCord they conducted needs assessments in order to plan for the future, provided support services to parents, hired an agency psychiatrist to work with the 51 children in their care, and supported children and their mothers in their own homes.

Through Miss McCord the agency had a great deal of contact with professionals and professional social work organizations. Not only did she attend monthly meetings of the Federation of Agencies Caring for Protestants, she also annually attended the Eastern Regional conference of the Child Welfare League of America, and the conferences of Sophie Irene Loeb's Child Welfare Committee. She wrote reports that circulated beyond the Society, and became known for her exceptional work, attracting many visitors. Her reports were used as teaching material at the New York School for Social Work; and were distributed by the Child Welfare League at the Pennsylvania Institute on Child Welfare. (McCord, 1926)

During the period of change, the Board was secure enough in their funding to forgo restricted gifts that might require them to implement policies of which they disapproved. The philanthropist, Edwin Gould, withdrew a tentative offer to build the Society a cottage because the Board insisted that the cottage should accommodate only 12 rather than 25 children, as Gould advocated. Gould openly disagreed with the Society's new program of foster care and private mother's pensions. In a letter to the Board, he wrote, "A good many changes have

taken place and are taking place in the conduct of the Home which I disapprove." In another, letter he wrote, "I am curious to know the result of your placing children out in homes. My idea is that they are not under as good supervision as they would be in an institutional home for children . . ." (Letters to Mrs. Gostenhofer, 1925–1930). The Board responded that "The policy of the Home has always been directed by the Board of Managers . . ." Gould continued to provide some minor support, in the form of magazine subscriptions, furnishings for the Cottage and books for the Cottage library.

In summary, the Board of Managers of the Society for the Relief of Destitute Children of Seamen was dissatisfied with institutionalization of children and utilized plant and staff difficulties as an opportunity for change. They were able to implement new practices because they were exposed to new concepts through consultation with experts and attendance at professional conferences. They gave up a large physical plant because it was outmoded and would be difficult to renovate and to staff. The values of their progressive leadership were consistent with the new forms of care. They hired professionals. In short, they were ready and willing to change, and when they were presented with the opportunity, they acted.

Case 2: The Orphan Asylum Society of Brooklyn

The Orphan Asylum Society of Brooklyn (OAS) was founded in response to a cholera epidemic during which a large number of children were orphaned. According to its Annual Report of 1845,

These destitute and needy children in their forlorn state excited the sympathy of some good people, who, after consultation proceeded to act in the matter by organizing on the 17th of May, 1833, "The Orphan Asylum Society of the City of Brooklyn . . .

Forty prominent women, five of them officers, were elected to the Board of Managers, and seven men to the Board of Advisors,⁴ and, "in this new home the little children were given a haven." (OAS, 1933, 9) Support for the institution came in part from the Protestant churches of Brooklyn, each of which could

name a representative to serve on the large board of directors. In 1872, the OAS built and occupied a large orphanage, the Beecher Home, which, by 1900 housed 325 "orphans." According to the Annual Report of 1900, in the twelve previous months 103 children were admitted and 128 discharged, "... some taken by the parent because of age limit, or possible the better condition of the parent to make a home for its own. Others adopted, or indentured. . . ."

Early reports showed interest in the children's futures: three boys, "showing themselves worthy", were being prepared for college. The Board maintained contact with children who were adopted or indentured when possible. In 1900, for example, 24 letters to families who had taken the children at about age 12 brought 21 satisfactory, and 3 unsatisfactory replies. From four families who had adopted the children the Board received

... letters so full of love and devotion... that our hearts swell with deepest gratitude to the good Father who has so richly supplied the mother love to these motherless ones."

By 1905, the Annual Report referred to the changes in the institution, and the Directors' philosophy of asylum care:

...the age demands that the child receive the best education possible, mentally, physically, spiritually. The student of philanthropic work today has only to glance at the nature and methods... To this child charity extends the gift of High School and College, if he had the quality of mind to receive such training. . . .

The 1912 Annual Report described a former child in the home who had "entered a mercantile house and step by step with dauntless courage mounted the ladder which leads to success" and who, that year, went down with the Titanic. That the institution had and might again "entertain angels unawares" was recalled, as the managers saw their responsibility as part of their Christian mission.

By the 1920's, "Beecher Home" tried to provide a "home-like" life for their children. Board minutes for the period revealed that parental visiting days were increased from once per month to twice; (January 1925) but children could go out

with their parents only with the approval of the superintendent. (May 1926). The children also went to summer camp. One child who had been sent West wrote back that she was dissatisfied, and was recalled. (June 1921) Further, teachers from the Public Schools that the children attended were entertained at the "Home" and they agreed that the "environment of the children . . . is much better than in many homes." (March 1927) In 1921, 1923 and 1924, the question of corporal punishment was discussed at Board meetings. Two staff members who used this method of discipline were dismissed.

Approximately half of the children in the Home were New York City public charges. However, in 1926, because of the deteriorating condition of the physical plant, the number of publically supported children was considerably reduced. The board minutes of June 2, 1926 state that the OAS had not received any committed children for nine months and, in addition, that the city had threatened to close the Home because it was in such poor condition. The situation was rectified with extensive repairs to the physical plant. The minutes of October 6, 1926, reported that:

A great deal has been done during the summer to the building and over \$50,000 spent and the rest of the building is now being put into condition that will pass inspection and we hope children will be sent us again.

Politics entered into the situation. The January 5, 1927 Board minutes stated that:

An inspector from the Department of Public Welfare was here just before Christmas and found that we had accomplished wonders. Mrs. Page asked her why we had received so few committed children and she said we should be more friendly with the Courts and the Department of Public Welfare. To have a good rating we will have to do more for the Federation, and interest Mr. Coler⁵ in this Home. A motion was made . . . that Mrs. Houghton be appointed to do this work . . . At present we only have 44 committed children.

On February 16th the Managers have asked the Federation to be their guests at luncheon at the Home . . . and we are to ask Mrs. Page to tell about our work. Mrs. Houghton made a motion seconded by Mrs. Church that we invite Mr. Coler here

for luncheon also and ask him to make an address. If he could not be present ask if he would send someone from his organization.

At the beginning of March, the Federation of Agencies Caring for Protestants asked if the OAS Board would consider taking some publically supported children from another institution that was closing. The children were welcomed. (March 1927)

The OAS's only relationship with an outside professional social work organization during this period was with the Federation, which negotiated with the City on behalf of institutions for increased board rates. As a result of Federation activity, the OAS received several increases. By 1925, the Board, seeing the benefits of membership, joined the Federation. The institution was also finally persuaded to use the Federation's professional social worker for family investigations, an arrangement which they had previously eschewed. (When the arrangement had been suggested earlier, "it was decided that no stranger could possibly take the personal interest taken by Mrs. Farnham."⁶ Fourteen months later, their opinion had changed.)

In summary, the OAS Board approved of institutional care and believed that their children had greater advantages than they would have had with their own parents. They needed public funds to operate their large, outmoded physical plant. Since they had invested a great deal in their building, and since it was still usable, they were not ready to demolish it. Their constituency consisted of churches, (naturally conservative) which contributed to the "Home's" maintenance, and whose members liked to see a concrete manifestation of their largess. They preferred familiar staff to professionals, and in the 1920's, continued to hire non-professionals. Their only contacts with social work and child welfare professionals were through the Federation of Institutions Caring for Protestants; and they were also influenced by Edwin Gould, the philanthropist. Both accepted institutions as appropriate placements for normal children.

Why the "Seamen's Children" Changed While the
"Orphan Asylum Society" Continued as Before

Both of these agencies operated in similar environments of laws, political sentiments, possibilities for funding and in

a policy environment that supported both institutionalization and family care. However, each agencies' responses to the environment were very different. Four attributes may account for those differences. These are: (1) the organizations' networks; (2) the amount of "sunk costs" associated with the possibility of change; (3) the ideologies and interests of organization leadership; and (4) their "boundary spanning" activities. These are discussed below.

First, according to Hasenfeld, (p. 221) In order to insure its legitimation and flow of enough resources to maintain itself and its work, a human service organization establishes a niche, or place for itself in its environment. To guarantee its continuation, it is important for organizations to have "stable, steady and predictable" relations with those who provide the bulk of its resources. If change is likely to upset these relationships and, therefore, agency legitimation and continued source of funding, then organizations are reluctant to change.

The situation of the Society for the Children of Destitute Seamen and the OAS differed significantly. While the OAS was reliant on other organizations for legitimation and money, the Society for the Children of Destitute Seamen was more independent, having numerous and varied sources of funds. The OAS was begun by, and had a continuing relationship with the Brooklyn Protestant Churches, which continued to provide legitimation, funding and board members. Also, approximately half of the "child inmates" of the asylum at any time were public charges, and the agency, therefore, received a sizable amount of government funding from the New York City Department of Public Charities. Both the churches and the City supported the continuation of the institution. For the churches and their members, the OAS "Home" provided tangible evidence of their "largess". If the society utilized mechanisms such as boarding homes or payments to parents, keeping families together, the children and the benefactors' largess would be invisible. Also, since government was not funding boarding home care or private mother's pensions, change to those modes of care would certainly have meant a reduction in available funds. In contrast, the Society for the Destitute Children of Seamen accepted no public charges and received no public funding, but instead relied on such sources as nominal parent fees, small contributions,

memberships, income from investment, and contributions from passengers of pleasure liners. Income from these latter contributors accounted for one-fourth of the Society's budget in some years, and came without "strings." Steamship passengers had no long-lasting interest in the organization. The network in which the Society for the Destitute Children of Seamen operated, therefore, consisted of fewer controlling elements that might inhibit change.

The second attribute is the difference in the amount of "sunk costs" that each agency would have to assume in order to effect a change. "Sunk costs" are investments of resources that cannot be recovered or converted to other purposes when an organization changes its program. (Hasenfeld, p. 223). These may include not only concrete capital investments, like buildings, but staff and other non-tangible investments. In his book, *Decarceration*, Scull reproduces an 1870 reference to the difficulty in closing institutions for the insane:

The amount of capital sunk in the costly palaces of the insane is becoming a growing impediment. So much money sunk creates a conservatism in their builders. . . which resists a change (Hasenfeld, p. 223, quoting Scull, p. 125)

It seems easier to consider change when facilities have so deteriorated that they are worth little, or cannot be used, or must be torn down. Hasenfeld, Scull, and Segal and Aviram, all note that the closing of mental hospitals began with those facilities that were outmoded and had deteriorated to a point that renovation was either impossible or would incur tremendous cost. Outmoded facilities that were difficult to repair represented lower sunk costs than those in good repair. Hasenfeld concludes that:

. . . the greater the amount of sunk costs associated with programs and services, the greater the incentive to maintain stability. In contrast, when resources can be readily shifted from one purpose to another, the greater an organization's openness to innovation and change (p. 223).

Similarly, when the Society for the Children of Destitute Seamen decided to change their modes of service, their institution, according to the experts consulted at the time, could

not be revitalized to meet the need. Similarly, the Society had been having staff problems, as they had had a quick turnover in the position of superintendent, and other staff members had to be discharged for inappropriate behavior. As a result, they despaired of finding adequate caretakers for the institution. Because the organization was not so financially dependent on other organizations, it could quickly divert its resources from an old method of care to a new, innovative format.

By contrast, although the OAS had to make significant renovations to their large institution to meet government standards, they were assured that if they renovated, they would receive enough public money to cover these expenses. Also, the Board of Managers believed that their Superintendent and other staff were more than adequate to their tasks. Thus, to tear down an institution that had once housed more than 300 children and was still renovatable, and to hire or retrain a staff to do a new type of work would mean that the Society would incur large sunk costs. The possibility of doing so was never considered.

The third explanation of effect has to do with the organizational leadership's ideologies and interests. Ideology has long been recognized as pivotal in shaping the types of services an agency provides and the way that they are delivered. (Hasenfeld, p. 224) Mohr stated that the capacity that an agency has to innovate depends in part on its leadership's motivation to do so. Whether or not there is motivation is dependent on the values of the officers and management. (pp. 111–126; as referenced by Hasenfeld, p. 231)

Their general satisfaction with the institutionalization of destitute children essentially created no motivation to change, or to overcome obstacles to change on the part of the Board of the OAS. By contrast, the importance of the family environment to a child's development was a long-standing interest of the Board of the Society for the Destitute Children of Seamen, which originally created an institution because they thought the provision of home care was impossible. In addition, their view that the children of Seamen were an especially worthy group encouraged the provision of the best possible care for the children. Their openness to the pronouncements of the experts

regarding the significance of home life only confirmed their prior belief that family care was to be preferred.

Finally, according to Daft and Becker, leaders who are concerned with quality services and maintaining high standards of performance are also concerned with "importing new ideas and more innovative programs. (Hasenfeld, p. 232). Corwin (1972) maintains that the ability of an organization to overcome obstacles to change depends on "the effectiveness of its inter-organizational relations, specifically its "boundary spanning" activities. These activities, which involve contact with other organizations mean that the agency is privy to, and can process information about prior innovation, methods for change, and how to negotiate and overcome potential problems and barriers. The language of systems theory also applies here. An agency with penetrable boundaries is known to be apt to change because it is exposed to, and is capable of, assimilating new knowledge, new ideas, and new methods of overcoming obstacles to its goals. An agency with less permeable boundaries is less likely to be exposed to new ideas and methods, and is therefore less likely to want or to attempt change.

When it became apparent to the Board of The Society for the Children of Destitute Seamen that they could not continue as they had in the past, Miss Marsh arranged for consultation with recognized experts in the field. In part, the Society's decisions were made on the basis of these collective consultations. Further, when it was time to hire a person who would operationalize their new policies, they hired a professional.

Annie McCord functioned as a continuing change agent for the organization, according to Hasenfeld, (p. 232) increasing its "motivation to innovate by bringing in information about new opportunities, and ideas," and helping to overcome obstacles by "facilitating relations with the environment."

The Implication of Findings for the Current Child Welfare System

Given the limitation that the above patterns were derived from only two case studies in a mixed policy environment, further tests utilizing a greater number of agencies in differing

policy circumstances would be in order. If these tests confirm the original theories, then policy makers should consider the following steps that would maximize social agency responsiveness to changing needs.:

(1) In accordance with stated goals, government bodies can discontinue or reduce funding for programs that prove to be of limited use, and offer financial incentives for programs that prove functional. In addition, funding should be tied to the ability to modify practices on a timely basis and should cover "sunk costs". These costs include but should not be limited to staff retraining, start-up costs for new programs, and compensation for nonrecoupable investments.

(2) An effort should be made to include in board, administrative and program leadership, persons who are associated with progressive policy development and practice, or who have been successfully associated with organizational innovation and change. The Sophie Irene Loeb, Mary Townsend Marsh and the Annie E. McCords of today should be encouraged, because it appears that their perspective and commitment will make a difference.

(3) Persons involved at all levels; government policy-makers, agency board members, administrators and staff persons should be encouraged or required to take part in such boundary-spanning activities as attendance at conferences and informational meetings, visits to exemplary agencies and the reading of relevant professional journals.

(4) Constituencies should be kept informed about changing demographics and current needs. If, then, change is required, they will understand and be more likely to support than impede it.

Current child welfare problems are now enormous, and societal disorganization and economic downturns are leading to changing needs. A greater number of new and specialized services will have to be created to respond to the requirements of new client constituencies. If Social welfare agencies can adapt quickly, current needs will be more likely to be met.

References

- Chapin, Henry Dwight (1926, January 15). Family vs. institution. *The Survey*, LV, 485-488.

- Chapin, Henry Dwight (1929, July). Homes or institutions? *Review of Reviews*. Reprinted by the Child Welfare Committee of America, Inc. New York.
- Child Welfare Committee of America, Inc. (1928). *Resolutions Unanimously Adopted by the Child Welfare Conference New York, February 20th to 22nd, 1928*, Publication No. 59. New York: Child Welfare Committee of America, Inc.
- Child Welfare League of America (1923). Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Board of the October 11 and 12. Unpublished microfilm. Available from Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.
- Corwin, R. (1972). Strategies for organizational innovation: an empirical comparison." *American Sociological Review*. 37, 441-54.
- Daft, R., and Becker, S. (1978). *Innovation in organizations*. New York: Elsevier.
- Gould, Edwin. (1925-1930). Letters to Mrs. Gostenhofer, Corresponding Secretary, Society for the Relief of Destitute Children of Seamen. Unpublished letters.
- Hart, Dr. Hastings H. (1919). Care of dependent children: The conclusions of the White House Conference, ten years after. U.S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau, *Standards of Child Welfare, A Report of the Children's Bureau Conferences, May and June, 1919*. (Bureau Publication No. 60). Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Hasenfeld, Yeheskel. (1983). *Human Service Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Homes better than orphan asylums. (1921, December 17). *Public Opinion in Literary Digest*, New York.
- Loeb, Sophie Irene. (1925, June 6). Orphan asylums seen as passing. *New York Evening World*. Reprinted by the Child Welfare Committee of America, Inc.: New York. Publication No. 24.
- McCord, Annie E. (1926, June 30). Executive secretary's report to the Board of Managers, Society for the Relief of Destitute Children of Seamen. Unpublished report.
- Mohr, P. (1969). Determinants of innovation in organizations," *American Political Science Review*. 63. 111-126.
- Orphan Asylum of the City of Brooklyn. (1845). *Constitution and by-laws of the Orphan Asylum Society of the City of Brooklyn. Together with the annual report for the past year, the treasurer's account current, and a list of officers, subscribers, etc.* Available from Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.
- Orphan Asylum Society of the City of Brooklyn. (1933). *100th anniversary condensed history, 1833 to 1933*. Available from Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.
- Orphan Asylum of the City of Brooklyn. *The sixty-seventh annual report of the Orphan Asylum Society of the City of Brooklyn*. (1900). Available from Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.
- Orphan Asylum of the City of Brooklyn. *The seventy-second annual report of the Orphan Asylum Society of the City of Brooklyn*. (1905). Available from Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.

- Orphan Asylum of the City of Brooklyn. *The seventy-ninth annual report of the Orphan Asylum Society of the City of Brooklyn*. (1912). Available from Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.
- Orphan Asylum of the City of Brooklyn. (1921–1927). *Orphan Asylum Society of Brooklyn, Minutes of the Board of Managers*, June 1, 1921; January 21, 1925; May 5, 1926; October 6, 1926; January 25, 1927; March 7, 1927. Unpublished. Available from Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.
- Segal, S.P. and Aviram, U. (1978). *The mentally ill in community-based sheltered Care*. New York: Wiley.
- Society for Seamen's Children. (1966). *Manual of policies, practices and procedures*. Unpublished.
- Society for the Relief of Destitute Children of Seamen. (1914). *Sixty-eighth annual report*.
- Society for the Relief of Destitute Children of Seamen. (1925). *Annual report*.
- Society for the Relief of Destitute Children of Seamen. (1930, October 1). *Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Managers*. Unpublished.
- Scull, At.T. *Decarceration*. (1977). Englewood Cliffs, NY.: Prentice Hall.
- United States Bureau of the Census. (1913). *Benevolent institutions, 1910*. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- United States Bureau of the Census. (1927). *Children under institutional care 1923*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau. (1927). *Handbook for the use of boards of directors, superintendents, and staffs of institutions for dependent children*. (Bureau Publication No. 170). Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Wyle, Armand, (1928). *Broken orphanages*. (publication No. 62). New York: Child Welfare Committee of America, Inc.

Notes

1. This number represented growth: there were 76 more institutions in 1910 than there had been in 1904.
2. The steamship collections provided about one-quarter of the budget, but were severely reduced during World War 1. (Sixty-eighth Annual report, 9).
3. According to the Sixty-eighth Annual Report, persons who were not parents were invited to visit every day except Saturday and Sunday. [frontispiece].
4. The women ran the institution, and the men took care of such business chores as investment of money.
5. Commissioner of Public Welfare.
6. The OAS's staff person assigned to investigations. Mrs. Farnham had no professional training.