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This issue concludes the first year of publication of the Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare. As we have noted previously in Volume I No. 2, the process of creating a new Journal is an adventure. We concluded this first year with 80% of our subscription goal realized. The response has been most encouraging.

We anticipate that Volume II No. 1 will be in press in the middle of September. The new volume marks the beginning of a new subscription year and we have every reason to hope that we will realize if not exceed our subscription goal.

In the current issue we included a cumulative index of all the articles published in Volume I.

The articles published here represent a number of issues in social welfare. Kutzik deals with ethnicity and correction. He argues that a major deterrent to rehabilitation in corrections may be the ethnic difference between inmates and correctional personnel. A major assumption which requires further discussion is whether rehabilitation can occur in a prison regardless of the ethnic composition of the correctional personnel. We trust that some of our colleagues will want to deal with the relationship of incarceration, rehabilitation and social welfare policy and practice. We welcome your contributions.

Hiltz deals with the problem of evaluative research in a demonstration program of service. The factors delineated in this case study highlight some of the core issues involved in evaluative research in human services. The relationship between evaluative research and social planning and implementation is an area that we would be interested in exploring with our colleagues.

The papers by Elifson et al. and Silberman deal with studies of the responses to the Welfare system by recipients and Welfare Directors. Elifson et al. conclude from their study that the "clients experiences with welfare played no apparent role in coloring their evaluation of the system...... and suggests that such experience as ease of payment, frequency of caseworker contact and perceived caseworker interest are unimportant." Silberman's study indicates the Welfare Directors in evaluating the effectiveness of their agencies tend to prefer "rehabilitative services" to "relief services" particularly if the director has an M.S.W. The implications of the "rehabilitative" thrust in Welfare deserves much attention.

Brown's paper is an interesting example of how a study of one activity (namely staff development) provides opportunities to test other theories of organization. One suspects that there are frequent opportunities for "serendipitous" gains in research if one remains open to the possibilities.
Hollister and Hudson examine interorganizational conflict between police youth bureaus and Juvenile Courts utilizing the conceptual model of varying degrees of technological determinateness, ideological differences and varying resource levels. How can social workers deal with the issues analyzed in this paper to minimize the harm done to "clients" of this system? What alternatives are there is a question that needs to be given considerably more attention.

Johnsosn's analysis of the elective courses taken by students at a midwestern university undergraduate social welfare sequence reveal that they tend to cluster around the social and behavior sciences with human behavior, social problems and the nature of society being emphasized. The absence of clusters in economics and political sciences raises questions concerning what kind of practice are these students preparing themselves. Do "rehabilitative" and "treatment" orientation predominate at the expense of knowledge and skill in effecting changes in institutions and interorganizational relations. There appears to be an implicit leaning toward the rehabilitative treatment orientation. How do we achieve a balance between the two orientations? Should undergraduate programs assume responsibility for more clearly defining this?

Despite all that has been written about restructuring human service organizations and the creation of new organization Kastilic proposes "that contemporary organizations may not be 'new' organizations in terms of age alone." Are we, as Dennis Wrong remarked in reviewing a book,"putting old wine in new bottles" or are we "putting new wine in new bottles." What are the implications for social welfare if it is "old wine in new bottles?" These are some of the issues that require further consideration.

Galper's article posits a crucial question for the social work profession. Given the current social context of political corruption, inflation, gross inequalitiest, what should be the goals of the profession and how should we go about achieving them? Whatever your response to what Galper suggests, the issue he raises is one that the profession can ill afford to ignore.

The articles we publish in this Journal raise almost as many issues as they seem to answer. In the spirit of intellectual inquiry we invite our readers to share their thinking with us. We also ask that you help us to increase our subscription list so that we may increase the number of issues we can publish in a volume from four to five.

To all of the people who have played important roles in helping make this first year of publishing a success, we express our heart felt thanks.

Norman N. Goroff
Publisher and Managing Editor
A SERENDIPITOUS RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THEORY MODIFICATION AND A STUDY OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Patricia A. Brown, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

There are instances in which the guiding impetus to a study is a very practical problem, the answers to which are expected to have immediate applicability. Although the practical purpose is accomplished, at the study's end comes the recognition that perhaps the most important contribution of the investigation had been the uncovering of theoretical implications.

The above serendipitous process is applicable to the following report of a limited study of staff development in a new youth serving agency. The study is presented in detail so that the main elements associated with the validation and elaboration of a conceptualization of organizational behavior can be traced.

Study Background

The need for staff development in such a time-honored endeavor within the helping professions, that it rarely is explicated in program objectives. Although not stated, most administrators of new agencies show a recognition of the need to develop their staff by either instituting one-to-one supervisory sessions, peer group sessions under the direction of supervisory staff, or a combination of the two. The goal of such efforts and the objectives to which it gives rise can be specified. The goal is that staff development become one of the steps leading to the achievement of service objectives. The need to move toward this goal is recognized in service delivery programs manned by experienced professionals.1 Thus, the need would seem to be even greater for programs manned by non-professionals and/or inexperienced personnel.

The staff development efforts studied were directed toward non-professional and/or inexperienced staff. Colored by the developmental needs of an embryonic counseling staff were the objectives that flowed from the above stated goal: 1) exposure to and acceptance of the values and norms of social work, 2) providing an ongoing opportunity to synthesize professional knowledge and skills, 3) providing information regarding the communities in which clients resided, and 4) providing information about the community of social agencies.

This study was concerned with one type of staff development—peer groups sessions under the direction of professional social work administrative staff. The general purpose was concerned with not only the reaching of the aforementioned objectives, but also the elements associated with movement toward attaining them. Some of these elements were thought to be a) counselor reactions to the meetings, b) administrative versus professional agendas, c) administrative versus counselor participation, d) verbal activity in the meetings, and e) number of counselors in attendance.

Underlying the study were two major assumptions. It was assumed that the staff development process is a dynamic endeavor toward reaching a goal that never can be actualized. As broad steps toward the goal are mastered both administrative and direct service staff expect that new and more intricate steps will be added. Thus, the specific purpose of the research had to be the study of elements associated with the movement toward the goal, rather than whether the goal was attained. A further assumption was that changes over time in the reaction to the meetings naturally would occur.

Methodology

This was a time series study of the movement toward the objectives of staff development. Data were collected during and following all but one weekly session. During each session, observations were made of the process of the meetings; whereas, following the meetings, staff reactions to them were collected. With respect to the use of an observational technique, it was recognized that the method implies certain limitations. For instance, observations can cover the continuum between disciplined subjectivity to undisciplined idiosyncrasy. The perceived observations resulting from the latter may be valid, but they are not necessarily reproducible by another observer. That is, observer # 1 may perceive X; while observer # 2 of the same phenomenon may perceive Y. In order to curtail such unreliability, two devices were used: the observation schedule which contained the items upon which to focus and the pre-training sessions of observers in the use of the schedule. These devices were particularly important when there were changes in observers. When this occurred, the new observer was trained in the use of the schedule by the principal researcher, as well as by the prior observer. Thus, each observer not only knew which pieces of the process to note, but also knew the previous interpretations of certain pieces of behavior that had been made by the previous observer.

Complementing the observation schedule, a post-reaction questionnaire was disseminated to each staff member present at the meetings in order to learn their perceptions of the sessions.

As indicated, there were two samples. One sample consisted of 24 meetings held during the period of April 26 to November 16, 1973.

---

2This study was one of five comprising the evaluation of this agency.
other sample consisted of the reported post-reactions of all counselors present at these meetings.

Findings

Movement toward the four above stated objectives was documented. The counselors readily adopted many of the values and norms of social work. Some of these were "confidentiality," "acceptance of the client," "establishing a contract with the client."

The fact that there had been weekly staff development meetings meant that the second objective had been approached. The opportunity to synthesize professional knowledge and skills had been provided. However, this particular study did not focus upon the extent of staff's profiting from this opportunity.  

Minimal information was provided about the communities in which clients resided. This movement toward the third objective, however, was never a planned agenda item of the meetings. Rather, such information was received incidental to having joint meetings with representatives from other social agencies. In the course of such meetings, members of these other social agencies often would inform youth serving agency counselors about the communities from which the juveniles came. Although the counselors seemed quite interested in receiving information about the communities in which their clients resided, this fact still did not prod administration staff to include information about these communities on the agendas. Instead, objective four, providing information about the community of social agencies, seemed to be their main concern. There were at least six meetings in which members from several different social agencies were present. Thus, to some degree the last objective was approached.

Counselor Reactions to Meetings

It had been assumed that participation in staff development sessions would directly correlate with line-staff's motivation to reach toward the objectives of staff development. Thus, satisfaction was seen as one measure of at least some degree of movement toward the objectives.

Staff Satisfaction: The first item on the post-reaction questionnaire elicited a global satisfaction rating of the meeting. An eight point scale was used: 8 = totally satisfied, 7 = very satisfied, 6 = moderately satisfied, 5 = more satisfied than dissatisfied, 4 = more dissatisfied than satisfied, 3 = moderately dissatisfied, 2 = very dissatisfied, and 1 = totally dissatisfied. Mean scores for each of the sessions were computed, as well as a mean score for all of the sessions. These scores were then related to the five elements mentioned above.

---

3 This study was one of five comprising the evaluation of this agency.

4 The mean score for satisfaction with all 24 meetings will be referred to as the 'norm.'
The satisfaction scores ranged between 3.0 (moderately dissatisfied) to 7.7 (almost totally satisfied). When the scores from all 24 meetings were computed, it was found that the counselors were moderately satisfied (6.3) with the meetings. Nine sessions fell below this norm and 15 sessions rose above the norm.

Administrative versus Professional Agendas: After data had been collected on four to six sessions, an interim report would be presented to the project administrators. These reports indicated consistently that the counselors were more satisfied with meetings having a professional agenda than those having an administrative agenda. The satisfaction ratings dramatically indicated the preference for a professional agenda. For instance, after the tenth session observed, the direct service staff registered its lowest satisfaction with a mean score of 3.0 (moderately dissatisfied). The agenda for that meeting covered only administrative matters. However, after the twenty-first session, counselors registered their highest satisfaction with a mean score of 7.7 (nearly totally satisfied). This meeting was concerned only with professional matters.

Although a meeting having professional content seemed to be rated more highly than a meeting with administrative content, having a professional agenda did not always assure a high satisfaction rating from the direct service staff. Two of the nine sessions rated below (4.8 and 6.2) the norm had professional content. Also, having mainly administrative content in a meeting did not assure a lack of satisfaction. One of the meetings rated above (6.8) the norm had only administrative content. On the other hand, the findings demonstrated that meetings which had both a professional and an administrative agenda were favored by the counseling staff. Nine of the eighteen meetings that were above the norm were of both administrative and professional subject matter. In addition, all meetings having members of community agencies were rated above the norm, whether the agenda was occupied with administrative, professional, or a combination of these two topics.

Number of Counseling Staff Present: Attendance ranged between four and eight counselors. On staff, were eight counselors. However, the modal average of counselors present at a staff development session was six. Although having six in attendance was associated with the highest level of satisfaction, it was associated also with the greatest variation in satisfaction ratings. The range in mean satisfaction when having six counselors present was 4.8 to 7.7. That is, direct service staff were nearly more satisfied than dissatisfied to being almost totally satisfied.

It appeared that counselor satisfaction was not related to the number in attendance. When only four counselors were present at the first session observed, the meeting still was rated 5.3; that is, more satisfactory than dissatisfactory. When eight members were present at the twenty-second session, the rating was much higher (6.4), but not higher than the twenty-first session in which six participants were present (7.7). Also, the tenth session in which there were five members present, rated lower (3.0) than the one in which only four were present (5.3). It must be noted that all of these sessions which rated above the norm had an agency representative present.

-182-
Administrative versus Counselor Participation: There had been the expectation that if counselors were more verbally active in the sessions than administrators, counselor satisfaction would be high. Conversely, if administrators were more verbally active than counselors, counselor satisfaction would be low.

The first six meetings observed bore out this expectation. The average participation for these meetings was 17% counselors and 83% administrators. All of these meetings, except the sixth one, were rated below the norm of 6.3. An interim research report to the agency administrators indicated the relationship between counselor satisfaction and counselor participation in the meetings. Following this report, line-staff participation expanded. The seventh meeting had line-staff participating 48.5% of the time. This participation grew to 77.3% during the sixteenth session. It was only during the twenty-second meeting that counselor participation was below 50%. At that meeting, their participation was 38.1%. However, their satisfaction was still above the norm.

It appears that after the first six meetings in which there was lower counselor participation as compared to administrator participation, there was no longer association between participation and satisfaction.

Verbal Activity: Even the liveliness of the sessions, as measured by the total number of contributions by both administrators and counselors did not seem to be associated highly with the degree of satisfaction. The liveliest meetings were the thirteenth, fifteenth, and seventh respectively. Satisfaction ratings for two of these meetings were quite high--6.7 and 7.0. However, the fifteenth meeting rated slightly below the norm with a mean of 6.2. Also, when the participation was very low, the satisfaction rating could still be quite high. When the verbal activity was composed of only 22 contributions in the eighth session the rating was 6.7. Also, in the sixteenth session, when the number of contributions was again only 22, the rating was 7.0. Thus, neither verbal activity in the meetings nor the rate of counselor participation as compared to administrator participation seemed associated, over time, with counselor satisfaction.

THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

As stated in the beginning of this paper, the reason for reporting a study on staff development was to illustrate its contribution to theory validation and elaboration. The referred to theory of organizational behavior began with one of Merton's hypotheses--a certain amount of deviancy is necessary for the maintenance of a group's stability. Gouldner treated this hypothesis as a triggering device with which to explode a new conceptualization, that of Reciprocities Multiplier. The essential meaning of his theory seems to be captured in the following statement: "For our analysis suggests that a sequence of identical conforming actions undergoes

an inflationary spiral and that later conforming actions are worth less than earlier ones, in terms of the reward or propensity to reciprocate which they elicit.\textsuperscript{6}

When the study findings are scrutinized under the lens, 'reciprocities multiplier,' the message that takes shape is that the elements which were singled out to be charted over less than a year's time could not be expected to be associated consistently with the 'reciprocal' action of high satisfaction. Furthermore, it can be expected that satisfaction with all of the elements eventually would regress towards the mean level of satisfaction for all meetings. For example, the satisfaction ratings of the first five sessions indicated a trend toward the normative rating for all sessions studied. The norm or mean score for all sessions was 6.3. The first five sessions elicited satisfaction mean ratings of 5.3, 5.7, 6.2, 6.2, and again 6.2. The satisfaction of staff was beginning to level off. This lack of movement in satisfaction supports Gouldner's observation that the providing of the same factors that initially were greeted with an expression of gratification, eventually would no longer be met with a growing degree of positive expression. Those elements will come to be expected and perhaps, even treated as a right.

Whereas the first five sessions supported Gouldner's theory that there would be a leveling off of satisfaction with the same elements, the variation in satisfaction ratings thereafter, supports the remainder of his conceptualization. The example that he offers clarifies the essence of this second part of his theory. "For example, we would expect workers to feel less gratified when their employer pays them their regular weekly wage than when he does something for them that they do not take for granted, such as providing an unexpected bonus."\textsuperscript{7} The variations in satisfaction registered by the staff follows this aspect of the theory. When the unexpected (a bonus) was given, such as meetings with different community agency representatives, the staff satisfaction registered was always above the norm. Each time a meeting was held with community agency representatives, there was something new--either a different physical setting for the meetings or a new agency about which to learn and from which to learn. These findings further validate Gouldner's theory.

Elaborations upon his theory are furnished also by certain findings. If it can be assumed that line-staff did come to think of the elements associated with their staff development sessions as 'rights,' one could hypothesize that the absence of one of these 'rights' would be met with dissatisfaction. Yet, the study shows that the presence or the absence of some elements were not associated consistently with staff satisfaction or dissatisfaction. For example, the number of peers in attendance was related to such variation in satisfaction with the sessions that the variable, number of peers in attendance, seemed to be an unimportant factor with respect to satisfaction ratings. This finding suggests that another dimension to Gouldner's theory be added--the amount of time allowed for

\textsuperscript{6} Ibid., p. 60.

\textsuperscript{7} Ibid.
the fulfillment of the expected 'right.' That is, when line-staff of an organization considers the factor to be an expected right, line-staff also may believe that in time the right will be fulfilled.

Assuming that dissatisfaction will be expressed eventually, another consideration to be added to the dimension of time is which level in the organizational hierarchy will be granted an extension of time before dissatisfaction will be registered. The study found that when line-staff members were the withholders of an expected right (attendance at meetings) other line-staff were willing to forgo the registering of dissatisfaction. Yet, when administrators were guilty of withholding an expected right (failing to provide professional instead of administrative content) line-staff quickly indicated their dissatisfaction. The only exception to this was a meeting in which the administrative item occupying the total agenda concerned the counseling staff's need for further explanation of a new reporting procedure necessitated by the installation of an information system. Subsequent to this session, an agenda structured totally around administrative matters again received disapproval ratings from line-staff. Indicated by these findings is the following hypothesis: The greater affinity ego feels with alter, the less ego expects from alter and therefore, the less dissatisfied ego feels when alter does not meet ego's expectation. Conversely, the less affinity ego feels with alter, the more ego expects from alter and therefore, the more dissatisfied ego feels when alter does not meet ego's expectation.

The above discussion of elaborations on Gouldner's theory has been predicated on the assumption that having full attendance at a staff development meeting was an exception of line-staff. However, it is quite possible that line-staff never had the opportunity to expect full attendance. The findings showed that the degree of satisfaction seemed unrelated to numbers in attendance. Yet, they also showed that attendance, itself, varied considerably. As a matter of fact, only once was there full attendance. This finding opens the door to a different interpretation. If staff did not regard having all of their numbers present as a 'right,' it could still be expected that when they received the 'bonus' of full attendance, they would register higher satisfaction than when they did not have full attendance. The fact that this was not the case suggests that there may be a hierarchy to the 'bonuses' that will elicit heightened satisfaction. That is, all unexpected events will not be greeted with the same degree of approval. Furthermore, it is possible that the hierarchy of bonuses correspond to the degree of regard that ego holds for alter, the bonus-giver. In the case of this agency's line-staff regard possibly was given to the administrators and to representatives of other community agencies to a greater extent than to their peers.

Although Gouldner's conceptualization of organizational behavior was validated by findings and further elaborated by other findings of this study, it is suggested that additional refinement of his theory can be made by subsequent perusals of study results that are related to organizational behavior.
While the general plight of welfare recipients has long been recognized, little or nothing to date has been ascertained concerning their views toward the system that largely determines their lives. Many recipients find themselves manipulated by a less than personalized bureaucracy but few researchers have sought to examine the experiences and attitudes of these recipients toward that system. Given the recent figures which indicate a "welfare explosion" (Piven and Cloward, 1971), and the vast expenditures for public assistance programs (Skolnick and Dales, 1969:5), the lack of systematic empirical research in this area is disconcerting. Such information should be of considerable value to the practitioner within the social welfare context. Differing policy orientations frequently are implemented without the guidance of relevant baseline information. Further inquiry into the strains inherent in the system would certainly lend itself to a more efficient and workable model. Our purpose here is to carry out such an analysis.

While some would seek to abolish public welfare, most scholars challenge such a proposition (Smith, 1966). Many have suggested that the present welfare system is weak and the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (1968:457) reported that it was largely responsible for the urban riots of the past decade. The Commission has further noted two major system deficiencies:

First, it excludes large numbers of persons who are in great need, and who, if provided a decent level of support, might be able to become more productive and self-sufficient;

Second, for those who are included, it provides assistance well below the minimum necessary for a decent level of existence, and imposes restrictions that encourage continued dependency on welfare and undermine self-respect (457).

Additionally, recipients have alleged invasion of privacy, stigmatization and general degradation (Handler and Hollingsworth, 1969). General deficiencies have given rise to numerous welfare rights organizations (Paull, 1967) and have prompted a number of legal battles (Reich, 1965).

Though aspects of the welfare system are dysfunctional for those it

*Partial support for this research was provided by Social and Rehabilitation Services Contract OS-R-4-72-21 with the Atlanta Urban League, Inc.*
seeks to serve, many positive benefits certainly accrue to the recipients and it would be inaccurate to assume that a pattern of negative evaluations is the norm. The right to an adequate level of food, clothing and shelter is endorsed by most Americans. In fact, much of the literature dealing with this area points to a positive orientation toward welfare on the part of the general public. Kallen and Miller (1971) interviewed three hundred white and black women in the Baltimore area and their data indicate a weak approval of welfare with the modal group being ambivalent. A California study (Ogren, 1973) concluded that "the most significant finding was that support for public welfare—both as a concept and a program and in abstract and concrete terms—far outweighed opposition" (Ogren, 1973:107).

Although a general lack of information characterizes our understanding of recipient attitudes toward welfare, earlier inquiries provide us with certain information. Briar (1966) studied ninety-two AFDC-U recipients in the Berkeley, California area and reported a conservative, anti-welfare orientation in the respondents. While this striking pattern would hint of inconsistency, Briar reports that the respondents typically saw themselves as "different" from the others. He writes:

Our respondents almost never (and most respondents never) referred to welfare recipients as "we" but as "they." This characteristic estrangement—also manifest in a tendency to view oneself as an atypical recipient, a self conception which seemed to be held by nearly all the recipients interviewed—reflects the desire of these recipients to disassociate themselves from the image they have of other recipients (375).

A study similar in purpose but broader in scope (Handler and Hollingsworth, 1969) corroborated Briar's implication that recipients attitudes are tempered by their adjustment to the welfare experience. Those AFDC recipients who felt stigmatized were considerably less satisfied with the welfare system than those who did not feel stigmatized. A third study (Grann et al., 1972) provides us with a comparative understanding of individuals in several types of assistance programs. Persons supported by AFDC and Aid to Disabled displayed the most liberal orientation.

A careful examination of the above studies reveals that none has systematically examined client orientation toward welfare by program and client characteristics. Furthermore, measurement of attitudes toward welfare has been less than rigorous. Our understanding in this area is far from complete and a Southern urban centered study was conducted to further specify the relationship between recipient welfare attitudes, demographic characteristics and welfare experiences.

Data and Methodology

Data for this study were gathered during the winter of 1973 in Fulton County (Atlanta, Georgia) from a sample of 549 individuals who were currently receiving assistance from one of three types of welfare programs of Social Rehabilitation Services of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A systematic random sample of 700 persons was drawn from the official list.
of over 33,000 individuals currently receiving assistance from the Fulton County Welfare Department. The final sample included 258 Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) recipients, 154 blind or disabled individuals and 137 persons who were receiving old age benefits.

Data were collected by means of a 45 minute personal interview. In addition to standard demographic and background information, a complete assessment was made of the respondents' experiences with welfare and attitudes toward welfare. The difficulties of reliable and valid data collection in low income areas are obvious and special efforts were made to insure that the data were collected under optimum circumstances. Interviewers were matched by race with the respondent and were indigenous to the areas in which they worked. Approximately 20 percent had been or were presently on welfare. A comprehensive training program was used to thoroughly acquaint the interviewers with the instrument and interviewing in general. Convincing the respondents that the information would be confidential was greatly enhanced by the similarity between the interviewer and respondent, a finding determined by validation checks with the respondents.

Dependent Variable

A scale originally developed by Kallen and Miller (1971) to assess recipient attitudes toward welfare was incorporated in the questionnaire and was tested for internal consistency on the Atlanta sample. A principal components factor analysis with orthogonal rotation was used to determine the structural configuration of the original scale. Two distinct factors were extracted from the eleven item pool and the least squares method was used to assign scores to the individual recipients (Rummel, 1970:437-441).

The first factor plainly reflected a disassociative orientation toward welfare and has been termed "disassociation." It is composed of items reflecting a negative stance toward welfare and tends to be endorsed by those persons seeking to disassociate themselves from the typically stigmatized aspects of welfare. Thus, the individual scoring high on this scale is one who views welfare as necessary for those requiring assistance. Not that he is lazy or dishonest about his need but that no other option is available for subsistence. The scales and their components are presented below.

Conceptually one can picture the scales as two continua which do not necessarily covary. Indeed, their uniqueness is confirmed by a zero order correlation of +.06, indicating two dimensions of attitudes toward welfare. Certainly it would not be inconsistent for an individual to score highly on both indices. Briar (1966), for example reports a characteristic tendency by recipients to view themselves as different from other recipients in that they themselves do not see themselves as stereotypic of those on welfare. Thus, a person might feel that most recipients exploit the available programs yet this stance does not preclude them from identifying with welfare and its humanitarian connotation. In this way, one is able to maintain self esteem yet be divorced from allegedly less deserving recipients.
The Recipients

Significant demographic differences were evident among the three groups of recipients. Certain of these differences stem from the type of aid itself. For example, AFDC recipients are almost exclusively female (97.7%) and the aged group has the highest median age (70.9 years as opposed to 27.9 for the AFDC group). Many of the other demographic differences among the three groups are in part explained by the differences in age structure. In the AFDC group, 88.7% are between the ages of 15 and 45, a range primarily determined by simple biological factors of reproductive capability and child dependency. The disabled and blind sample has the broadest distribution by age with 58.2% between 41 and 65 and 84.4% between 36 and 75, while all of the aged recipients are 65 or older by definition.

The differences in age structure in part explain the observed differences in years of school completed. The AFDC recipients have a median education level of 10.0 years and a median age of 27.9 years. The disabled and blind recipients have a median age of 52.1 years and a median education level of 6.6 years, while the aged group has a median age of 70.9 years and a median education level of 5.0 years. These age-education levels follow the expected pattern, based on the median school years completed for the entire U.S. black population for comparable ages. However, the education levels for the recipients are somewhat lower than the corresponding figures for the national population for each age. This can be partially explained by the fact that the South has a lower overall educational attainment level than other regions of the country for each relevant age group (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1972b). A summary of demographic characteristics by type of aid is provided in Table 1.

- Table 1 about here -

Experience with Welfare

The recipients were asked a series of questions dealing with aspects of their experiences with welfare which covered such areas as case worker contact, difficulties in obtaining assistance and adequacy of support. The responses of the three groups were largely similar, with relatively slight absolute differences.

The existing literature on public attitudes toward recipients indicates a stronger public bias against AFDC recipients than other categories of assistance. Ogren (1973), for example, found that the general public ranked aid to the aged and disabled as having higher priority than aid to families with dependent children. The public's disapproval of AFDC programs is also indicated by the concentration of agency efforts, primarily aimed at AFDC recipients, to "uncover welfare cheaters." The most publicized of these being the infamous "midnight searches," a tactic far less frequently used with other types of recipients. Matza (1971) includes such factors as illegitimacy, absence of father due to socially disapproved reasons, and long-term dependency as among several reasons that the public views AFDC recipients as "disreputable." It was expected that these public opinions would be reflected in the experiences
of the AFDC client who would have a harder time applying for aid, would experience delays in receiving aid, and who would be less likely to perceive the case worker as "helpful." In each case, however, these expectations were not realized. By the same token, one might wish to propose a counter hypothesis that because AFDC clients might be considered more "helpable" and may be more aggressive due to their relative youth, they would fare reasonably well in spite of the alleged stigmatization.

Of all categories of recipients interviewed, the AFDC recipients seemed to have the best relationship and experiences with the agency. AFDC recipients are most likely to describe the welfare application process as "easy" or "very easy" (82.5% versus 70.6% for disabled and 78.5% for aged) and also reported slightly less delay in receiving payment. AFDC clients received assistance in an average of 24.8 days from the time of application, while the disabled group took 26.9 days and the aged group 25.8 days. Additionally, the AFDC recipients had the most frequent interaction with the case-worker (average time between visits was 4.8 months for AFDC, 5.8 for disabled, and 6.2 for aged), are most likely to talk with the caseworker in their own home, and were most likely to describe the caseworker as "helpful" or "very helpful" (72.4%, 65.8% and 53.8% for AFDC, disabled and aged respectively).

The aged recipients appear to be the most "forgotten" group in that they report the least frequent interaction with the caseworker, are least likely to describe the caseworker as "helpful" or "very helpful", and are least likely to be visited in their own home. The disabled group is intermediate or similar to the aged group on all measures except the evaluation of the application process. The disabled were least likely to describe the application process as "easy" or "very easy."

The final question concerning the respondent's experience with welfare assessed the adequacy of the welfare payment. Much of the public criticism of welfare aid has been associated with the idea that welfare recipients "get too much," or that the standard of living on welfare is higher than recipients could attain if working, thus removing the incentive to work. The recipients were asked to describe their ability to get along on the welfare money in terms of four responses: (1) Can't make ends meet, (2) barely able to get along, (3) have enough to live comfortably, and (4) have more than enough. The responses were similar for each aid group. The proportion responding that they "could not make ends meet" was 29.2%, 30.5%, and 26.7% for the AFDC, disabled and aged groups respectively and 58.4%, 61.0%, and 61.5% for the same respective groups for the "barely able to get along" response. Thus, relatively few of the recipients viewed life on welfare as "comfortable," with only 12.1%, 8.4%, and 11.9% for the AFDC, disabled and aged groups respectively responding in this category. If this is a valid indication of their evaluation of life on welfare, it does not seem likely that, at least for the Atlanta sample, welfare payments are great enough to motivate people to choose them over other means of support.

Findings

Overall, the distribution of the recipients on the identification and disassociation scales is in sharp contract. Over 80 percent of the sample
scored highly on the identification scale while only two percent registered low identification. Due to the highly skewed distribution characterizing the scale, its ability to discriminate is limited. The distribution probably illustrates a general endorsement of the positive functions welfare serves for those in need. In essence, the items comprising the scale assess approval or disapproval of a humanitarian orientation toward those genuinely requiring assistance. To reject such a notion is not normative for the recipients nor does it set them apart from the general populace (Ogren, 1973).

Focusing on the disassociation scale, a more normal distribution is apparent. Nearly 50 percent of the cases fall in the middle range while only six percent lie in the extreme categories. The resulting distribution might be attributed to a number of factors. The negative connotations attached to the status of recipient may necessitate a mental adjustment process which allows one to maintain a positive self image while receiving assistance. Both Briar (1966) and Handler et al. (1969) report that recipients typically view themselves more favorably than they do other recipients. The resulting distribution perhaps results from the difficulties in resolving these inconsistencies.

Table 2 provides further insight into the relative evaluation made of the welfare system by persons supported by the three district programs.

A shift from the total distribution patterns on the two scales is apparent. The AFDC recipients exhibit a slight tendency to identify more strongly with welfare than do the blind, disabled and aged respondents, however, the overall tendency for all groups is toward identification with welfare. These differences might stem from the belief that AFDC recipients are less entitled to the benefits they receive than are the blind, disabled and aged. Matza (1971) contends that all recipients are not viewed as a whole.

Certain forms of dependency are understood, tolerated, and subsequently exempted from the special stigma of demoralization. We have long regarded the disabled, the aged, the blind as occupying a special moral place in society—a place where the normally assumed relation between dependency and demoralization is either inoperative or irrelevant (613).

Recipient differences on the disassociation scale are more apparent. The tendency to divorce oneself from the negative aspects of welfare is greater among the AFDC recipients than by the blind, disabled and aged recipients. Perhaps the latter feel they have a "right" to accept welfare whereas the AFDC group senses less freedom to maintain a similar stance.

Client Characteristics and Attitudes Toward Welfare

A major determinant of attitudes which will now be considered is the respondents' demographic characteristics. Due to the interrelationship between client attributes and the enrolling program, the analysis will focus on two levels. Both the total sample and the respective program sub-samples
will be considered to ensure that variation is not masked by the restricted variable ranges frequently encountered when only employing a sub-sample analysis.

The findings for the effect of race on attitudes illustrates the difficulties in going from a sample to a sub-sample analysis. Considering the total sample, 82.5 percent of the blacks and 71.7 percent of the whites exhibited high scores on the identification scale, a finding consistent with the sub-sample results discussed previously. However, when the sub-samples are considered by racial categories, the lack of whites in the AFDC category makes analysis by race unfeasible. The pattern of high scores on the identification scale holds true for all demographic attributes because of its highly skewed distribution. With respect to the disassociation scale, there was a significant difference by race ($X^2 = 31.08, p < .001$). Whereas 19.2 percent of the black sample scored high on the scale, only 4.4 percent of the whites also scored exceptionally. This may be a function of two factors. First, the disproportionate distribution of blacks among the aid groups, and second, the possibility that blacks have been stigmatized both as blacks and as recipients (Kallen and Miller, 1971) may account for their tendency to disassociate themselves. The AFDC group has the largest proportion black, and is generally seen as subject to the greatest degree of public hostility.

Age is perhaps the most important demographic characteristic to be considered because of its close relationship with the type of aid and the extent to which other demographic characteristics are a function of age and aid category. Age and disassociation for the total sample were inversely related ($\gamma = -0.338$), with the younger groups exhibiting considerably more disassociation. The effect of the restricted age distribution in the sub-samples is clearly evident. For example, the proportion of respondents scoring high on the disassociation scale in the AFDC group was 26.0 percent, the disabled group, 11.2 percent and the aged group, 4.4 percent. However, examination reveals this difference to be a function of the relative lack of overlap in the composition of each group. This is also true of the educational and dependency patterns between groups which are both positively related to disassociation (education and disassociation, $\gamma = 0.283$; dependents and dissociation, $\gamma = 0.285$), but covary very weakly with the identification measure.

**Client Experiences and Attitudes Toward Welfare**

The pattern of relationships between experiences and attitudes differs from that observed between attributes and attitudes in that significant relationships are found more frequently for the identification scale rather than the disassociation scale. The overall pattern concerning the effect of experiences on attitudes for both scales, however, is that variations in client's experiences with the system appear to have relatively little effect on attitudes toward welfare. This is probably due primarily to the high degree of similarity among client groups in their experiences with welfare agencies.

The experience variables which exhibited the most significant relationships with attitudes are those concerned with visiting the client in his own
home, helpfulness of the caseworker, and adequacy of the welfare payment. The measures of length of time on assistance, ease of application, and frequency of talking with the caseworker, had little effect on either attitude scale for either the sample or sub-samples. The measure of visiting in the client's home was found to be associated with identification in the overall sample at the .05 level, with those who had been visited identifying strongly with welfare. This trend was most pronounced within the AFDC group, where twice as many of those who have been visited express high identification as those who have not been visited ($X^2 = 18.19, < .01$).

Overall, those clients who viewed the caseworker as helpful or very helpful tended to have a lower level of disassociation than those who viewed them as unhelpful. Scores on the identification scale, both overall and within groups, were high and unrelated to the helpfulness of the caseworker.

The measure of adequacy of payment exhibited an interesting relationship with the identification scale. Those who said they could live "comfortably" on the welfare payment consistently identified only weakly with positive aspects of welfare. This finding seems inconsistent with the overall tendency of the whole sample to identify so strongly with the humanitarian view of welfare. Perhaps it could be hypothesized that this is a guilt reaction.

Conclusions

Throughout the preceding analysis we have sought to further understand both the demographic and contextual aspects of a major urban welfare program and their relationship to client evaluation of such a program. A meaningful contribution is believed to have been made in that we have gone well beyond past efforts and have focused on an urbanized area which is not unlike a number of other metropolitan centers.

The major methodological contribution is the development of two scales which assess distinct orientations toward welfare. Previously, attitudes toward welfare were assumed to be of a unidimensional nature and were treated as such. Whereas the identification scale proved to have little discriminative power, the disassociation scale did reveal considerable variation among the clients and suggests that recipients do not uniformly seek to divorce themselves from what middle class America might view as a rather degrading situation.

The type of aid program in which the recipient was enrolled determined, to a great extent, his characteristics, experiences and attitudes toward welfare. Certainly the value of examining the welfare situation by client type rather than as a totality has been demonstrated. Few client welfare experience differences were found between programs and experiences with welfare are a poor predictor of one's overall evaluation of the system. That client experiences with welfare played no apparent role in coloring their evaluation of the system belies common sense and suggests that such experiences as ease of payment, frequency of caseworker contact, and perceived caseworker interest, are unimportant.
NOTES


2. Weiss (1968-1969) reported that the responses of black welfare mothers in the New York City area were subjected to validity checks and that the data were highly valid. This finding in conjunction with our experiences lends further credence to the Atlanta data.

3. Schuman and Converse (1971) have addressed the issue of interviewers bias due to racial differences. Matching of interviewer and respondent is particularly important when the subject area is controversial or sensitive.

4. Ten percent of the sample was contacted to insure that interviews had been conducted and comments concerning the interview situation were overwhelmingly favorable.

5. The PA 2 program (principal factoring with iteration) in the Statistical Program for the Social Sciences was utilized.

6. Kaplan and Tausky (1972) for example, found that a sample comparable to the Atlanta study evinced a strong desire to work, endorsed the work ethic and negatively evaluated those receiving public assistance.

7. The positively stated items were recoded to render them consistent with the remaining items prior to the factor analysis. Response categories ranged from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". The factor loadings of the items comprising the "disassociation from welfare" scale (Factor I) were:

   .64 Too many women receiving AFDC from the welfare department are having illegitimate babies in order to increase the amount of money they get.

   .59 Too many people getting welfare spend their money on drinking.

   .51 I don't see any reason why a person who is able to work should get welfare money.

   .44 There are too many people receiving welfare who should be working.

   .42 No mother who had had an illegitimate child should get welfare.

   .38 Too many people are moving to Georgia from other states to get welfare money here.
Those items included in the "identification with welfare" scale (Factor II) were:

.54 There would be fewer people on welfare if jobs were easier to find.

.51 One of the main troubles with welfare is that it doesn't give people enough money to get along on.

.50 In general most people getting welfare try to find jobs so they can support themselves.

.39 Although there may be a few cheaters, most people who get welfare money are honest about their need.

.35 Welfare is a right and not a privilege.

The magnitude of the factor loadings assures us of item homogeneity within each factor (Palumbo, 1969:285-306). Factor I ("Dissassociative") explained 17 percent of the variance in the matrix while Factor II ("Identification") explained 12 percent. The respective eigenvalues were 1.62 and 1.10.

8. A further discussion of the diversity, both attitudinal and demographic, which characterizes the poor can be found in Ferman et al. (1965).

TABLE I
Demographic Characteristics of Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AFDC</th>
<th>Disabled</th>
<th>Aged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>27.90</td>
<td>52.10</td>
<td>70.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Ratio (Males/100 Females)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>61.10</td>
<td>26.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Black</td>
<td>93.80</td>
<td>74.70</td>
<td>69.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Education (Years)</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$1430.00</td>
<td>$1023.00</td>
<td>$961.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Dependents (Including Recipients)</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Income per Person</td>
<td>$ 423.00</td>
<td>$ 814.00</td>
<td>$814.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Employed</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2

Recipients' Attitudes by Type of Aid
(in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>AFDC</th>
<th>Blind/Disabled</th>
<th>Aged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Low) 5-9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(High) 22-25</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = (258) (154) (137)

\( X^2 = 11.55, \ NS \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disassociation</th>
<th>AFDC</th>
<th>Blind/Disabled</th>
<th>Aged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Low) 6-10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = (258) (154) (137)

\( X^2 = 53.15, \ p < .001 \)
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Any effort to define appropriate tasks and directions for social work practice must necessarily come to grips with some analysis of the particular social-political-historical situation within which that practice is being formulated. Too often it seems as though we attempt to define practice abstracted from the particular period in which that practice takes place. It is true, on the one hand, that it is important to develop generic principles of practice. Similarly, it is true that the definition of the social work task is not a matter left solely to the discretion of the profession. In fact, the profession may have a relatively small voice, at any moment, in defining its task. On the other hand, the separation of practice formulations from the specifics of the historical moment leads to blind technicism and to the charge of irrelevance which has often and sometimes accurately been leveled at the profession. And, while we may have far from the definitive influence on our own practice, if we are not conscious of directions we value and do not press for them to the extent possible, then we do not act with the fullest responsibility for human service.

We must constantly question and develop practice in the light of our own best understanding of social realities. In a recent essay, Kahn formulated this notion as follows:

Fadism, cultism, controversy, mark all attempts to characterize the social scene, to state how one might look at America today in thinking about the social sector, social welfare, social services, or social work—whatever the political perspective—in the reshaping of a "relevant" and effective social practice. Yet, the advocate of social welfare policies and the molder of social practice must face the contradictions and must decide what to make of it all. Otherwise, ad hoc programming takes over, repeating a periodic history of professional drifting in which service priorities, program philosophies, and manpower strategies are based on inconsistent, or at least on unarticulated, premises and do not come close to solving urgent social problems, coping with serious individual needs or enriching community life.\(^1\)
A Dilemma

Any effort to develop an understanding of the context for social work practice in the current period in the United States must face one overriding reality. We are a country with enormous problems. Political corruption, energy crises, gross inequalities, and a general sense of social aimlessness press themselves unavoidably on our consciousnesses. Some may take a more systemic, that is, root or radical, view and see these problems as symptomatic of pervasive structural flaws in the society. Others may see in these problems a series of specific issues to be addressed which do not necessarily support the need for radical change. In either case, the reality of a nation in deep distress has impressed itself on all of us at this time.

The dilemma emerges when we juxtapose social work practice - the practice of a profession dedicated to the furtherance of the well-being of individuals and the society as a whole - against these enormous problems. Social work practice can indeed seem irrelevant, puny, and futile. We must come to grips with the reality that we practice within a society that does not seem to have human welfare as a high priority. As citizens we are aware of, complain of, and suffer from the pain of our society. As professionals, we too often proceed with business as usual. How can we resolve this dilemma?

The various resolutions to this dilemma that we usually seek have not been adequate. One of these is to ignore the societal context, as practice plays out in the specifics of day to day work. We may acknowledge the seriousness of the overall situation, but we proceed with an abstracted formulation of practice devoid of an infusion of purpose and direction from that acknowledgement. This approach leads to practice that is indeed irrelevant to the real issues of our day and to professional cynicism - "doing good" within a framework of despair and resignation, convinced beforehand that practice is merely an exercise. Another resolution is to view the piecemeal efforts of social workers, however small they may be, as somehow cumulative building stones toward a larger solution. Even if the building stones were pebbles, this might be an acceptable view. Unfortunately, the evidence seems to be that we are not making progress - that social work is not making a dent that is noticeable. The primary criticism of incrementalism, as we have practiced it, is that it is not incremental.

A third resolution is to bifurcate the profession. Most of us will practice in conventional ways. A few perhaps in the national NASW office or in special commissions, will prepare position papers, write legislation, lobby, and so on. The shortcomings of this resolution are at least two-fold. First, the kinds of politics the few can carry on in the name of the many are necessarily divorced from the grass roots power that might come from worker and client organization and involvement and are, therefore, constrained in speaking to the need for structural change. Second, this approach proceeds as though the specific day to day work of most of us were not profoundly political in its implications for social conversation or social change. It makes social change a narrow and specialized endeavor separate from the realities of everyday life, where it fully belongs.
Our dilemma, then, is that we practice toward the ends of social betterment in a society organized around profit making, efficiency, and the like, but not around the maximization of human well-being. Social work practice must face the challenge of speaking to large social problems, even if in a small way, as an integral and ongoing part of its daily work.

**Toward What Ends?**

As there must be efforts to wrestle with the diagnosis of the broad social problems before us, so there must be efforts to discuss the goals we would like to achieve as a society in the long and short runs. It may be useful to suggest some quite broad outcomes as an end point of practice in particular and larger social struggles in general. The value in doing this is to keep before us the largest agendas, the ultimate agendas, as we struggle with the realities of day to day life and with the smallness of what we can accomplish. We social workers cannot be faulted if we cannot bring about the millennium, cannot bring it about now, or cannot bring it about alone. This is only to acknowledge political reality. We can be faulted if we lose sight of what that millennium is. And, more often neglected, we can be faulted if we fail to ask ourselves, in each instance of our practice, what is the contribution of this specific of practice, however small, to the coming of the millennium. Toward that end, would the following five areas of concern, five hoped for outcomes, capture what many of us have in the back of our minds?

1. The inequality in the distribution of the resources of our society, both the distribution among the domestic population and the distribution between the United States and other nations, is not acceptable. We surely have in mind as an endpoint of practice and social evolution far greater equality. In terms of international distribution, the United States is not an innocent actor. It has been a conscious agent of exploitation of the people and resources of other nations. To talk of worldwide redistribution is to bring to the fore the problem of American imperialism. To talk of internal maldistributions is to bring to the fore the question of capitalism, to which point item two is more specifically addressed.

2. The system of private ownership of the means of production and, consequently, of privately made determinations concerning the investment of our resources, does not permit us to organize ourselves in a way that maximizes our social potential. In addition to the economic inequalities and hardships to which capitalism gives rise, one must reckon with the negative effect on our social organization and personal lives of accumulation for its own sake, of work that is organized for efficiency and profit and not for the development of the worker, of investments made on the basis of their potential profitability and not on their social utility, of a wealth of privately purchaseable goods and a desperate shortage of funds for the public purposes of education, social services, and other public resources. Social movements in general and social work practice in particular, must express some concern for this society's need to pursue humane social ends with the same logic and vigor we now invest toward the ends of private profit and accumulation.
3. As an overall concern, we must place foremost on our agendas the question of human dignity for all persons. All discriminations and forms of exploitation of any individuals for any reason must be addressed. Presently, this discrimination and exploitation find expression most viciously in the case of black and third world persons, women, gay persons, and the aged, and must be fought on these fronts.

4. Living in some more organic relationship with our physical environment becomes daily more of an obvious necessity. We can no longer see human beings and the human endeavor as a minor activity on a vast, endless, eternally resourceful stage. The concept of spaceship earth, of the human race as potentially capable of ultimately using up and destroying its home, must inform our practice concerns.

5. We seem to lack an overall sense of social purpose capable of guiding the nation as a whole and the individuals in it. No single overall social purpose can be suggested by any one person, with the exception of the general notion that such purpose would surely concern the maximization of the lives of all people. What can be suggested is that no such social purpose can emerge in a way that will have meaning to us all and guide us in a non-coercive way, unless we all participate in its formulation. Toward this end, there must be restructuring of the major institutions of the society in the direction of greater participation in decision making by all of us. This will probably require radical decentralization of social institutions and decision making processes. It will probably require that we move in the direction of shifting the locus of decision making in our institutions and in our society from decision making at the top of hierarchies to decision making at the lowest possible levels in hierarchies consistent with overall concerns for equity and rationality. It will probably require an emphasis on smallness and locality rather than bigness and integration.

Implications for Practice

We have suggested some broad and long term goals. We have said that our society is presently far from achieving those goals. We can also suggest that social welfare is presently under attack and is not in one of the stronger positions it has experienced in the last thirty years. How then shall we avoid despair, resignation, or self-illusion about our work? How can we relate our practice to the social context in a constructive way?

It seems to be the case that people in general, and social workers by inclusion, either resign themselves to lives and practice lived within and serving conservative ends, or pursue extremist actions that tend to be futile and self-destructive. To live and practice conservatively is to make a mockery of the profession's commitment to human welfare, and to destroy ourselves as individuals in the process of accommodating ourselves to a destructive system. To live a totally radical life and to implement a totally radical practice is surely to face political isolation and to risk personal self-destruction.
But there is another position, though it can be suggested only in its broad outlines. We must live in resistance to the existing forms and practice, precisely because they are destructive to others and ourselves, and because we are committed to change. That resistance must be such that it stays as close as possible to a border line—the border line at which to resist less is to accommodate ourselves to conservative ways, and to resist more is to become isolated or to be self-destructive. Too often we do not press close enough to that border line. We fail to do so not because the repression is too great, but because we have not developed appropriate strategies, have not developed the kind of collective support that makes ongoing resistance possible, or have become resigned. Surely there are tremendously powerful external forces which inhibit efforts to create change. But we too often stop in our efforts far short of facing those powers. We stop at the point at which internal pressures and dissension determine our actions. These are real and must be struggled with so we can move closer to the border and stay there more consistently.

With this as a general, and admittedly non-operationalized guide, can we be more specific about practice? If we try to "do good" in the conventional ways, we may do some good and, in fact, help some individuals or modify a system of procedure. But few of us are likely to think that the accumulation of these kinds of efforts makes much of a dent on the very basic factors that create the problems in the first place, or move us closer to the realization of the five values suggested earlier. The question then becomes, how can the small pieces of practice, the concrete and real things that social workers do, be more than isolated efforts? How can they become a contribution to the sorts of structural changes required?

To make a link between the specifics of practice and these larger changes requires that we develop some larger conceptions of how we think profound social changes might occur in the society. We need a theory of social change. Such a theory must be developed by practitioners to help them focus the specifics of practice. It cannot be developed here. However, Andre Gorz and others have suggested the concept of structural, or non-reformist reforms, as an approach to the kinds of specific and concrete activities we can undertake that can contribute to a larger process of change. This notion is potentially highly informative and provocative for a social work practice that must stay linked to the old at the same time that it pushes for and toward the new.

Gorz argues in this way:

A reformist reform is one which subordinates its objectives to the criteria of rationality and practicability of a given system and policy. Reformism rejects those objectives and demands—however deep the need for them—which are incompatible with the preservation of the system.

On the other hand, a not necessarily reformist reform is one which is conceived not in terms of what is possible within the framework of a given system and administration, but in view of what should be made possible in terms of human needs and demands.
In other words, a struggle for non-reformist reforms - for anti-capitalist reforms - is one which does not base its validity and its right to exist on capitalist needs, criteria, and rationales. A non-reformist reform is determined not in terms of what can be, but what should be. And finally, it bases the possibility of attaining its objectives on the implementation of fundamental political and economic changes.2

Carroll, Lakey, Moyer, and Taylor, political activists associated with the non-violent Movement for a New Society, have attempted to operationalize this notion in a way that may be helpful to social workers. They suggest that a non-reformist reform has six characteristics. It helps to decentralize power and control and, simultaneously, to restrict centralized power and control; it develops, in the present, some aspects of the social forms and values that might be desired in a radically changed society; it brings about greater people's control of resources; it supplements the resources of people's movements; it erodes the power, privileges, and wealth of the establishment; and, it is located "where the action is," that is, it builds on and facilitates political movements.3 To these criteria, we ought to add that a non-reformist reform also serves as a vehicle for political education and consciousness raising.

Contained within these criteria, obviously, is a theory of change which suggests a profound struggle, from the bottom up, against the existing institutions of society. Obviously, too, tremendous intellectual and practice work is needed to develop the utility of these criteria for the specifics of social work activity. But if we accept the dilemmas before us and the need to be part of the struggle that is required, we will undertake the task.

For example, these criteria would suggest that it might be more important to help organize welfare clients than to work directly for immediate improvements in benefit levels. Improvements in benefit levels are important. In themselves, however, they do not organize the kinds of new power bases that are required, do not raise political consciousness, and may even erode support at the client level for political struggle. On the other hand, when organized clients win political struggles for benefit improvements, and see those struggles in the context of problems of inequitable distribution in capitalist society, they not only achieve specific improvements but also develop their political strength in a potentially important way.

The issue before us, then, in developing a strategy for social work practice, is the issue of connecting daily struggles around a concrete issue with which we come in contact, to the largest agendas and hopes that we have.4 The notion of structural reforms may be one way to formulate and begin to play out, in practice, in classrooms, in theoretical discussions, the specifics of that strategy.
FOOTNOTES


Police departments, juvenile courts, training schools, and a variety of welfare organizations together constitute the network of agencies formally instituted to deal with juvenile deviance. Because each of the organizations has an interest in reducing deviance, it is sometimes assumed that they share the same goals and work closely and cooperatively with each other. The purpose of this paper is to report on an exploratory study of inter-organizational relations at one link in this network: relations between police youth bureaus and the juvenile court.

The domain of an organization is defined by Levine and White as "the specific goals (an organization) wishes to pursue and the functions it undertakes in order to achieve these goals." For health organizations, Levine and White note that domain consists of "claims which an organization stakes out for itself in terms of (1) diseases covered, (2) population served, and (3) services rendered." Thompson suggests that if "range of products" is substituted for "diseased covered", the concept of domain appears useful for the analysis of all types of complex organizations.

Agreement among organizations regarding each other's domain is defined as domain consensus. According to Levine and White and Paul, domain consensus is one of three variables affecting the amount of exchange among organizations. Two other variables are (1) "the functions (organizations) carry out which in turn determine the elements they need," and (2) the organizations' access to elements from outside the local organizational network. Although in the community they studied there existed domain consensus between health organizations that were local chapters of national organizations (such as Planned Parenthood, American Red Cross, American Cancer Society) and other health organizations, the actual amount of exchange among these agencies was apparently reduced because certain local chapters could rely on their national organization for many resources and were not entirely dependent upon the local as network.

Whereas Levine and White view domain consensus primarily as an independent variable affecting inter-organizational exchange, domain consensus may also be viewed as a dependent variable. It is proposed here that three variables affect the degree of domain consensus in an inter-organizational system: (1) the level of resources possessed by each organization, (2) the determinateness of the organizations' technologies, and (3) the degree of ideological difference among the organizations. While an ideal theory would specify the relative contribution of each of these factors, the present effort is aimed at conceptualizing each of them and illustrating their role in relation to a county juvenile court and two youth bureaus. Each of these variables will first be considered separately.
1. Resources, whether from outside or inside the system, affect an organization's ability to fulfill its domain — its claim that it can deliver certain goods or services. For example, a skimpy budget hinders an organization's ability to hire and retain sufficient numbers of competent staff.

2. An indeterminate technology is similar to what Thompson calls "uncertainty in cause/effect relations." A technology of low or unknown effectiveness will in the long run affect the organization's ability to fulfill its claims. Other organizations which initially honored and acted upon the organization's claims will in time dispute the organization's domain, and may seek alternative exchange partners. For example, uncertainty exists as to the most appropriate means of preparing police officers for their complex and changing roles. A university which claims to train police officers better than traditional police academies may initially have many supporters and purchasers among police departments in the area. But if its graduates do not demonstrably outperform police officers from academies or other programs, departments which initially supported the university may turn elsewhere.

An indeterminate technology is not the same and should not be confused with an inefficient technology. As long as resource levels remain high, an inefficient technology will not necessarily threaten the organization's ability to fulfill its domain. It can still deliver, though it does so at high cost.

3. Ideological differences may be defined simply as disagreements among organizations as to whether and how certain tasks should be performed, regardless of which organization performs them. The concept differs from domain consensus in that domain consensus refers to the degree of agreement as to which organization(s) should perform a task.

"Justice" versus "treatment," "welfare" versus "self-interest," and "environmental protection" versus "economic expansion" are examples of ideological differences around which organizations coalesce, and sometimes polarize.

Ideological differences among organizations do not necessarily hinder an organization's ability to fulfill its own claims, but ideological differences do affect the amount of agreement regarding which, if any, organization(s) should perform a task — in short — domain consensus. Exchange may nevertheless occur among organizations differing ideologically, if they engage in similar functions or have little access to resources from outside the system.

Levine, White, and Paul do bring in ideological considerations, but in an ad hoc manner. They mention (1) differences in "views of the world" (a term unnecessarily broad) held by professionals and non-professionals, (2) "divergent policies regarding ways of handling the patient and referring him to other agencies," and (3) differences in "outlook and goals" held by specialties within the same profession, e.g., public health nurses and other registered nurses. These are said to be "other factors which impede greater coordination and effective mobilization of resources" among organizations in the health system. All three of these factors may be seen as
aspects of ideological differences, which in turn affect agreement among these organizations regarding each other's claims.

The conceptual scheme of Levine and White and the elaboration of it presented in this paper are shown in Figure One.

FIGURE ONE. DETERMINANTS OF DOMAIN CONSENSUS, AND OF INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL EXCHANGE

The scheme shown in Figure One is illustrated below by a case study of inter-organizational relations between two city police youth bureaus and a county juvenile court.

Setting and Procedures:
The juvenile court and one of the city police youth bureaus were located in a Midwestern county seat, a city of about 70,000 people whose main industries were light manufacturing, research and development, and education (referred to in this paper as Forest City). The second police youth bureau was located in the same county in a nearby industrial town of about 20,000 people (referred to below as Satellite City). The two youth bureaus together accounted for 82 percent of all male referrals accepted by the Juvenile Court and 59 percent of female referrals accepted. Excluded from
the study were the police departments in several small villages in the county, the sheriff's office, and the two local posts of the state police located in the county. However, these excluded police agencies together accounted for only a small portion of referrals to the Juvenile Court.

Both youth bureaus had official standing within their respective municipal police departments and both had some full-time staff. At the time of the study, the Forest City Youth Bureau employed five full-time police officers, including one policewoman, plus secretarial staff. At the time of the study, the Forest City Youth Bureau employed five full-time police officers, including one policewoman, plus secretarial staff. The Satellite City bureau had one full-time officer and a secretary, plus intermittent help from officers assigned to other divisions of the police department.

The Juvenile Court had a staff of twenty-five, including a full-time director of court services, full-time "trained" workers (i.e., staff possessing Master's degrees in social work), several part-time trained workers, and several secretaries, plus two referees and a half-time judge. The referees, who heard cases in the absence of the judge and recommended dispositions to him, also had social work degrees.

Data regarding relations among these three organizations were collected over a three year period through interviews with members of the three staffs; observations of members of each staff in interaction with juvenile offenders, other staff members, and staffs of the other organizations; analysis of the careers of selected cases through the youth bureaus and the court; observation of a series of meetings among the full staffs of all three agencies; and analysis of documents published by the organizations.

The Domains of the Organizations:

Both youth bureaus were formally charged with the task of handling complaints concerning juveniles. This included investigating complaints, apprehending suspected offenders, interrogating them, and "disposing" of the cases. Dispositions included, among other things, exonerating juveniles, giving warnings and advice, releasing to parents, referring to welfare agencies, and referring to the Juvenile Court. Although the same range of alternative dispositions was available to each youth bureau, the respective styles of operation and claimed domains differed considerably. The Forest City Youth Bureau sometimes placed a juvenile on its own informal system of "probation". In these instances it required the juvenile to report for regularly scheduled conferences with a bureau officer. The officer in charge of the Forest City Youth Bureau explained this device as follows:

We do treatment. Other agencies in the community can't handle all the cases, so we have to do treatment as well, and in doing this we look at the total situation the child is in. This helps us to decide whether to use the punishment approach or the education approach...We evaluate what the juvenile's adequacy is. Do they need help and guidance? If so, can the Family Service or Catholic Social Services help them, or do they need more authoritative help, for instance from the court? If they are not willing to cooperate, we may have to send them to the court. But all the social agencies in the community have long waiting lists. If the kids needs help now, then we should get to him now. Two weeks from now he might not be able to be helped nearly so well...
The Satellite City Youth Bureau, on the other hand, did not claim to treat juveniles. Its officer warned or threatened offenders, referred them to the juvenile court or occasionally to selfare agencies, or dispensed his own punishment for juvenile traffic violations. He usually kept the juveniles' drivers license for two weeks to three months:

We take the kid's license on the first offense. None of this foolishness about two or three times. This really shakes the kids up. The license is something they really need.

The Satellite City Youth Bureau generally scorned counselling by either police agencies or the juvenile court:

It's true that sending the kid to prison may not do any good to the guy himself, but it will deter his friends...If my kid was sent to the juvenile court, I would want him told that he's not going to be allowed to do these kinds of things, instead of being told, "We want to see what makes you tick." This makes it seem to him that he has an excuse...The kids need an example made of someone. I wonder how long it has been since anybody at the court has been punished. Almost everybody gets only warnings. You've got to show them.

The Juvenile Court, like juvenile courts in most states, operated under a very broad legal mandate to intervene in situations "endangering the health, welfare, or safety of the child, or the well-being of the community." The Director of Court Services and most court workers tended to emphasize rehabilitation and treatment rather than punishment for juvenile offenders. For example, one worker commented in response to a policeman's insistence that juvenile tire-stealers be punished more severely:

We are told by law, of course, that punishment isn't our job. Our job isn't to punish. So in order to change that, we'd have to change the law. Of course, we can send a person to the training school, and this amounts to punishment.

A second worker commented:

The question is how much time to allocate to each kid...Some get very little attention, and others get a lot. We try to give the most attention to those we feel we can help the most and farm the rest out to other agencies in the community.

The quotations above illustrate the low degree of domain consensus among the three organizations. The Satellite City Youth Bureau saw treatment functions as inappropriate for both the Juvenile Court and the Forest City Youth Bureau. It's officer wanted both agencies to deal more authoritatively and punitively with juvenile offenders.

The Forest City Youth Bureau claimed treatment (as well as other functions) to be within its domain. It would decide which cases needed counselling by its own officers, which needed treatment by social agencies, and
which should be referred to the Juvenile Court. Those who were to be referred to the courts were those who refused to "cooperate" and juveniles committing very serious offenses. The Bureau minimized the appropriateness of treatment by the Juvenile Court. It asserted that the appropriate domain of the Juvenile Court should be the exercise of authority in cases where the Bureau's methods were not sufficient, or where the offense was so serious and visible that the public demanded adjudication. A "good" court would be one which backed up the threats of the Bureau officers and which ordered the dispositions recommended by the officers.

The Juvenile Court acknowledged the screening functions of the youth bureaus (the screening out of juveniles committing minor offenses), but tended to scoff at the treatment claims of the Forest City Youth Bureau. Bureau officers had no professional training and were presumed by court workers not to be competent to treat, nor to be competent to decide whether juveniles or their families needed treatment. A "good" youth bureau would leave these decisions to the court. Conversely, the Juvenile Court viewed treatment as very much within its domain, and minimized punishment as a goal (though it acknowledged that the consequences of its intervention were sometimes a de facto punishment).

Domain Dissensus and Its Effects on Exchange:
A low degree of domain consensus among organizations may be referred to as domain dissensus. Its existence, theorize Levine and White, does not in and by itself prevent or terminate exchange among organizations because exchange is affected by at least two other factors—the functions the organizations engage in and the extent to which the organizations concerned each have access to resources from outside the local system.

In the present instance all three organizations were agencies of social control and were particularly concerned with juvenile deviance. As such they engaged in similar functions.

Secondly, the agencies were required by law (at least for certain kinds of cases) to interact with each other and not with other organizations. For example, the two youth bureaus were legally bound to refer to the Juvenile Court the most serious offenses, and the court was legally obligated to consider and dispose of the case (even if in some cases this meant waiving the case to the adult court). The youth bureaus in these instances had no choice; they could not refer it to a non-judicial agency, nor could they choose a more "friendly" juvenile court.

The removal of certain juveniles from the community and the preceptions by other juveniles in the community of the Juvenile Court as a punitive institution can be viewed as resources that were needed by the youth bureaus to help deter delinquency. The youth bureaus' access to these resources outside the Juvenile Court was severely limited.

The Juvenile Court, on the other hand, did have access to cases from other sources than the youth bureaus. However, it received the bulk of its delinquency referrals from the two youth bureaus, and it was dependent on the youth bureaus for certain services, such as transporting juveniles to the detention home and apprehending runaway wards of the court. Thus, the youth bureaus and the Juvenile Court were forced to interact with each other much of the time, given legal requirements and the resulting unavailability of needed resources from elsewhere, and in spite of domain dissensus among the three organizations.
Nevertheless, exchange was diminished in areas where legal requirements and mandates were broad or ambiguous. For example, the statutes give the Juvenile Court broad discretion regarding whether or not to intervene. In the first year of the study the Juvenile Court rejected 120 out of 230 petitions (referrals) sent to it by the Forest City Youth Bureau. Court workers attributed the high refusal rate to the "inappropriateness" of many of the cases sent by the bureau. According to court workers, many petitions were not accompanied by evidence sufficient for the court to establish its right to intervene in the situation.

In one instance the Forest City Youth Bureau wanted the juvenile court to accept a petition on a boy and then order the mother and father of the boy to go to a family service agency for help. The court refused, claiming it would have great difficulty establishing jurisdiction over the case. Although the father was a chronic drinker and the mother allegedly "ran around" with other men, there was no evidence the child was physically neglected. The court intake worker said it would be difficult to justify the court's intervention, whereas the Bureau insisted that the court could accept the petition on the basis of "moral neglect." The court worker said moral neglect was very difficult to establish for a boy as old as this one (15 years) and further, that it was futile to force people to go to an agency for treatment when treatment would require willing cooperation. Court workers frequently objected to the police making specific recommendations as to what should be done with the child or family in question. Workers saw this decision, for cases accepted by the court, as belonging to court workers and not to police.

In some instances the court refused the petition because its workers believed the police were trying to use it to get the juveniles to confess. Workers objected to this use of court facilities, which they regarded as treatment or rehabilitative facilities.

Sometimes the court refused the petition because workers asserted that the time had passed when the court could work effectively with the juvenile, even though there was sufficient evidence to establish its jurisdiction. Court workers occasionally refused petitions for juveniles who had committed repeated and serious offenses and who had never been referred to the court by the Bureau until the most recent offenses but had instead been handled by the Bureau on its own informal probation system.

A second area of conflict concerned the exchange of information. Youth bureau officers complained that the Juvenile Court did not systematically inform police as to the Court's dispositions of the cases police referred to it, or as to which juveniles were wards of the court. Court workers refused to share this information on grounds that it was confidential material, but some workers also expressed concern over the uses the police might have for the information. Whereas police asserted that the information was necessary simply in order to coordinate their work with the court, some court workers expressed the fear that the bureaus might use the information to threaten certain juveniles, e.g., if a bureau knew a boy was on probation, an officer could threaten to refer him to the court if he didn't cooperate, for instance, in informing on other juveniles.
Court workers, on the other hand, sometimes complained that the youth bureaus were withholding information from the court on some cases so as to increase the likelihood of obtaining the disposition they desired on the case. Youth bureau officers denied this practice.

Thus, it appeared that neither information nor cases were exchanged as much as they might have been if there had been greater domain consensus among the three organizations.

Factors Affecting Domain Dissensus:
Analysis of relations among the three organizations suggests three factors which contributed to domain dissensus: ideological differences, low resources, and indeterminate technologies.

Ideological differences were defined earlier as disagreements among organizations as to whether and how certain tasks should be performed, regardless of which organization performs them. Although all three organizations in the present study were concerned with juvenile delinquency, each viewed differently the nature and causes of delinquency, and each favored different strategies of social control. In discussing these differences, it is useful to refer to the concepts of "juridical" versus "medical" modes of deviance.10

In the juridical mode the deviant is deemed responsible for his acts. Investigation is focused upon the acts in question and other factors such as the family and community influences are de-emphasized. The deviant is impeded from returning to, or is dislodged from, his social positions. The deviant is not given nor permitted social and emotional support from the organization(s) involved. "Punishment" is emphasized as the appropriate means of social control.

In the medical mode the deviant is deemed not responsible for his acts, at least not wholly responsible. Investigation does not focus on intent but on the forces presumed to provoke and influence the deviance. The organization(s) involved attempt to help the deviant to return to his social positions and typically provide social and emotional support. "Treatment" is emphasized as the appropriate means of social control.

The two views of deviance are seen as incompatible with each other in that they imply different styles of interaction between staff and offenders, and imply different case dispositions. It is nevertheless true that regardless of how the offender and his handling are defined, both the juridical and the medical modes may have similar consequences in some cases, such as deprivation or stigmatization.

The Juvenile Court tended to hold the medical view. Most referrals accepted by the court were viewed by court workers as needing treatment (casework and counselling) in order to bring about long-run change. However, workers acknowledged that given the huge volume of cases in the court relative to staff size, it was impossible to give more than cursory attention to many cases. Workers also acknowledged that sometimes juvenile offenders did not respond to even very intensive counselling and that very authoritative and punitive measures were necessary in these cases. Thus the court tended to operate in the medical mode but sometimes also acted in the juridical mode.
The Satellite City Youth Bureau tended to hold the juridical view; it stressed swift and certain punishment for offenses.

The Forest City Youth Bureau shared both views, claiming to decide which mode of handling was preferable in each case and referring to the Juvenile Court those offenders it deemed in need of punishment.

These differences of view regarding the "causes" of delinquency and of the best means for control very directly affected each organization's willingness to concur in the others' activities. One can speculate that these differences of view are inevitable. Police agencies may be likely to adopt a juridical view, given their primary concern with deterrence and enforcement. Juvenile courts may be more likely to adopt a medical view, given their usual mandate of concern for the protection of the child.

In addition to the ideological issues, domain dissensus between the bureaus and the court can be traced in part to the low resource level of the court. The Juvenile Court's ability to commit offenders to state institutions was severely limited, even when it desired to do so. Due to crowded state facilities, the court was allowed to commit only one juvenile per month to the state correctional institution for boys. The court's capacity to send boys to private institutions in cases where the parents could not pay was limited by its lack of financial resources. This meant that a high proportion of offenders who the youth bureaus would have liked to see committed inevitably had to remain in the community. More use was made instead of community social agencies and court probation.

Court probation, however, was viewed by the youth bureaus as largely ineffective and useless, in part because the bureaus viewed the juveniles they referred as cases which needed sanctions much stronger than more counselling or warnings. In addition, the youth bureaus (and court workers) correctly recognized the impossibility for most juveniles of more than a superficial attempt at treatment by the court, considering its very high case volume relative to staff size. This increased the bureaus' skepticism of the effectiveness of the Juvenile Court's policies. Had greater resources been available to the Juvenile Court in the form of more funds to hire staff and a larger quota of training school commitments, it might have been better able to fulfill its claims that its' policies reduced recidivism and thereby protected the community.

This takes us to the third consideration--indeterminate technology. None of the three organizations could demonstrate that its methods of handling juveniles accomplished the intended goals. The Juvenile Court could not demonstrate that even intensive casework with juvenile offenders reduced recidivism to any extent. Nor could the youth bureaus demonstrate that either "punishment" or the Forest City bureau's variety of treatment was effective. Staff in each organization believed their means to be superior, but for lack of systematic evidence, the Juvenile Court was unable to persuade the youth bureaus of the validity of its claims, and vice versa. Domain dissensus ensued.
Summary

The study reported here is exploratory in nature and involved only three organizations. Its main contributions have been to suggest three propositions regarding variables that affect the degree of domain consensus in an organizational network and to illustrate their utility for analysis of relations among the three organizations studied. These propositions, as well as other parts of the total scheme (Figure One), need further refinement and testing. Presumably the conceptual model applies to any inter-organizational network, and it should be testable through the analysis of relations among organizations having varying degrees of technological determinativeness, ideological differences, and varying resource levels.

Footnotes

1. Other formal organizations may play an important part in labelling and processing juvenile deviants, but these organizations serve other formal goals as well. An example is the public school. Although its official mandate is education of the child, it may nevertheless play a crucial role in defining juvenile deviants. See for example, Walter E. Schafer, "Deviance in the Public School: An Interactional View," Ch. 3 in Edwin J. Thomas (ed.) Behavioral Science for Social Workers, (New York: Free Press, 1967), pp. 51-58.


3. Ibid.


8. Principal support for this research was provided by a curriculum development grant from the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in cooperation with the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, and by a research grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, United States Public Health Service. The principal investigators were Robert D. Vinter and Rosemary C. Sarri.

9. In this state, as in many others, the juvenile court could waive jurisdiction to an adult court of cases which would have been considered a felony if committed by an adult.

11. The thrust of U. S. Supreme Court decisions in the last decade has been toward the protection of due process for the child, e.g., the Kent and Gault decisions. These have resulted in more formality and advocacy in the juvenile court, at least at the hearing stage. The full effect of these decisions on courts operating in the medical mode remains to be seen, but one may predict some movement once again toward the juridical mode. However, the decisions reinforce, not diminish, the juvenile courts' mandate to protect the child. For a study of ideological conflict within the juvenile court, see Vaughn R. Stapleton, "Normative Conflict in the Juvenile Court," paper presented at the 1967 annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco.
EVALUATING A PILOT SOCIAL SERVICE PROJECT FOR
WIDOWS: A CHRONICLE OF RESEARCH PROBLEMS

S. Roxanne Hiltz, Upsala College

The decade of the 70's has seen the appearance of a number of publications in the area of "evaluation research", the effort to systematically apply social science research methods to the evaluation of action programs set up for the purpose of helping to solve social problems. Evaluation research is thus one area in which social scientists can be of direct aid in setting public policy about social welfare services.

An excellent primer on the problems that are likely to arise in the course of an evaluation effort and the "conventional wisdom" that has been developed thus far is Carol Weiss' *Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness* (1972). Had her work been available when the research reported here was designed, some of the problems encountered might have been foreseen and dealt with more wisely. There are also a number of readers which have appeared recently, including Caro's *Readings in Evaluation Research* (1971) and Weiss' *Evaluating Action Programs* (1972). As the fine 24 page bibliography in the latter volume shows, however, there is a lot more published material about the conceptual and methodological issues which arise in evaluation research, treated in the abstract, than there are case studies which illustrate the fact that evaluation research is often an essentially political process of conflict and bargaining among the researcher, the staff members whose program is under scrutiny, and the funding agencies. To paraphrase a famous aphorism, the sociologist who is not aware of previous research problems and mistakes is condemned to repeat them. This paper is an attempt to summarize some of the specific research procedures and research problems that arose in evaluating a three-year pilot social service for widows, related from the obviously biased position of the evaluator.

**Background of the Project: Widowhood as a Social Problem**

In 1972, there were 9.6 million widows in the United States, representing slightly more than 12% of all women over the age of 14. The majority of them lived alone. The same Current Population Survey shows that there were only 1.8 million widowed men (Bureau of the Census, 1972). This points out the fact that remarriage is not a likely solution to the problems widows must face, but that most will have to rebuild their lives as widows. The median age for the onset of widowhood is 56, at which point the average widow has a life expectancy of about twenty years, (Metropolitan Life, 1962) Although this is about as much time as a woman spends bearing and raising children, there is little or no preparation for it. All too many women spend this last period of their lives in poverty and bitterness; a personal tragedy and a societal waste.

Widowhood represents a social problem in the sense that a majority of widows are likely to be poverty-stricken, socially isolated, left
without a meaningful life pattern or social function, and psychologically or emotionally troubled. In addition to the grief within, they face sexism and ageism from the society without. A similarly bleak picture of widowhood emerged from a study of the beneficiaries of its life insurance policies undertaken some years ago by the Prudential Insurance Company. Two prominent New York women, who might be termed "social work entrepreneurs", came across the report when they were searching for possible financial sponsors for their idea of a social service agency devoted to widows. The Prudential Board of Directors became convinced that it was their social responsibility to fund an effort to see what could be done to help widows other than handing them an insurance check. The Widows Consultation Center was funded by the Prudential as a three year pilot project, with the proviso that evaluation research be an integral part of the project design and budget.

Negotiating Research Procedures

The fundamental problem encountered was that of how to mesh the often conflicting demands of evaluation research and social service. If the evaluator set up a rigorous experimental research design which suited her purposes, the results might very well have been disgruntled staff and outraged clients, who felt that they were being used as "guinea pigs" rather than being helped. If the social workers were able to proceed completely in the manner they found most satisfying, it would exclude the systematic collection of data needed for evaluation and the potentially disruptive monitoring of their work with clients.

The basic design worked out for the evaluation was a "before" and "after" measure of the clients, with observation and monitoring of the various services that were developed. Specifically, the plan was for the caseworkers to administer an extensive set of questions to the widow about her problems as part of the intake interview. The same questions could be included in a follow-up interview with clients several months later, and the changes measured. The amounts and kinds of services received from the Center and the clients' assessments of their helpfulness could be used to assess the "cause" of any changes. Added to this would be direct observation of such things as group discussion sessions and intensive interviews with staff in order to observe what kinds of techniques seemed to "work." However, staff resistance to the kind of interference with their work implied by these plans precluded their complete implementation.

Nobody Loves an Evaluator: Strategies of Non-cooperation

At one point in the project, the evaluator came to the conclusion that a book entitled Nobody Loves an Evaluator would summarize completely the experiences to that point. At times, analogies to the Vietnam war, as a protracted and unpopular conflict, came to mind. Suffice it to say that in putting an evaluation plan into operation there is more call for political acumen that for methodological expertise.

The founders of the Center were quite willing to grant a broad evaluation research mandate as a condition for funding. It seems, however, that they neglected to inform the Director of these plans before hiring her. What happened was that the Director was so opposed to the whole
effort that she threw roadblocks in the way at every stage of the research, and discouraged, rather than encouraged, the rest of the staff from cooperating with the evaluator.

In retrospect, the evaluator should have insisted on interviewing prospective directors, familiarizing the candidates with the research plans, and vetoing any who were not sympathetic to the effort. Put in the situation of a fait accompli, it was unwise to go ahead with the thought that the Director could be "won over" at a later stage. The evaluator, after failing to convince the Director that the idea of evaluation research was at least acceptable, should have resigned at that point and declared that the research project could not be done adequately without minimal support from the administrator of the Center.

As other evaluators imply, much resistance probably would have occurred anyway, even with good will and understanding at the outset. There is always a good deal of stress and strain when professionals from different fields must cooperate in a joint research undertaking, and the difference in values between social workers, oriented toward service, and a sociologist, oriented toward research, are inevitably going to result in clashes over priorities. As Mann (1971) notes about such evaluations, "The institute staff tend to consider the researcher as a necessary evil, who must be tolerated for a time, but whose prime function seems to be to make their difficult life even more complex by giving them more forms to fill out...."

A semantic difficulty complicated matters. "Evaluation" is used very loosely in our society to mean everything from a single on-site visit in which impressions are gathered, to a completely experimental design in which the research itself is the main purpose of the project.

Resistance to the extensive data demands made for the evaluation may be summarized as a series of "strategies of non-cooperation":

1) Attack the validity of the proposed research. However, steadfastly refuse to offer any constructive suggestions.

2) Claim ethical considerations that make the research impossible.

3) Attack the researcher's credentials, ability, personal characteristics, or anything else that might stop the research.

4) Having lost the battle over whether there is to be any evaluation research, limit access of the researcher to staff and data. (Assume that the evaluator is the enemy and let the staff know this.) If the delays and frustrations are great enough, maybe the evaluator will give up!

These difficulties definitely affected the amount and quality of data collected through the case histories and the interviews with staff members. Generally speaking, the staff of the Center accepted the evaluation research as a necessary inconvenience at best, only because the grant to the Center by the Prudential had specified that such evaluation be done. This "big stick" was especially effective because the grant was made in quarterly installments and could be withheld if cooperation stopped.

Troubles began with the design of a case history form. From the point of view of the evaluator, several standardized questions on the
severity of various problems were desired, with the idea of repeating these same questions in a follow-up interview. The staff of the Center found this totally unacceptable on the grounds that it would interfere with their ability to help clients. Here is an account of a visit to the Center during its first month of operation, July 1970, when the evaluator discovered that the interview guide which had been designed for use during a client's first visit was not being used at all. (This account was written immediately after the discussion, with the omissions and simplifications that such recall always involves.)

Evaluator: Why don't you even try to use the interview guide?  
Caseworker: I will cooperate with your research only if it does not interfere with the service I can offer my clients. After an hour and a half or so of talking with me about their problems, you cannot expect the client to answer all of these questions.
Evaluator: When do you think you could fit these questions in?  
Caseworker: I brought this up with one woman I have seen, and I really don't know. Perhaps, after we have seen the client and helped her, we could ask her if she wouldn't be willing to come to the Center some day and help us by completing a short questionnaire?
Evaluator: No, no, this is totally unacceptable. I've told you that we need to get a survey of the woman's problems and feelings before you have helped her. And it must be done for all clients, not just for those who feel grateful enough to make a special trip to the Center to fill out a questionnaire.
Caseworker: I have heard all that before.
Evaluator: (pleading) Please, won't you try to incorporate the questions into the initial long interview?  
Caseworker: It isn't a matter of trying; I would be embarrassed to ask these questions. I do not intend to ruin the reputation of the Center by subjecting widows to questions that they might not think are applicable to them. What is discussed by the widows must come from them; must be what they want to talk about. The Center must not try to impose questions on its clients that they do not bring up of their own accord in the course of an interview.

A meeting was called at which the staff and the evaluator went over the whole form, question by question. Such a meeting among all interested parties is recommended to others as a way of dealing with apparent impasses between researcher and practitioners. It produces a group consensus of one sort or another, which then does not seem to be "imposed" on the staff by the outside evaluators. Although the idea of a consensus-seeking meeting seems to be a good one for restoring the momentum of an evaluation effort, unfortunately the result of the lengthy bargaining process turned out in practice to be a very unsatisfactory compromise. The case history form settled upon was time consuming and annoying to the caseworkers, and also unsatisfactory to the evaluator, because it included no questions with standardized wording. Future evaluators would do well to establish regular (perhaps bi-monthly) meetings with all staff to review the progress of the evaluation effort and to revise procedures which do not work out well.

There was also some resentment of the interviews with the staff members, as being time consuming and useless. These feelings were verbalized by the Director during one visit to the Center in October 1971.
for the purpose of interviewing a caseworker:

You can't just make an appointment to see one of my workers. You must get my permission first. Why do you want to talk to the social workers? I do not know why you want to do this and see no need for it. If you want to know anything, you should ask me, not the social workers.

Resistance to the Follow-up Interviews

The most serious of the charges and resistance points encountered involved the opposition of the professional staff of the Center to having their clients contacted for follow-up interviews, on the grounds that release of their names to interviewers would be a breach of confidentiality and that being interviewed could be emotionally distressing.

To satisfy the first of these objections, elaborate steps were taken to protect the clients' right to privacy. Before any names of clients were released, each widow received a letter explaining the nature of the study and enclosing a postcard form on which she could check, "I do not wish to be interviewed." In that case, her name was not released by the Center at all. The steps taken to protect the confidentiality of information given by those widows who agreed to be interviewed were unveiled by the Center's staff like a precious gem. The name and address of the client was to appear only on a separate top sheet. Before the interview was coded or could be seen by anyone other than the interviewer and myself, this identifying information was to be physically removed by the personnel at the Center and replaced with the case history number.

The staff of the Center were also concerned that even though they had tried to screen out the most emotionally fragile clients, the interview might reactivate feelings of grief and distress for many clients, especially if not handled with great sensitivity. These concerns were formally expressed in a letter to the evaluator by the founders, who had become Chairman and President of the WCC:

In the interests of arriving at a sound evaluation, of good public relations, and above all, our profound concern with the feelings of already traumatized individuals, we would emphasize the importance of selecting skilled interviewers, sensitive to the fact that these are women who have, in most cases, not yet recovered from a devastating experience.

Only experienced, mature interviewers were recruited for the project. This was accomplished by offering a rate of pay considerably above the market. Pretests and some of the interviewing was done by the author. The other three interviewers were a social worker experienced in individual casework, and two professional interviewers trained and employed by NORC. Despite the assurances that the interviewers would be capable and closely supervised, the Center's staff continued to vent their fears and objections. The evaluator was left in the uncomfortable position of simply insisting that with the sensitive and well-trained interviewers...
that would be used, the interview experience would generally be a cathartic one for the widows. There was no evidence that could be found to "prove" this to the satisfaction of the staff, and a crisis point was reached with vaguely veiled threats traded of resignation by the professional staff and a cut-off of funds by the sponsor. The matter was left to "stew" for a few weeks, and eventually the first list of client names was released by the Center.

The interviews were carefully monitored to make sure that the experience was not turning out to be a distressing one for the widows, by having the evaluator personally conduct the initial set, and then by having the interviewers return all completed interviews immediately and complete a report form on the interviewing experience. Based on the information on the "interviewer report forms" filled in for each interview and on the scarcity of complaints to the Center or to the evaluator, one can conclude that the reaction of the clients was generally favorable toward the interview experience. Ninety-two per cent of the widows interviewed were reported by the interviewers to be completely cooperative. Most widows found the interview enjoyable because it provided them with a sympathetic ear. They seemed to view it as an extension of the service of the Center, a chance to talk freely and confidentially about problems.

The interviewers were instructed to go out of their way to make the interview a supportive, pleasant experience for the widow, even though this might mean listening to a person "ramble on" about a problem that was bothering her, far beyond the direct response to a question which would be codable for purposes of the study. On the other hand, the interviewers were directed not to give advice, even if asked, but to suggest that the widow might call the Center.

Occasionally, the interviewer stumbled into a crisis situation, which could not be referred to the Center. Here is an example of an interviewer's report on the type of situation in which a helping role combined with the research role:

Mrs. D. was periodically confused and preoccupied during the interview... Finally, in response to her last two answers I asked again what was the matter... She then opened up. She apparently had been feeling dreadful the last two days. She wanted to go to the hospital... I encouraged Mrs. D. to call her daughter... helped her to plan the call, find the number, plan how to get to the hospital... I then spent half an hour helping her to get ready to go to the hospital, dress warmly, find the $20 she had misplaced, etc.

To summarize, a purely research interview would be concerned with getting "facts" and leaving. During the first pretests, I found that widows tended to view the interviewer in the role of a kind of "extension service" from the Center. What had to be done in this interview situation was to make sure that the interviewers would be supportive and helpful whenever possible, but not take on a counselling role for which they might not be trained. It is probable that evaluation research involving interviews with clients of any type of social service might encounter similar types of problem situations and similar
opportunities to serve as a liaison with the caseworkers when a client seems to need more help.

Results of the Research

What did all this painfully negotiated evaluation effort come to? After three years of research effort, the computer outputs from the case histories and follow-up interviews and the hundreds of pages of transcripts of interviews with staff presented a veritable mountain of data. The data were presented in a lengthy report which concluded that the Center was an effective source of support and help for recent widows. However, those who were footing the bill looked at the same data and concluded that the service was not worth the cost.

A procedure which could possibly have averted the negative decision by the funder would have been to negotiate detailed "goals" for the pilot project ahead of time, in very precise terms. In this case, an agreement could conceivably have been reached before the follow-up interviews on exactly what constituted a "client"; what percentage of clients saying the service had been a "great deal of help" would constitute "success"; and exactly what kinds of costs and client flow levels would be considered acceptable. This would have gotten the quite different expectations of the professional social workers and the corporate philanthropists out into the open at a point at which no money was immediately involved, and eventual agreement might have been reached. As soon as the research instruments have been designed, these negotiations might be made by evaluators for future projects.

Although the evaluation did not result in its primary purpose from the agency's point of view, of motivating continued support from the sponsor, it was useful in other ways. Feedback from the evaluation resulted in several changes in and additions to the agency's services, which proved popular with clients and satisfying to the social workers. The existence of complete tapes of group discussion sessions, for instance, had the unanticipated consequence of facilitating transfer of the therapeutic discussion groups to new leaders when this became necessary. In addition, a summary of the findings was utilized to obtain support for the Center in the future from a combination of sources, including private insurance companies, foundations, and the Greater New York Fund. Currently, the Center not only continues to function in New York but has inspired efforts to establish similar services in Winnipeg, Canada and in Hartford, Connecticut. The evaluation report, with its documentation of the problems and successes of the first three years efforts of the Widows Consultation Center, can help launch these programs by enabling them to build upon the experience of the pilot program.

Conclusion

Once having identified the existence of structurally induced misery and poverty among widows, the "rational social scientist" model of action would seem to dictate the generation of institutionalized means of dealing with the problem, and a careful evaluation of the effectiveness of the attempt at social engineering. Multiple difficulties beset this effort in the case of the Widows Consultation Center, however. At the present stage of development of evaluation research, the resistance to research on their clients among social workers and the ethical questions
raised by the establishment of control groups meant that the data collected were incomplete in many respects. The lack of existence of any standards of comparison for "success rates" among similar kinds of service agencies make it difficult to conclude whether this institutional innovation is doing a relatively good or bad job in helping its clients to restructure their lives. Nevertheless, with great patience, it is possible to negotiate research procedures which are acceptable to social workers; to interview clients about very personal and troublesome matters without damaging their emotional balance or their relationship with their caseworker; and to produce data which can be useful to the agency.
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From the beginning of its interest in undergraduate instruction, the Council on Social Work Education has stressed the importance of a broad liberal education for baccalaureate social workers. Such emphasis was restated twice in subsequent CSWE documents, and more recently in other materials which enunciate the standards for the new undergraduate accreditation process commencing in 1974. It is much easier to state the notion of a general education than it is to describe its content and character and there is a tendency to become ambiguous. We are prone to resort to a high level of generalization in characterizing a "general education" and in delineating its parameters. When discussants do achieve specificity and become explicit, then lack of consensus often appears, e.g., should or should it not include foreign language, the fine arts, natural science, and so forth. It is nonetheless important that serious consideration be given to this matter since the majority of social workers in the nation continue to be persons holding only the undergraduate degree.

In the study reported here there has been the attempt to examine what content, in fact, has been part of the student's formal work as an undergraduate. No presumption is made that such courses collectively constitute an ideal liberal education, whatever that may be, but rather hopefully it will be instructive as to what has happened recently in one social work program in a school which purports to be liberal arts in orientation and is, perhaps, fairly representative of baccalaureate programs. The question is restricted to formalized courses per se, not because this is all of education within a college or university nor necessarily the majority of it, but because it is easiest and most feasible to objectify and survey. This writer is convinced that much education and learning, perhaps most, takes place outside the academic paraphenalia of courses, classrooms, texts, and lectures, but this larger experience almost escapes measurement because of its fluid and open qualities.

SETTING AND PROGRAM

In 1973, an analysis was made of the records of all students majoring in social work who graduated with the Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Iowa in 1971 and 1972. There were 195 such persons, 91 the first year and 104 the second. The University enrolls approximately
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20,000 students totally. Included in the institution are undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs organized as the Colleges of Business Administration, Dentistry, Engineering, Law, Liberal Arts, Medicine, Nursing, and Pharmacy. The School of Social Work with graduate M.S.W. and undergraduate B.A. programs is located within the College of Liberal Arts along with six other schools and a large number of departments.

Students in the University have the following basic requirements if working toward a B.A. degree:

**Basic Skills—rhetoric—eight hours (two semesters)**
- physical education—four hours (usually two semesters)
- mathematics—one course for students with less than 2½ years of high school math and a standard score below 23 in the mathematics section of the ACT tests.

**Foreign Language**—two years (12 to 14 hours), unless reduced by prior study in high school.

**Core Areas**—eight hours (two semesters) in each of the following:
- (1) historical-cultural, (2) natural science, (3) literature.
  A fourth core area in social science, required of students generally, is waived for those majoring in social work because of social science courses specifically required for this major, e.g., sociology.

Because the above are general liberal arts requirements they are uniform for all students, although offering a number of options particularly in each of the core fields, and they were not included in this survey.

What was not known at the outset of this study was what courses students take as electives and to fill out areas of concentration in conjunction with the major. It was the purpose of the study to ascertain these in order to have solid information about student's actual education rather than general impressions. The requirements for a social work major at the University of Iowa have been revised and expanded since the time these students were in school but, during 1971 and 1972, a student in this field was required to take four introductory courses in the social and behavioral sciences, one each in sociology, psychology, political science and economics. The required social welfare and social work courses included an introductory survey course, Social Welfare Program and Policy, Social Work Methods, and Field Experience. Other offerings in social work were available on an elective basis. Finally, students took fifteen hours in one single department of their choice from the following twelve alternatives and six hours from the other group, either social sciences or humanities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Amer. Civilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polit. Science</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>European Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Thought</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which specific courses are taken within the fifteen and six hour concentrations are up to the student, although a list of recommended courses is available for student use and consideration. In practice, sociology and psychology are by far the most common choices for the fifteen-hour emphasis and hence the other six hours are usually distributed within the humanities.
In simplified terms, the rationale for the requirements of the social work major include the development of basic knowledge and skills in social welfare and social work, fundamental concepts and principles in the social and behavioral disciplines, strength in at least one related or relatable area outside of social work, and the extension of a liberal education from the perspective of social welfare and social work. Because these are the objectives of the social work major per se they are superimposed on the University's basic general education requirements applicable to all B.A. candidates. In other words, there is strong conviction within the School of Social Work as to the importance of the liberal arts even to the extent of adding requirements of a general nature to the already substantial ones of the University. The School gives more than a nod to the broader education of social work majors, a stance supported by some research. This leads to a position that social work courses should be limited in number, that the focus in the program should be preparation for practice as generalists, and that the student's general education must be protected.

This rationale is seen as compatible with and essential to a program with diverse students and goals, including preparation for beginning practice, graduate education in social work and other professions, employment in related human service occupations, and for effective citizenship participation and leadership. Of these, preparation for practice is seen as primary.

FINDINGS

For most students majoring in social work, the program as described leaves some room, often considerable, for electives. This is purposeful in that the social work faculty and students as well as central administration in the University hold to the importance of flexibility and individualization as reflected in elective opportunities. Within the 124 hours required for graduation, the vast majority of students have at least twenty-four hours of electives after completing all of the previously mentioned requirements, including those for the major. Many students, if not most, have even more than this. It is these purely elective courses as well as the non-social work fifteen-hour area of concentration required for the major that provided the subject for the survey. In a sense, the latter fifteen hours may also be thought of as electives in that the student is entirely free to choose whatever courses are desired as long as they are within one department selected from the twelve prescribed. Multiplicity of courses and departments from which to pick represents still further student choice. Courses utilized for the six-hour requirement were not analyzed due to their smaller scope.

Listed in order of frequency, elective courses taken by the 195 social work graduates were from the following departments and programs:

**Number of Registrations of Social Work Majors by Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Registrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociology*</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science*</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and Drama</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic Art</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Civilization</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In addition to an introductory course which is a specific requirement for the major and therefore was not included as an elective.*

Less frequently taken courses were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Registrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Science</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Regional Planning</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Science</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Literature and Thought</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics and Astronomy</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese &amp; Orient. Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No courses were listed on the graduates' academic records from the following departments and programs in the College of Liberal Arts: Botany, Museum Training, Comparative Literature, and General Science.

The information reported thus far is unrefined and raises additional questions. For example, the fact that these graduates of the University studied more sociology and psychology than any other fields outside of social work is noteworthy but probably not surprising. But which courses in these departments were being chosen from the dozens available? It could be argued that in some cases there is as much diversity, if not more, among course offerings within one department as between departments. Therefore a further step was taken and the records processed to break down the wholesale groupings into specific courses to ascertain more detailed information. This was done in each of the five departments in which students had taken the largest number of courses: sociology,
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5Core courses used as electives after core requirements completed.
6One course each in Geology, Pharmacy, Physical Therapy, Portuguese, Speech Pathology.
psychology, education, anthropology, and home economics, and is shown in the following compilations.

**SOCIOMETRY**

By far the largest number of courses elected by the social work students came from sociology, which is a department entirely separate from the School of Social Work. In order of frequency, such courses are enumerated below. These are in addition to the introductory course which, as noted previously, was a requirement.

### Number of Students Completing Selected Sociology Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Delinquency</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Social Psychology</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Society</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology of the American Family</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnic Relations</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Urban Community</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory, Research and Statistics</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Psychology of Alcohol Use and Community Problems</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Stratification</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (40 courses)</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a social work point of view, it is important to note that many of the utilized sociology courses related at least to some degree to social problems, e.g., Social Problems, Criminology, Juvenile Delinquency, Population, American Family, Race Relations, Urban Community, Alcohol Use, Social Stratification. By contrast, except for introductory level courses, fewer courses were selected in the areas of social theory, social psychology, social institutions, social change, community and population. This is true in spite of the fact that the latter, along with social problems, are all sociology department curriculum groupings which contain courses on the undergraduate level. There is the suggestion that since social work is an applied discipline, students from this field may choose courses they perceive as more "practical" and relevant.

**PSYCHOLOGY**

Somewhat fewer courses were taken in psychology. Beyond the introductory course required for the social work major, the most common choices in psychology are indicated next.

### Number of Students Completing Selected Psychology Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology of Adjustment</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abnormal Psychology</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. to Social Psych.</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development 7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro. to Statist. Methods</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Children 8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology and Measurement</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Measurement</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Disorders in Children</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (29 courses)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7Same as Child Development in the Department of Child Development, but classified separately for purposes of this study.
8Cross-listed with education but classified separately.
9Cross-listed with education but grouped separately.
Interestingly, in a university with an outstanding reputation in experimental psychology, few social work majors selected such courses. Only five students opted for the course, Experimental Psychology I, although six did take Experimental Social Psychology. While speculation might lead one to think that a factor separating social work students from psychology majors would be the greater interest of the latter in scientific and experimental approaches, informal observation suggests that many psychology students too are interested in the human service fields, but often with a greater propensity for research. This is an area for further exploration going beyond the scope of the present project.

EDUCATION, ANTHROPOLOGY, HOME ECONOMICS

Social Work students from the group studied had a total of 226 registrations in education courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students Completing Selected Courses in Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Psychology and Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro.: Elementary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro.: Secondary-School Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Retardation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as students in social work and education are concerned, the desire to increase their employability and provide a sort of "insurance" in an uncertain job market not uncommonly ties together these two fields in the form of double majors.

Not only did fewer students study anthropology than sociology, psychology, or education, but fewer courses were involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students Completing Selected Anthropology Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro. to Study of Culture &amp; Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The World’s Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The "Introduction," a course enrolling over two-thirds of all the students who took anthropology, is described as the comparative study of culture and social organization.

In view of developments in the nation and world in recent years, it is interesting and perhaps perplexing how relatively few social work students elected the course dealing with the American Indian and Urban Anthropology, as well as several courses pertaining to Africans and a course, Spanish-Speaking Peoples of the U.S. Most students' experience with anthropology was restricted to the introductory course. One might speculate that, based on their previous education, students tend to be less familiar with anthropology than many other disciplines such as sociology and psychology, and

\[10\] Cross-listed with psychology but classified separately.

\[11\] Cross-listed with psychology but kept separate here.
therefore are more hesitant to venture into courses that may be perceived as more advanced or specialized than the introduction.

Finally, home economics courses in the programs of social work students were also examined in greater detail to ascertain what kinds of specific subjects were studied. As with anthropology, a single course was heavily used; over two-fifths of those taking home economics courses took Marriage and Family Interaction, which is described as contemporary American marriage and family relationships, including study of mate selection, marriage and family interaction. In some colleges and universities comparable courses exist in a sociology context. Home economics courses were selected as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marriage and Family Interaction</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth &amp; Develop. of Young Child</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Food Study</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Nutrition</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing Design and Selection</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art in the Home</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Child Relationships</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (11 courses)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be surprising that so many social work students took advantage of home economics courses. The fact that a heavy majority of these students were female is undoubtedly a factor given the traditional identification of home economics with women. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that a number of male social work students capitalized on the availability of the course in Marriage and Family Interaction. It should be noted that neither home economics nor education is an option for the fifteen or six hour concentrations, so courses chosen from these departments are electives in the pure sense of the term with the exception of students who may have double majors.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This has been an attempt to report on a study of most of the elective courses taken by students majoring in social work at one midwestern state university. The students attended school principally in the late 1960's and 1970's and all graduated either in 1971 or 1972. Since the group studied numbered 195 and was restricted to one institution, it would appear to be a relatively modest undertaking. Actually it proved to be rather complex for several reasons. Academe is a constantly changing scene, not unlike the larger world, and modifications in curriculum during the time under consideration complicate this kind of research. Transfer students were another factor to contend with in view of differences between educational institutions. Reconciling these differences proved to be difficult but not impossible. Hours of credit, which vary considerably, were not dealt with in this project which is a limitation. The decision was to tabulate courses, not hours, on the assumption that since three hours is the most frequent arrangement, differences in hours is less significant than different course titles.

The survey demonstrated that social work students expose themselves to a wide variety of courses within and in addition to requirements of the University and major department. These diverse offerings tend to fall into a fairly small number of constellations with a heavy emphasis on social and behavioral sciences. Content on human behavior, social problems and the
nature of society is conspicuous. There is reason to believe that in the absence of the required fifteen hour concentration such students would continue to accumulate substantial hours in fields such as sociology and psychology. This concentration has been referred to as elective because of the wide choice the student has on two levels, among departments and among courses within the selected unit. The study confirms that sociology is of the greatest importance to social work students as far as choice of non-social work electives is concerned and it points up that within sociology, courses selected are diverse.

No attempt has been made to define "liberal arts" and it is not being suggested that these particular graduates are necessarily liberally educated persons. It is the conviction of this writer that social work well taught both contributes to a general education and benefits from inclusion in such a learning context. That social workers need to be broadly educated there can be little doubt. It is to be hoped that with the developments around preparation for practice on the undergraduate level the general education of students will not be ignored. There is nothing in undergraduate accreditation or the idea of preparation for practice that calls for unnecessary course proliferation within the major at the expense of the student's total educational experience.

A college or university is a veritable treasure house for the fulfillment of human potential. Most people probably travel this route only once as students, even with today's emphasis on continuing education. It is essential therefore that we fully capitalize on all that an institution of higher learning has to offer, tap it wisely and exploit it thoroughly. In social work emphasis is placed on the whole person; in education we need to think of the whole person also and the total college or university of which the student and education are a part. The more we know about the elective possibilities within our respective institutions, the better. This would appear to be especially true for departments such as sociology that seem to be perceived as extremely relevant by the social work students in this study.

Finally, the need for further research is apparent. Comparative studies could be done of different schools at the same time and single schools over time when programs have changed. It would also be useful to compare educational content of social workers with that of nurses, teachers, non-specified majors and others. And more needs to be known about our graduates' views of their education. Knowledge acquired through such research would be advantageous in curriculum planning for the baccalaureate workers of the future.
Introduction

Innovation and Involvement

There has been a dramatic increase in the number and variety of human service organizations in recent years. Federally inspired programs in health and welfare as well as nongovernmental attempts at providing such services appear to account for much of this increase.* Of particular interest in this regard are neighborhood health centers (NHCs) and free clinics.

These organizations share common characteristics with other types of community service organizations that Fenn (1971) has termed "contemporary service organizations." Fenn compares contemporary and "traditional" organizations. Traditional organizations are essentially "homogeneous" in board and staff composition, with an orientation toward determining and then implementing programs to serve others. Contemporary service organizations are essentially "heterogeneous" and seek to combine different elements in the community, especially those who are to be served, in the processes of planning, administration, and service.**

Contemporary organizations seem to be distinguished from traditional ones by four characteristics that can be grouped under the two headings of innovation and involvement (Rosengren, 1970; Colombo, et al., 1969; U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity, 1968; Health Policy Advisory Center, 1971).

Innovation

1. An emphasis upon innovation in administration, operation, and structure.

2. An emphasis upon collaboration with other relevant service organizations.

*Rapid expansion of governmental programs beginning in the mid-1960's (Perlman, 1971) and the "explosive growth" of free clinics from the establishment of the Haight-Ashbury Free Clinic in 1967 to "upwards of 200" operating in October, 1971 (Health Policy Advisory Center, 1971) are two rough indicators of this growth.

**For a similar distinction, see that made by Austin (1970) between "voluntary community service organizations" and traditional service organizations.
Involvement

3. An emphasis upon serving the whole person in a social context; and at least a professed interest in altering the social context.

4. Most importantly, an emphasis upon the participation of those to be served in the processes of planning, administration, and service.

Roots of the Ideas

These emphases are related to a variety of sources. Authors writing on the general subject of community action in the War on Poverty have pointed to a long history of voluntary efforts, beginning with settlement movement origins in the late 1800's, to encourage the participation of low-income people in the affairs of their neighborhoods (e.g., Kramer, 1969). Urban renewal efforts beginning in the mid-1950's required grass roots involvement of citizens as a condition of federal support (Cox, et al., 1970). Community organization reform and service efforts in the United States have recurrently stressed the themes of participation and democracy (Cox and Garvin, 1970). With respect to health care in particular, the roots of the ideas of innovation and involvement have been traced from the early health centers of the 1900's and free clinics of the late 1800's. Stoeckle and Candib (1969) show these ideas as a recurrence of the basic prescriptions of the health centers of the Progressive Era, and Turner (1972) presents similar arguments concerning present day free clinics and their predecessors.

More recent influences which seem to result in the emphases on innovation and involvement are the "gray areas" programs of the Ford Foundation (Krosney, 1966), the pilot anti-poverty programs of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency (Moynihan, 1966) and the revolt against traditional paternalistic welfare programs (Leiby, 1971). All of these factors helped to shape the "remarkable ferment for change" which set the framework for the efforts of the War on Poverty and the movement for participation in decision making and administration in many areas of human relations (Leiby, 1971; cf. Bennis, 1969).

Purpose of This Paper

Innovation and involvement have come to be ascribed an almost mystical potency for the task of bringing more relevant services and more human relationships to clients of service organizations. Many descriptive and hortatory articles have appeared in the social welfare and health literature concerning the virtues of contemporary organizations exhibiting these characteristics, but little in the way of hard thinking about their real implications to service organizations has been done. The majority of the articles are reprises of proposals, or accounts of the first year or two of a program, with an emphasis upon positive prospects or accomplishments and little critical analysis beyond that.
Much of the literature in organization theory suggests that the problems of survival and imperatives placed upon the organization from the outside and inside will force innovative organizations to become more like currently existing organizations which perform the same or similar functions. For example, Rosengren (1970) has conjectured that, despite "scanty" empirical evidence, organizations may possibly follow quite inexorable careers with discernible stages from beginning to end. If such a phenomenon as an "organizational career" (Rosengren, 1967, 1968, 1970; Lefton and Rosengren, 1966; Rosengren and Lefton, 1969) does exist, then it may be necessary to reconsider the placement of so much value on the emphases of innovation and involvement of clients in organizations.*

Following will be a brief sketch of the theoretical position taken in this paper, and of various propositions proffered by organization theorists with a view toward considering:

1. The possible gap between rhetoric and reality about contemporary service organizations.

2. Some thoughts about service organizations and a line of research implied by this short review.

The thesis of this paper is that contemporary organizations may not be "new" organizations in terms of being novel approaches to the problem of organizing service structures, but rather "new" organizations in terms of age alone.

Related Theoretical Background

From the perspective of this paper, service organizations in health and welfare are defined by the work that they do, and the context in which they do that work. This is in contrast to other perspectives, which conceive of organizations as cooperative systems, decision-making systems, compliance structures, institutions, or bureaucracies (see, for example, three summaries of the literature: Blau and Scott, 1962; Thompson, 1967; Rosengren and Lefton, 1969). The perception and definition of the materials processed (in the case of service organizations, primarily their clients), as well as the perception and definition of the way in which these materials are processed (the technology, or work done in the organization) are assumed to have a decided effect upon organizational structure and operations.

*Unsystematic conversations in recent months with experts and workers in NHCs and free clinics seem to indicate that initial high expectations for these agencies have not always been realized. "Floundering," "innovations which got lost," "never getting off the ground," and "becoming establishment" were some of the descriptions given of organizations.
The works of Thompson, Rosengren and Lefton, and Perrow are the major contributions to this perspective. Thompson (1967) conceives of an organization as "an open system, hence indeterminate and faced with uncertainty, but at the same time as subject to criteria of rationality and hence needing determinateness and certainty." Thompson persuasively suggests that the central problem of organizations is that of coping with the uncertainty posed for the organization by its technology and its environment. He also suggests that differences in the sources of uncertainty will result in dimensions of difference in organizations.

Perrow (1967, 1970) takes the position that perceived differences in the nature of the clientele as well as the confidence of the organization members in the efficacy of the work methods of "people-processing" organizations leads to important differences in organizational structure and process. Rosengren and Lefton (1969) place primary importance on the manner in which clients are perceived by the organization and the effect of this perception on the internal structure and dynamics of the organization. According to their perspective, organizations attempt to intervene for various lengths of time in the lives of their clients, and with varying scope and intensity.

Innovation

Rosengren and Lefton (1969) argue that service organizations are likely to begin with a broadly focused and short-term style of intervention into the lives of their clients, and that they "drift" as they age toward a narrowly focused and long-term orientation. NHCs, with their emphasis on comprehensive continuing services appear to strive for a broadly focused and long-term orientation. According to Rosengren and Lefton, this would be an attempt to mix the characteristics of new and old organizations (Rosengren, 1970). Many factors which mitigate against such an orientation toward clients have been suggested by organization theorists.

First, we will consider some ideas as to why organizations choose a broad focus on the client initially. Then some reasons why this might not be a viable long-term goal will be explored.

Stinchcombe (1965) has made the point that new organizations rely heavily on establishing social relationships with "strangers," and these relationships tend to be highly unstable and subject to change. As noted above, organizations, under norms of rationality, seek to regulate and stabilize the effects of uncertainty. This is because all organizations seek to minimize the impact of extra-organizational influences upon their members, to promote a high degree of specialization in order to ensure efficiency and competency, and to control as completely as possible the variabilities in their environment (Perrow, 1970).

The degree of stabilization and regulation of uncertainty varies among organizations, and within organizations over time. Where the environment of the organization changes too rapidly to be controlled or compensated for, and/or where tasks are too variable and ill-defined to
permit maximum specialization, a high degree of structure, specification, and control is not possible.

Especially in the early stages of development, the organization must seek means other than structure and specification to achieve some control over the uncertainty and variability it faces in attempting to relate with "strangers." Diffuse pressures from rapidly changing and uncertain environments tend to produce a decentralized authority structure, and a high level of interaction among members, causing the organization to rely heavily upon informal structures and processes (Downs, 1967; Udy, 1965). One consequence of this situation might be that newer organizations appear to be more innovative than older ones simply because there is a less formalized structure.

One way an organization might try to overcome the uncertainty inherent in dealing with "strangers" is by offering a wide variety of services in order to attract a large number of clients to compensate for the tenuous, unstable initial relationships. Rosengren (1970) has pointed out that this is consistent with Thompson's (1967) idea that organizations seek to anticipate changes which cannot be absorbed nor controlled.

A wide variety of services also attracts a heterogeneous clientele, leading to a broad base of support from many sectors of the community. This variety serves to begin to link the organization to a larger "organization set" of relevant organizations (Evan, 1966).

A broad focus of intervention is also related to the reasons that new organizations are established. One of these reasons is to offer new services or combinations of services for which the founders of the organization perceive a need (Stinchcombe, 1965; Downs, 1967; Rosengren, 1970). In doing either of these two things, offering new services or new combinations of services, organizations are essentially engaged in novel, untried behavior. Rosengren (1970) feels that organizations, in trying to do something which has not been previously done and with which they are not comfortable will attempt to achieve through scope what they are not sure of achieving through depth.

Broad combinations of service make the organizations especially vulnerable to problems of cohesiveness and control. The presence of a broad range of services demands the participation of multiple professionals and other workers with multiple ideological and technological orientations. The NHC "health team concept" (Parker, 1972) is an excellent illustration of this. The various points of view held by various professionals lead to status problems, goal dissensus, and allocational rivalries.

As Udy (1965) has proposed, the more complex the technology, the greater the reliance upon administration. This may partially be accounted for by the need to regulate internal relationships between contending factions. This, in turn, leads to greater structure (or bureaucratization), routinization, and standardization. The result may be a reduction in the scope of services, or a lack of integration of services, resulting in the very fragmentation of the client that the contemporary organization set out to avoid.
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Involvement

In considering the concept of client involvement in relation to contemporary organizations, as defined in this paper, it is useful to think of the organizations as similar in many ways to voluntary associations in which the main goal is to serve the purposes of the members, rather than to think of them as purely client serving organizations where societal control of deviant or unacceptable behavior is the primary goal. For example, Rosengren (1970) has the opinion that client serving organizations may be quite far along the road to becoming, at least in an approximate sense, voluntary organizations. Curtis and Zurcher (1971) make a similar comparison in their review of empirical research done on client participation in OEO programs. They refer to these participatory programs as "voluntary formal organizations."

It is well to keep two things in mind when using this analogy. First, as has been amply documented (see Curtis and Zurcher [1971] for one of many examples), participation is generally found to be inversely related to indicators of social class and status. So, the poor whom these programs are aimed at are more often "represented" than "participating." Second, we should consider the caveat of the dean of all modern organization theorists, Chester Barnard (1938). He wrote that "the most ineffective services in a continuing [organizational] effort" are those of volunteers. They are motivated by nonmaterial incentives and have too great a personal investment in their work, which results in "internal friction and many other undesirable consequences."

These considerations, especially the latter, bear upon the placing of importance on client involvement in organizations. The provision of broad, comprehensive services, as well as "full" membership for clients in the organization, involves inducting much more of the client's personality into the organization than a more categorical, specialized approach. "This institutionalization of client latent roles is potentially disruptive to the organization" (Rosengren, 1970). The organization itself becomes the target for manipulation, especially in the case of NHCs where one of the primary goals is employment of the poverty clientele.

People who have worked within or with OEO agencies and programs have experienced the contentiousness over paid positions that often exists in such programs. Often staff members have been ousted by boards with board members or their friends ending up in paid positions. In free clinics, there is also often a progression from client to volunteer or board member roles, and ultimately to paid staff positions. This is neither good nor bad in itself. In fact, many look upon this situation as one of the strengths of the contemporary organizations. But it is an important factor to be considered in trying to understand the dynamics of these organizations.

Parsons (1970) has pointed out that "the consumer in service organizations has to take a more or less active part in the production of services he is expected to consume." The fact that "people-processing" organizations must deal with a much more difficult and capricious raw
material than other types of organizations makes task accomplishment extremely difficult. Coupling that with extending full membership in the organization as opposed to the more traditional client status makes things even more difficult organizationally, more costly in terms of expenditure of human and organizational resources, and less conducive to organizational stability.

Over time, the organization will attempt to limit the scope and intensity of the involvement of the consumer in an attempt to reduce internal tension and strain. Udy (1965) addresses a parallel to this point when he proposes that informal organization generates pressures for centralization of administration in response to role conflict. In essence, institutionalization of involvement and innovation institutionalizes role conflict for staff, board, clients, and client-members of the organization. To expect individuals and organizational structures to exist in a permanent state of role conflict may be unrealistic.

Summary

Coupling broad long-term involvement in the client's life with full participation by clients in the organizational planning, administration, and service provision processes can apparently lead to great potential for disruption of ongoing, rationalized organizational processes. And ongoing rationalized processes are, after all, what organizations are created to carry out.

This brief, selective review of some thoughts about organizational processes indicates that there is good reason to suspect that new service organizations, "contemporary" or not, tend to begin as unroutinized, unstandardized, and unbureaucratic. These are some of the organizational characteristics that the advocates of contemporary organizations support and strive for. But pressures for survival, adaptation, and development seem to act on organizations over time to move them toward routinization, standardization, and bureaucracy. On one hand, if routinization occurs in contemporary organizations, it is often seen as a loss of the initial promise of the organization. On the other hand, pressures from the environment and from the internal organizational work processes may serve to impede the process of routinization, placing an unbearable toll on the staff and members of the organization, which in turn is also seen as a loss of promise, and will lead to routinization or dissolution of the organization.

Actually, it may be that contemporary organizations appear to be different from traditional organizations only because they are new, and not because they are really basically different. If this is indeed the case, then there was never any special promise to lose. The limitations on the imagination and ingenuity of persons interested in providing "more relevant" services such as those aspired to by NHCs and free clinics, each in their own way, may be more compelling than we like to admit. Perhaps "innovation" and "involvement" are just new ways of packaging the same old services and organizational arrangements of traditional health and welfare service and reform efforts. One of the interesting
comments that a free clinic worker made about a three-year-old free clinic in his city was that it was "part of the establishment." His own clinic was only a few months old. In two or three years someone may be alluding to his clinic in the same way.

Implications for Research

It seems that further research into whether or not such a thing as an inexorable organizational career exists for service organizations would be a profitable line of inquiry. If such a "career" is found to exist in a fairly regular way among a number of organizations, it may influence planners and administrators to view the consequences of innovation and involvement for organizations in a more realistic manner. From another perspective, it may indicate a revision of thoughts about the financial and human costs of such programs and organizations, and lead to a revision of criteria for evaluating such programs and their accomplishments.

The main point seems to be that we must be suspicious that any really drastic organizational transformation is actually taking place. One way of interpreting the movement for client participation in service organizations is that the professionals have abdicated their responsibilities for creating and sustaining humane organizational structures and have turned over a task they could not carry out to the clients. This gloomy view aside, something does seem to be going on that is different. If nothing else, it appears that the expectations of some clients and some professionals of what a service organization should be, and the values it should embody, are changing. But the hard work of actually creating organizations that incorporate, and more importantly sustain innovation and involvement seems to have barely begun.
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THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ETHNICITY IN STAFFING CORRECTIONS

Alfred J. Kutzik
School of Social Work and Community Planning
University of Maryland*

Until recently the total thrust of efforts to improve the staffing of corrections has been towards the recruitment and development of trained personnel. In the past decade it has begun to be recognized that factors other than training have to be taken into account. Largely as a result of California's groundbreaking Community Treatment Project the personality of staff is now considered by some to be as important as their training and in a few programs those with certain types of personality and training have been assigned to work, i.e., "matched", with juvenile offenders who have consonant types of personality and problems. Although less consistently and influentially, there has also been recognition that the ethnicity of correctional personnel has a bearing on the effectiveness of treatment of offenders, particularly those from minority groups. However, little has been done in the seven years since the first and last discussion of this subject in the literature to implement its conclusion that "cultural differences among offenders" indicates the need for "recruitment of increased numbers (of correctional personnel) from minority groups." There has been some increase in recruiting Blacks, but this has taken place mainly as a fair employment measure because of the new political power of this group rather than out of concern for improving treatment, as evidenced by the fact that very few Chicano and Puerto Rican personnel work with the considerable numbers of offenders from these politically weaker groups in the United States' southwest and northeast. This discussion addresses itself to the failure to recognize the crucial importance for corrections of the ethnicity of its service personnel. It presents a theoretical rationale for and some program and policy implications of such recognition.

The prevailing disregard of ethnicity in staffing correctional programs can be attributed to racism, credentialism and other maladies of our society. Admitting these are contributing factors, I contend that the principal cause is the individualistic orientation of the helping professions and social welfare in general and social work and the field of corrections in particular, reflecting the dominant WASP (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant) ideology of the United States which minimizes the significance when it does not deny the existence of cultural differences and the ethnic groups from which these derive. Since such differences are undeniable in the racially and linguistically distinctive minority groups which have lately been insisting

*With the research assistance of Janice C. Brillson, then graduate student at the University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work.
upon their separate identities, they have finally begun to be at-
tended to. However, even after Attica, conforming to the WASP-mid-

cle class norms of the helping professions to which it looks for

leadership, the importance of ethnic differences is still greatly

underestimated and inadequately responded to by the correctional es-


tablishment. This is manifested in the accepted position that all

that is necessary for staff of any ethnic background to work ef-

fectively with offenders from other ethnic groups is an understanding

of their culture. I contend that even the most competent profes-

sional use of a deep understanding of the offender's culture by staff

different cultural background can not lead to correctional rehabili-

tation. For the latter is a social process through which the offender

"unlearns" anti-social norms and values (social control) and intern-

alizes socially acceptable ones (socialization) of his particular

community, essentially his ethnic group, in order to return to and

assume a constructive role in it. And, as with all social control

and socialization, this can take place successfully only if members of

the offender's ethnic group are among the chief agents of this process,

i.e., the correctional staff.

In their colloquial and political senses, the terms social con-

trol and socialization have problematical connotations for helping

professionals. However, they are used here in the social scientific

sense for the two most general processes of social systems. Social

control has been defined as the process which "tends to counteract

a tendency to deviance from fulfillment of role expectations" and

socialization as the process which instills these expectations,

"develop(ing) in individuals...the commitments and capacities which

are essential prerequisites of their future role performance." It

is obvious that corrections involves social control. However, that

it also involves socialization is not so evident. Other definitions

of socialization bring out its applicability to correctional rehabilita-

tion: "the acquisition of attitudes and values, of skills and behavior

patterns making up social roles established in the social structure;"

"the...process by which an individual [develops] behavior...customary

and acceptable for him according to the standards of his group." While

it is not necessary for present purposes to go much beyond

general definition of this complex phenomenon, two further points must

be made in light of age levels and circumstances of juvenile and

criminal offenders.

Although many psychoanalytical-oriented hold that socialization

takes place principally if not exclusively during early childhood in

the family, it is now generally considered by scientific students of

the subject to be a "continuous process which is going on at all

stages of development" in all social institutions which the individual

participates in. From the foregoing it is clear that corrections

involves the process of socialization, but correctional practice has not

been seen in this light until quite recently. This has been the case

despite the long-understood fact that correctional institutions, as

differentiated from correctional services or practice, are agencies of

socialization. Folk wisdom, practice knowledge, and scientific study

all tell us that, in opposition to their objectives, correctional in-

stitutions tend to function as schools of criminality, i.e., they

socialize offenders into antisocial and criminal roles. What I am
calling attention to here is the relatively new conception of correctional practice as a process of non-criminal socialization or resocialization, replacing the offender's anti-social roles, norms and values (removal through social control) with ones acceptable to his community. Exemplifying this, Studt's 1965 discussion of professional practice in corrections treats it as "resocialization" which is explicitly considered to be a combination of social control and socialization. Similarly, although not using these terms, a 1966 publication reflecting the views of leaders in juvenile corrections and criminology characterizes the treatment of delinquency as "a problem of learning and unlearning."13

If corrections is a process of social control and socialization, what are the implications for the issue under discussion? In general terms, it implies that the basic requirements for these processes must prevail in corrections for it to achieve its goal of rehabilitation, i.e., resocializes and resocializing agents must be participants in the same face-to-face group and members of the same community and subculture of which the group and its norms are a part. Since the most important community for most Americans, particularly those overrepresented among adjudicated criminals and delinquents, is their ethnic group, this implies that the staff of correctional programs must include individuals of the same ethnicity as offenders if resocialization of the latter into their community is to take place.

This conclusion is not concurred with by others who view correctional rehabilitation as resocialization. While they generally agree that it should be patterned as far as possible after the normal processes of socialization and social control and therefore see the need for involving in the resocializing process members of the offender's community, i.e., his ethnic group, they attach no importance to the ethnic identity of correctional staff. For example, Studt holds that "resocialization must be modeled after the primary socializing processes, using the same social and personal resources to accomplish its goals." She infers from this the need for going beyond traditional treatment patterns and organizing for each offender a "resocializing community" approximating his normal community. Due to institutional constraints, in residential programs Studt sees this consisting of certain inmates and staff. It may be assumed that among such inmates would be (if available) members of the offender's ethnic group, for Studt advocates that non-residential programs include in the "resocializing team...significant persons who...live in the [offender's] normal community...among the offender's family, his peers, his employment associates...." While this, in effect, acknowledges the essentiality of the common sociocultural background of resocializes and resocializing agents, it does so only as regards non-staff. The ethnic identity of staff is not even implicitly touched upon. On the other hand, fully half the article is devoted to the many professional skills workers require for carrying out their responsibilities in the resocialization process. In addition to organizing and directing the resocializing team, such skills are seen as enabling the worker to make "a unique contribution to the resocializing process as the person who helps the offender learn from his new social experience."15 But these skills
can be effectively employed in carrying out these responsibilities, particularly the crucial latter one, only if certain social and psychological prerequisites relating to staff and offenders are present. As one of the few discussions of this problem in the literature suggests:

One important factor in understanding why some [juvenile correctional] institutions are able to mobilize inmate support for staff goals of [rehabilitation], and why some inmates are effectively socialized by their institutional experience, while others are not, is the social-psychological process of identification. Unless inmates come to accept staff members as significant others, unless they come to feel a part of the institution so that its goals become their goals, we can hardly expect the staff to enlist the aid of the inmate culture, or to be successful in its task of people-changing.16

I contend that a major if not the principal obstacle to the acceptance by offenders of staff as "significant others" in the resocializing process is their different ethnic identities. The characteristic failure of offenders to feel part of the correctional resocializing system dominated by ethnically different staff is not, as generally supposed, mainly the result of prejudice. Even when mutually respectful relations exist, it is primarily due to the fact that ethnically disparate staff and offenders have different, more or less conflicting conceptions and expectations of social roles and the values and norms they incorporate. One recent discussion makes essentially the same point.

Life style, perception and value systems vary. They are different in kind in different classes and ethnic groups, not only different in degree. Moreover, not only the contents of the value systems differ, but also the way they are organized and transmitted....Our trouble [in corrections], then, has to do with value -- heterogeneity in time and place, with occupational, class, regional and ethnic variation, all of which could be complementary and compatible, but evidently are not. There is a clash of values, goals, and philosophy.... If there is an important difference between his ["the correctional worker's"] cultural background and that of his clients, he is a stranger in more ways than one to the very people with whom he is expected to work.17

The absence of consensus on role definition and role expectations which this passage brings out is what, in our view, makes successful resocialization of offenders of one ethnic group by staff of another extremely difficult if not impossible.18

If one accepts the validity of this position, does it follow that only staff of the same ethnicity as offenders can provide them effective correctional services? No. From what is known of the processes of socialization and social control, although desirable it is not necessary for the worker who has the one-to-one counseling
relationship with the offender to be a member of the latter's ethnic group. For, like all socialization and social control, correctional resocialization is a social process in which many individuals and groups take part. This is why Studt insists upon a "resocializing team" or "resocializing community" rather than exclusive reliance upon the traditional one-to-one counseling approach. However, it does follow that the resocializing team should include staff of the same ethnic background as the offender in positions of authority. Not only so that they will be among the "significant others" that the offender is resocialized by but that being part of the resocializing system they facilitate and maintain the offender's identification with it leading to his "accept(ing) its goals, values, and norms as his own." In stressing the importance for resocialization of such "institutional identification" as both alternative and complement to identification with given individuals, Adamek and Dager note that the former can be brought about by various organizational strategies. But, as with all other writers on the subject, they do not relate these to ethnic identity of staff and offenders.

Seven years ago, the proceedings of the only conference to date on cultural differences in corrections concluded:

Certain correctional systems are now experimenting with attempts to classify offenders by psychological type and match these with correctional workers. Similar experiments need to be undertaken in matching worker and offender in terms of cultural variables. The need for this has been underscored by the findings of the major study of psychological matching that there are very different proportions of certain personality types among offenders of different ethnic groups and that the typology being used can not be applied to substantial numbers of Black and Chicano offenders.

Studies of the effects of ethnic similarity and difference in staffing corrections should include, but not be limited to, matching worker and offender. From the viewpoint of correctional rehabilitation, it is important that they also compare the effects on offenders of institutions and staff teams of varying ethnic composition. Many such studies are needed to guide practice and policy in this area, but I submit that there is already substantial evidence supporting the view that the ethnic factor is a significant one in staffing corrections -- that, in fact, it is significant in staffing all social services -- and that administrators and other correctional personnel are professionally obligated to address themselves to this issue without delay.

While further complicating an already complex issue, in doing so the fallacy of considering only racial and linguistic minority groups to be ethnically distinct should be avoided. Recognizing analogous sociocultural differences among Italian, Jewish, Polish, etc. "whites" and adopting the approach advocated by this paper towards them as well as Blacks, Chicanos, Indians, Puerto Ricans, etc. may seem an insuperable administrative problem. However, it could turn out to be less a
problem than an essential component of programs more effectively dealing with the problem of correctional resocialization.

FOOTNOTES


2. Ethnicity here denotes the sociocultural identity deriving from membership in "any group which is defined or set off by race, religion, or national origin, or in some combination of these categories." Milton M. Gordon, Assimilation in American Life (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 27-28.


4. Despite considerable change in the direction of social modalities of helping in accord with the cultural identities of those helped, the professions are still on the whole subject to the critique on this score written three decades ago by Kingsley Davis, "Mental Hygiene and the Class Structure" in Patrick Mullahy, ed., A Study of Interpersonal Relations (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1949).

5. For example, see the views of officials of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training in the "Foreword" and "Introduction" to McKnickle, op. cit.


9. Ibid., p. 687 and Clyde Kluckhohn, "Culture and Behavior" in *ibid.*, p. 922. For a discussion of "socialization in extra-familial social systems" see Parsons, *op. cit.*, Chapter VI.


14. It must be noted that the crucial importance of ethnicity is not called into question but supported by the importance of social class. For each ethnic group has its own social class structure which supersedes that of the larger society for its members. See Gordon, *ibid.*


16. Despite the importance attributed to the worker in the last citation, Studt considers his direct role in helping the offender "learn" only one of the many factors involved in resocialization. In our view it is (typically) the primary factor. For the primacy of correctional staff in resocialization due to their superior position, reciprocal relation and control of reward and punishment vis-à-vis the offender see Adamek and Dager, *op. cit.*, p. 932.
17. Ibid. "People changing" is equated by Adamek and Dager with socialization which is considered the "business of such [juvenile correctional] organizations."


19. The importance of role consensus and complementarity for resocialization is discussed in some detail by Studt, who includes correctional staff and other "specialists in remedial services" with members of his family and community among "the offender's role partners (who) together provide the human relationships that are the basic tools of any socializing process and...resocialization." Studt, op. cit., p. 221.


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. 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-CL-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 regulations. 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, versa. Limited resources constrain organizations to employ more efficient, bureaucratic modes of activity. Thus, in general, it be expected that the more limited the amount of resources available to a given agency, the smaller will be the proportion of its resources allocated to social service activities.

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:XII-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 urban 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF RESOURCES (TIME AND PERSONNEL) ALLOCATED TO SOCIAL SERVICES, BY TRAINING OF DIRECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).  

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). 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Policy Regarding the AFDC Program</th>
<th>Departmental Objective (% of Resources)</th>
<th>Personal Preference (% of Resources)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Concentrate on Legally Defined Obligations to Clients</td>
<td>40.6 (79)</td>
<td>42.0 (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Go Beyond Existing Provisions to Help Clients</td>
<td>54.4 (89)</td>
<td>49.6 (125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>13.8***</td>
<td>7.6*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M.S.W.</th>
<th>No M.S.W.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clients Helped</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Assistance</th>
<th>Child Welfare</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients Helped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>14.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Workload</th>
<th>≤20 Welfare Workers</th>
<th>&gt;20 Welfare Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥1000 Applications</td>
<td>&lt;1000 Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Allocated to Social Services</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Heavy)</td>
<td>(Medium)</td>
<td>(Medium)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(70)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients Helped</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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. 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Resource Allocation</th>
<th>Primary Goal of the Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>+ .199*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td>- .179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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). 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Goal of the Agency</th>
<th>Adequacy of Funds Compared with Other Agencies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>63.8 **</td>
<td>44.5 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Resource Allocation</th>
<th>M.S.W.</th>
<th>No M.S.W.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>-.300*</td>
<td>+.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td>+.258*</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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. 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

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

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Resources Available to Each Agency</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>(% Better Off Than Other Agencies)</td>
<td>47.3 (91)</td>
<td>33.0 (97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>(% Better Off Than Other Agencies)</td>
<td>47.3 (93)</td>
<td>34.4 (96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Facilities</td>
<td>(% Better Off Than Other Agencies)</td>
<td>58.1 (93)</td>
<td>21.9 (96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Has M.S.W.</td>
<td>(% With M.S.W.)</td>
<td>41.2 (97)</td>
<td>18.2 (99)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Numbers in parentheses indicate number of responses to the questions. Non-responses were excluded from the analysis. *p < .05; ***p < .001 (χ²-tests).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Allocation of Resources to:</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Welfare Workers</td>
<td># Welfare Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-20</td>
<td>21-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>40.0 (21)</td>
<td>42.4 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td>48.3 (21)</td>
<td>51.4 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean % Completely Helped (Effectiveness)</td>
<td>47.6 (13)</td>
<td>50.1 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrate on Legally Defined Obligations</td>
<td>33.3 (21)</td>
<td>35.7 (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Has M.S.W.</td>
<td>22.7 (22)</td>
<td>45.5 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Better Off With Respect to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>28.6 (21)</td>
<td>46.3 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>42.9 (21)</td>
<td>45.2 (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Facilities</td>
<td>57.1 (21)</td>
<td>54.8 (42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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