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Our concern today with social science and social welfare policy is in keeping with the purposes and conceptions of the founders of the Society for the Study of Social Problems. In those early days these men and women were idealists— they were reformists, but they also found themselves in an acute state of embarrassment. As humanitarians, idealists and reformists on the one hand, they were concerned about improving the conditions of society to make life more livable for all the people in the society. On the other hand, they were scientists—even though social scientists—and they felt a mandate from their profession and their disciplines to eschew social reforms.

Social science was in the process of becoming more scientific and less social. That required of its practitioners a certain objectivity—a certain dispassionate disclaimer of social reform. Social science was concerned with describing and analyzing what is; what was; the causes and consequences, and the parameters of social behavior. But social science was urged to leave the application of its knowledge and, indeed, even the implications of its knowledge to others; others who were less well-trained; others who had less insight into the nature of these social dynamics and dysfunctions; others who were less well-motivated to engage in social reform. Social scientists said we are simply scientists and not activists or advocates. We only describe and adjust to what is, we do not try to influence what is or what should be. This attitude, one might even say this religious conviction on the part of the dominant social science opinion makers led to a schism between social scientists and social reformers; between science and behavior; between research and action and between theory and policy.

It was an effort to bridge this gap or to resolve this role-conflict in which they found themselves being both scientists and social reformers, that the founders of the SSSP developed this annual forum and its publication. It was, in their mind, a way of calling attention to social problems without abandoning social science. These were brave, courageous and insightful men and women, but they were not brave enough. For they were not willing to join or to organize a movement for social reform. Instead, they stood back a pace or two and decided to study these social problems. This was admittedly a long and innovative step beyond the dominant stance of ignoring social issues, but it was not yet a willingness for social scientists as scientists to become heavily involved in the execution of social change, social reform and social welfare policy.

Today, therefore, as we focus on the topic before us, we are impelled to move a step further. We cannot confine ourselves to the simple study of social issues and social welfare policy, we must be concerned with the analysis of the functions and dysfunctions of those policies from the point of view of social reform of social well-being and of social equality. We must become advocates of those policies and programs that enhance human well-being in our research, in our theories, in our classrooms, in our neighborhoods, in our politics, in the
economic life of the nation, in religion, in communications, in athletics, and so on. This is a call for a new level of consciousness on the part of the SSSP. I suggest that we become a society for the solution of social problems.

Over and over in social science as in social policy, we can see how racism has operated as a barrier to the effective solution of social welfare problems and indeed as a barrier to the effective understanding of these problems. If by racism we mean the systematic negation, exclusion and oppression of members of one racial group by the people, institutions, power, privilege and ideologies of another group, we can see clearly that racism in our society wears a white face. The only kind of racism we have is white racism and those who would speak of Black racism or racism in reverse, for example, would mislead us. For nowhere in the country are Black people arrayed in systematic fashion on the side of the oppressive forces of society utilizing superior wealth, privilege, power, the institutions of society and their own ideologies to systematically negate, exclude and oppress white people. Nowhere is that phenomenon in existence. Everywhere in our society we see just the opposite. Everywhere—including social science and the Society for the Study of Social Problems. This problem is so pervasive that you can almost at random pick any activity of this Society, its annual meetings, the projects it sponsors or any institution where its members are clustered and you will find racism at work.

Intellectual racism, then, is the manner in which men and women of learning conceive of and perceive Black people and Black institutions in negative terms. It is the way foundation executives treat Black scholars and Black institutions as though they are inferior, not as worthy, as qualified or as competent as white ones. It is the way white-dominated sociology departments refuse to change their character of their curriculum in order to embrace the Black presence in America. It is the manner in which social science studies continue to grow more out of the subjective experience of the investigators than out of the objective realities which surround us. So, ideological and intellectual racism abounds in the sacred halls of academe, and in the Society for the Study of Social Problems, and in the minds, attitudes, experience and consequently the behavior of its members.

Perhaps the following incident will illustrate the pervasive nature of the problem. I was idly browsing through the library of a friend just the other day and came upon a book called Applied Sociology: Opportunities and Problems. Many of you will recognize this as a book published in 1965 by this Society for the Study of Social Problems. It was edited by Alvin Gouldner and S.M. Miller, surely two of the more able and representative social scientists writing today. And no doubt many of you have used this book of readings in your studies or teaching or research. And yet, reflect with me, if you will, that this book was published in 1965 which might reasonably be said to be in the midst of the most active decade of social reform since the end of Reconstruction a hundred years ago. The 1960's was the decade that witnessed a massive attack by Black people and a few white people on segregation in the South. It witnessed the birth of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the rebirth of the Congress of Racial Equality, the pinnacle of the influence of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the pre-eminence of the public school desegregation battles waged so relentlessly by the
NAACP and other efforts at radical social reform. Moreover, the decade of the sixties represented the first nationally declared war on poverty which, surely next to racism itself, is the most profound and crippling social problem the nation faces. Further, the nation witnessed during the sixties the most explosive ghetto uprisings in its history in reaction to a whole cluster of social problems which social scientists should have seen more clearly perhaps than any other group. And, that is not all. The 1960's gave us the omnibus Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and a great deal of agitation, but less action on housing reform. Model Cities legislation supplemented the array of antipoverty legislation and Head Start was born.

In short, it does not take a great deal of recollection to be reminded that the decade of the sixties witnessed a nation in ferment with a major focus on some of the more crippling social problems which effect this nation, many of which were informed to some degree by the presence of Black folk in this country, more typically toward the bottom levels of the opportunity and reward structures of the society. So, it might be reasonable to suggest that the Society for the Study of Social Problems volume, published in 1965 in the middle of this decade, would reflect the major lines of this development. You will perhaps be as disappointed as I was to learn, or to be reminded, that of the more than two dozen articles covering the study of a variety of social problems only one was written by a Black person, and that was Charles V. Willie's very excellent article on the influence of community leaders on social welfare policies and practices in Syracuse. One looks in vain for an article by James Farmer on the social problems faced by poor Black people in Plaquemine Parish, Louisiana, or the efforts of CORE to help with the solution of those problems. One looks in vain for an article by Bayard Rustin on the social implications of the freedom rides which some say set off the tremendous Southern movement. Or, what about a piece on the social problems represented by the massive national resistance to the effective education of Black children? Or, perhaps a paper or two on some one of the more prominent social movements of the time. Or, maybe a little piece by Alvin Poussaint on the socio-psychological problems of young Black and white people locked in a struggle with racism, intellectual and otherwise, in their own midst as they attempted to understand and change the massive and more overt racism of the Mississippi Delta. Or a piece on the National Welfare Rights movement which was in its incipient stages, or one on alternatives to the present welfare programs. No, none of these were represented in a volume on applied sociology sponsored by the Society for the Study of Social Problems in the midst of the most active struggle against these social problems the nation has witnessed in modern times.

It might well be that these problems were missing from this volume for the same reason they were largely missing from the annual meetings: because the people most actively involved in them and most knowledgeable about them were not qualified for membership in the Society for the Study of Social Problems, and the social problems they represented were not qualified for study by this Society. To put it more simply, we in the Society were blinded in part by the intellectual racism which has kept the social sciences from being an instrument
for social reform and agents for the solution of social problems. For if we are simply committed to the study of social problems, surely it is much better to study them historically, some years after their emergence as a focal point of interest. Only if we are a society for the solution of social problems is it required that we be actively engaged in their analysis and control and elimination at the same time others are devoting their efforts to these causes.

There is a second major landmark of intellectual racism represented in the annals of social science. It is a contemporary version of the works of Daniel Patrick Moynihan, most especially his study of *The Negro Family: A Case for National Action*, and his infamous memorandum on "benign neglect." I refer now to a fairly recent book by a very highly regarded social scientist. Edward Banfield’s *The Unheavenly City*, is in the forefront of the more recent social scientific treatises which grow out of and feed into a most vicious kind of racism and anti-humanitarianism.

Edward C. Banfield is among the more outstanding social scientists and urbanologists in the nation today. Professor Banfield is author of at least ten major books and monographs on social science, government planning and the cities. Many of us know him for his very authoritative and pioneering work of some years back titled, *Politics, Planning and the Public Interest* done with Martin Meyerson, or his *Government and Housing in Metropolitan Areas* done with Morton Grodzins or his *City Politics* done with James Q. Wilson. His most recent book he authored by himself and that may be the major problem with it.

It is titled, *The Unheavenly City: The Nature and Future of our Urban Crisis*. It draws heavily on all the major social science disciplines and is focused on the social problems most characteristic of life in large scale urban America. It is, therefore, very appropriate to our consideration today of social welfare problems and policy. At the very beginning of his book, Professor Banfield gives us a very important clue to its style as well as its contents. In the very first sentence of the preface, he states, "This book will probably strike many readers as the work of an ill-tempered and mean-spirited fellow." In his second sentence he confirms that it might, indeed, be an accurate impression: "I wouldn't mind that," he tells us, "especially if I did not think that it might prevent them from taking its argument as seriously as they should." Then, describing himself as "well-meaning" and as "soft-hearted" as the next man, he proceeds to lay out an analysis of the social problems of the cities and his proposed solutions to them.

One of the major findings Professor Banfield sets forth in this book is that social class overshadows all other realities in urban life and accounts more than any other complex of factors for the difficulties both individuals and the society face. Throughout the book, he consistently minimizes what many sensitive observers consider to be major, severe and unacceptable social problems. In his introductory chapter, he argues that "Most of the 'problems' that are generally supposed to constitute 'the urban crisis' could not conceivably lead to disaster. They are - some of them - important in the sense that a bad cold is important, but they are not serious in the sense that a cancer is serious." (p.6) And, again, he finds that "there is still much poverty and much racial discrimination. But there is less of
both than ever before." (p. 4) Thus, on his way to making what he considers more important observations, he slides right over two of the nation's most outstanding and crippling social problems, namely racism and poverty.

He continues:

It is clear at the outset that serious problems directly affect only a rather small minority of the whole urban population. . . . the overwhelming majority of people are safely above the poverty line, have at least high school education, and do not suffer from racial discrimination. For something like two-thirds of all city dwellers, the urban problems that touch them directly have to do with comfort, convenience, amenity, and business advantage. (p. 11)

This is a very curious type of analysis for a social scientist concerned about social problems. For even if two-thirds of the nation is "alright Jack" the fact that a third of the nation may be ill-housed, ill-clothed, ill-fed, and ill-treated by the other two-thirds, does not add up to a set of serious problems for Professor Banfield. If that is so, you can imagine what he would think about the problems faced by only a tenth of the population.

Indeed, insofar as this book is concerned at all about Black people, it advances the view that the problems of racism or racial discrimination and even racial prejudice are not major problems. Thus, according to this hypothesis, it is not being Black that causes problems for Black people in this society, but being lower class. His major criterion for social class distinctions is psychological, or the individual's "orientation toward the future." "The more distant the future the individual can imagine and can discipline himself to make sacrifices for, the 'higher' is his class." (p. 47)

Now, if it were possible for a social scientist to be truly objective, he could not possibly come to such a conclusion. Or, if Professor Banfield, whom I assume is an intelligent and honest man could read the social science literature more carefully, critically and sensitively, and if he could become actively involved in the solution of the problems he writes about, and more especially still, if he could live and work sensitively among all socio-economic sectors of the Black community as well as the white community, he might well come to see that the true nature of the reality he is attempting to describe is just the opposite of his description. It is not that the more futuristic a person's orientation is the higher is his social class. In the complex reality of real life, it is more accurate to say that the higher a person's social class, the more futuristic he is able to be. This book, then, is another of the more recent and celebrated social science treatments which inverts the true nature of social cause and effect relationships and places on the shoulders of the victims of social problems the responsibility for causing their own difficulties.

Let us consider Professor Banfield's own analysis of how the lower-class people cause their own difficulties:

At the present-oriented end of the scale, the lower-class individual lives from moment to moment. If he has any awareness of a future, it is of something fixed, fated, beyond his control; things happen to
him, he does not make them happen. Impulse governs his behavior, either because he cannot discipline himself to sacrifice a present for a future satisfaction or because he has no sense of the future. . . . He works only as he must to stay alive, and drifts from one unskilled job to another, taking no interest in the work.

Professor Banfield continues:

In his relations with others, he is suspicious and hostile, aggressive yet dependent. He is unable to maintain a stable relationship with a mate; commonly he does not marry. He feels no attachment to community, neighbors, or friends. . . . resents all authority . . . and is apt to think that he has been "railroaded" and to want to "get even." . . . The lower-class household is usually female-based.

. . . The incidence of mental illness is greater in the lower class than in any of the others. Moreover, the nature of lower-class culture is such that much behavior that in another class would be considered bizarre seems routine. (pp. 53-54)

In his chapter on the problem of unemployment, Banfield concludes that the lower-class unemployed people are largely, though not completely, responsible for their own unemployment. "One important reason, then, why the number of jobs for very low-value labor is declining . . . [is] that those who might do these jobs have been told by parents, welfare departments, and the ever more affluent middle class generally that the small amounts they could earn by doing them are 'peanuts' --too little for a self-respecting person to bother with." (p. 101) He thinks that this is clearly a mistake, and part of the problem, not part of the solution of the problem.

Professor Banfield does recommend making more jobs available, but then adds:

Even if there were a lively demand at high wages for all the labor in the city, however unproductive, some people would remain unemployed. Members of the lower class work only intermittently even if job opportunities are good. Providing for a future, even a week or two away, is not part of their culture; nor will they accept the discipline that a job usually imposes. . . . Resistance to steady work on the part of able-bodied persons is especially strong in the slums. (p. 112)

On careful reflection, The Unheavenly City seems to be a rather more sophisticated, modern, up-to-date, warmed-over version of the Moynihan report. The major exception is that Professor Banfield insists that he is speaking not about Black people, but about lower-class people, and the fact that they are largely coterminous for him is coincidental.

A final observation on the author's conception of the causes, consequences and solutions to the problems of ghetto uprisings:

It is naive to think that efforts to end racial injustice and to eliminate poverty, slums, and unemployment will have an appreciable effect upon the amount of rioting that will be done in the next decade or two. These efforts are not likely to be very serious or, if they are, very successful. . . . they will significantly affect
the factors that produce riots. Boys and young men of the lower
classes will not cease to "raise hell" once they have adequate
job opportunities, housing, schools, and so on. (p. 205)
Banfield continues, "The faster and farther the Negro rises the more impatient he
is likely to be with whatever he thinks prevents his rising still faster and still far-
ther." (pp. 205-206) What then, does he recommend? He advises: less television
coverage of these uprisings and improved police methods and equipment. Finally,
he offers his own type of final solution. "It would seem that the problems posed by
the lower class can be solved fundamentally only if the children of that class are
removed from their parents' culture." (p. 229)
So there we have a fairly representative view of what one of the most suc-
cessful and respected social scientists has found from his life's work and study to
be the problems and the solutions for urban America. The problem in a nutshell,
is the lower-class people who live in the cities. The solution is to restrict their
freedom, police them more carefully, remove their children and place them with
"normal" people, and incarcerate large numbers of lower-class adults in semi-
concentration camps. For the rest, pay them lower wages so that employers will
have incentives to keep them employed. Then wait for another hundred years or
so and the problem will take care of itself. Banfield is not alone. Experts like
him have enormous influence with other social scientists, with policy makers,
government officials, industry and universities and even religious bodies. Little
wonder that Black people, and poor people, and the society at large are in such
trouble.
An even more recent example of intellectual racism which has a crippling
effect on efforts to solve the problems faced by millions of young Black people in
trying to get an effective education is represented by the works of Christopher
Jencks in his massive study, Inequality. During the past year, Christopher Jencks
and his associates at Harvard have published this huge volume summarizing and
interpreting a wide range of social science data which bear on the interrelation-
ships among family background, schooling, and success in the economic areas of
later life. The study has been widely interpreted as supporting the current polit-
ical and social trends away from a focus on meeting the educational needs of
Black youth as a means of improving the conditions of life for Black people and
bringing about a greater measure of equality between Blacks and whites. The
book has been generally viewed as an attack on educational reform while advo-
cating in a vague, general, and unexamined way what the authors consider more
basic economic reforms by means of a redistribution of wealth. It has been
generally criticized for its rather unscientific conclusion that "luck" rather than
education or cognitive ability was responsible for the achievement of individuals,
families and groups in the socio-economic areas of life.
It seemed to many of us to be a wide-ranging manipulation of data ori-
tented by a beginning bias against educational reform, reflecting a great deal of
ignorance of educational matters combined with an inordinate amount of arro-
gance on the part of the investigators, which all added up to be a massive anti-
intellectual undertaking. Having posited the ends of education as making people
rich, it then proceeds to suggest that education fails at this task and that there is no need to reform education in order to make it more effective because it is useless. In his own words, Jencks has described the major findings of the study as follows:

1. Poverty is not primarily hereditary... While children born into poverty have a higher than average chance of ending up poor, there is still an enormous amount of economic mobility from one generation to the next. This means that inequality is recreated anew in each generation, even among people who start life in essentially identical circumstances.

2. The primary reason some people end up richer than others is not that they have more adequate cognitive skills... Equalizing everyone's reading scores would not appreciably reduce the number of economic "failures."

3. There is no evidence that school reform can substantially reduce the extent of cognitive inequality... Neither school resources nor segregation has an appreciable effect on either test scores or educational attainment.

Recently when ten Black social scientists and educators pooled our analysis and reaction to this work, we were at a loss to explain how so well trained a scholar could make so many mistakes in the formulation of the problem, the analysis of it, and the conclusions he drew. In our experience, it would be hard to find an informed group of persons dedicated to the effective education of Black children who would agree with his statement of the ends of education. Likewise, it would be difficult for an unbiased group of methodologists to accept his use of path analysis and the conclusions he draws from it, particularly because of the limitations of path analysis and especially because he left Black children out of the analysis, but included them in his conclusions and inferences. Finally, the conclusions and inferences he draws left us convinced that at best, this was another exercise in mischief on the part of unrestrained and uninformed manipulators of data and ideas. And at worst, it was another social scientific justification for racism and the status quo.

In a very informed working paper presented to our group by Howard Taylor, titled, "Playing the Dozens with Path Analysis," the phenomena of blaming the victim and particularly his parents for his failure in society were carefully pointed out in this work. We concluded, therefore, that "Despite its appearance of scientific sophistication, Jencks' work suffers from a rather long list of methodological pitfalls. Jencks and his co-workers conclude that schooling and related variables make little difference in determining a person's ultimate success in occupational attainment and income. However, the statistical technique used, path analysis, ignores any possible nonlinear relationships that might exist between family background, schooling, and success; it ignores any 'interactive' or 'conditional' relationships; and it ignores all variables or factors in an individual's past life or school environment that would not constitute what statisticians call 'interval scales.'" Furthermore, we were critical of Jencks' acceptance of past studies done under a wide variety of conditions with a wide variety of sampling errors, and treating them as though they were equal and equally valid and true. Finally, because of our own knowledge about the importance
of effective education to the later success of Black people, we could not understand why he would apply the findings of his analysis to Black children since they were left out of his major reliance on path analysis.

Finally, I would call your attention to a new study recently published in Commentary Magazine by Wattenberg and Scammon. When we turn to an analysis of Wattenberg and Scammon's contention that 52 percent of Black families are now securely in the American middle class, we are indebted to a very perceptive analysis written by Herrington J. Bryce, Professor of Economics at Howard University, and Director of Research at the Joint Center for Political Studies sponsored by the University and by the Metropolitan Applied Research Center. Dr Bryce has articles in the August issue of Ebony Magazine as well as in the August issue of Commentary which call into severe question the validity of Wattenberg's and Scammon's research and conclusions. Dr. Bryce raises the following simple, yet penetrating, question of this analysis: "What good is it that black incomes are rising faster than those of whites when the incomes of blacks remain only about 60 percent of that of whites?" And he continues: "It is true, and gratifying, that black family income grew significantly during the past decade [the 1960's]. For example, the median income of blacks in 1960 was $4,236, but today it is just under $7,000. Yet, the U.S. Department of Labor estimates that a family of four needs at least $7,386 to maintain itself at a minimum standard of decency. Half of black families are barely making it, if at all."

What Professor Bryce did not add is that the median white family income during this same period rose to just under $12,000. And that since 1970, the income differential between Black and white has been on the increase; while poverty has been on the decline among white families, it has been on the increase among Black families.

Many of these matters which were critical social problems in the sixties are still critical social problems today. They cry out for solutions based on sound, sensitive analysis and strong advocacy. Consider, for example, the housing situation which has been in a state of crisis for Black people and some other poor people since the end of World War II. Where are the social scientists who have mastered the intricacies of this problem and have developed a consistent, persistent, lifetime dedication to its solution? There are, of course, a few social scientists who have dabbled in the housing field, but they have abandoned it as soon as government grants combined with the dilettantish nature of most social scientists make for movement from one area to another with limited understanding of each and with almost no impact on the problem to be studied or solved.

And when Wattenberg and Scammon decide that more than half of all Black families have now moved into the middle class because median income in the Black community approaches six thousand dollars a year, compared to nearly twelve thousand dollars for white families, it is a curious analysis for sophisticated social scientists, statistical experts and long-time students of population. It is curious on a number of counts, not the least of which is that they eliminate any reference to housing whatsoever. Now all of us know that you can't have or measure middle-class status without reference to housing and neighborhood patterns. It would seem to me that an intelligent concern for housing as a social
problem would produce among social scientists some ongoing analysis of the ebb and flow of housing adequacy for the various sectors of the population. It is true that some sociologists were among the advocate of the movement that led to the Housing Act of 1968 with its goal of constructing 26 million housing units within ten years with six million of those devoted to low and moderate income families. But how many members of the Society for the Study of Social Problems know how the nation is progressing with this very modest and grossly inadequate and disproportionate goal? This legislation provided subsidies for builders, but not for families. And predictably it has fallen far short of its goal, especially for low- and moderate-income families. It is apparently now about to be scrapped by the administration. Will the successor program reflect a systematic analysis of the functions and dysfunctions of the 1968 legislation done by a group of social scientists? And will those social scientists be among the advocates of a sounder and more effective approach to the housing of people? Even so, this new approach promises to give even greater attention and assistance to the construction of homes for the upper-middle-income families. It is hard to escape the conclusion that if such an overwhelming proportion of the ill-housed were not Black and poor, the nation and the nation's social scientists would have paid much more systematic and sustained attention to their needs.

What we say about housing can be said, of course, about a number of other areas in which the social welfare of the Black and poor portions of the population are not being vigorously pursued by social scientists concerned about the study of social problems. The same can be said for health, education and economic security. These are the critical areas of the social welfare of a people. They are the areas where our most critical social problems lie. They need a certain amount of study, to be sure, but not isolated, idiosyncratic studies done primarily so that the author can get another publication to put on his vita or so that he can get promoted and become a leading professor in one of the sociology departments of one of the nation's leading universities so that he will be in a better position to keep women and Black people and brown people from being admitted into the profession. What we need from social scientists is sustained, systematic study done in collaboration with the people most actively engaged in and affected by the problems, together with sustained and systematic action in collaboration with those same forces designed to solve the problem. Then, when we come together annually, we can share our experiences in the struggle. We can share our mistakes and failures, as well as our successes. We can learn from each other and from the people themselves how to fashion both a professional and a national society devoted to the solution rather than study of social problems.

The sociologists in the audience will perhaps forgive me if I close with a reference to a psychologist who seems to have pointed up, with a great deal of precision, the nature of the greatest social problem we face in this country. James Comer, in his new book, Beyond Black and White, has reminded us that "Our social system produces too much uncertainty, fear and anxiety." "This is due largely," he suggests, "to the fact that America has a defect in its executive or leadership structure, and in its ethical or moral structure, similar to
ego and superego defects in an individual." Sociologists are particularly aware of the hazards of making analogies from the individual to the collective and from the structure of personality to the structure of society. And yet, one needs only read today's headlines to appreciate the aptness of Professor Comer's analysis written more than two years before the onset of Watergate. He continues his analogy as follows: "In fact, the behavior of too much of the leadership group resembles neurotic patterns in individuals." These include, "fleeing from responsibility, failing to face up to reality, [and] self-destructiveness."

Now, before we conclude by pointing our collective fingers toward Washington or City Hall, let us remind ourselves that the members and participants in the Society for the Study of Social Problems are all members of the leadership structure in society. And, if you are an established social scientist or social practitioner in one of the established institutions or agencies, you bear a heavy responsibility, indeed, for the level of uncertainty, fear, and anxiety in the land. For much of it is based on inaccurate and misleading information. An awfully large segment of the population and a fairly large segment of our student bodies actually believe that the most severe crime problem facing the nation is crime in the streets. They have not been effectively taught by us about the insidious and pervasive nature of official, upper-class and white collar crime, or what a Black preacher has referred to as "crime in the suites." Middle-class white women actually think that they are in constant danger of being molested by some strange and unknown Black man out of the ghetto because they have not been taught by social scientists that their greatest threat lies in their own communities, their own race, among their own friends, and in their homes. Many people now truly think that Black people have reached equality with white people in most sectors of society and that continued agitation for affirmative action is designed to discriminate against white people and take their jobs and homes and academic positions away from them. They think this, in part, because social scientists concerned about social problems have not done an adequate job and many have abandoned the struggle for equality and have joined with middle America and the political conservatives in attacking Black people and other poor people and all of those who would advocate our cause.

There is a very simple truth which Vernon Jordan of the National Urban League is trying very hard to teach the nation. It might very well become the basis for a rejuvenation of this Society. It is this: What the average Black man wants for himself and his family is very similar, indeed, to what all men want. It consists of a combination of the following: good health, a good job, adequate housing, and a good education for his children. These are the basic requisites for social welfare on the part of individuals and families, and for social reform on the part of the nation. These are among the most critical problems before us. It would be very exciting, indeed, if, at the next annual meeting, our awareness and activities were such as to enable us to bear proudly, informally, if not formally, the appellation and indeed the accusation of being a very vigorous Society for the Solution of Social Problems.
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The way a society deals with its younger deviants reflects the place assigned to youth in that society. In his famous study of European family life, Philippe Aries pointed out that for centuries children shared the same status as adults and were mixed with adults as soon as they were weaned from their mothers at about the age of seven. And so it was possible that in England in 1801, a child of thirteen was hanged for stealing a spoon. A girl of seven was publicly hanged in 1808 and a boy of nine was hanged as late as 1831 for setting fire to a house. But insofar as a childhood status was afforded to the young in early America, the puritans turned their "rude, stubborn and unruly children" over to Masters who would "force them to submit to government". In New York in the early 1800's it was declared that "If a child be found destitute—if abandoned by its parents—or suffered to lead a vicious or vagrant life; or if convicted of any crime, it may be sent to the House of Refuge". And, as Anthony Platt observed, the child saving movement which helped initiate the juvenile court at the turn of the century actually invented large categories of delinquency which had up to that time been handled more or less informally. The new reforms in effect imposed sanctions on conduct unbecoming youth and in effect "sought to disqualify youth from enjoying adult privileges".

Measured against this background of changing perspectives the relative-ness of our own approach to youthful deviance is particularly evident. Obviously, the way youth are treated depends largely on how they are perceived and how their behavior is defined. It would follow that the determination of sound policies must rest on an understanding of the processes underlying these perceptions and definitions. This paper will deal with some of these processes and policies in light of the current labeling perspective on deviance.

Although it may be difficult to acknowledge, we never see things in their total concreteness. We see only certain aspects—those that we have been taught to abstract using the currency of our own cultural symbols. As Walter Lippman expressed in his famous aphorism, "First we look, then we name, and only then do we see." It is in the naming or defining of behavior that we come to "see" or appreciate it as significant for we do not respond to stimuli but rather to our definitions of the stimuli but rather to our definitions of the stimuli. Inasmuch as our behavioral definitions have established cultural connotations, what we see or overlook depends in the final analysis on the concepts our culture provides.
What passes for knowledge and understanding then must center on how we arrive at these definitions. In exploring the sociology of knowledge, Manheim introduced the notion of relationism which held that truth is not necessarily a fixed commodity but is predicated on the historical and situational context in which it is found. As cross cultural studies reveal, our own involvement and narrowed frame-of-reference institutionalizes varying versions of the truth. And, any frame of reference is subject to time and place distortions.

Hence, the early social pathologists, as social reformers, reacted with moral indignation against non-conforming, disruptive and negative behavior. Strongly influenced by their faith in natural law, small town and middle class ideologies they simply assumed that social problems resulted not from defects in the existing institutions but from the acts of individuals who were seen to be either "dependent, defective or delinquent". The social disorganization theorists later moved away from such philosophical pronouncements and held that deviant activities arose from the absence, inadequacies or ineffectiveness of social rules and norms. And then "conflict" theorists, representing still another view believed that deviance was not so much a response to externally imposed values as it was a reflection of a differing set of values.

Increasingly, we are recognizing that deviant behavior is not exclusively the outcome of disruptive and disorganized forces in society but reflects the normal social processes of control which account for conventional behavior as well. Structural functionalists maintain that the normal strains which exist in the social order create conditions of anomie whereby large segments of the population are disproportionately influenced towards deviant adaptations. Meanwhile, labeling theorists in the symbolic interactionism tradition have focussed on the normal social processes which define, label and articulate negative societal reactions which in a sense contribute to further deviant responses. Deviancy in this view cannot be separated from the interpersonal context in which it is defined.

Each of us has his own set of concepts and related assumptions regarding the young and the definition of youthful deviance varies accordingly. The labeling perspective will be considered further inasmuch as it is particularly suited for exploring the processes which affect these definitions.

Basically, the labeling perspective sets forth a set of assumptions about how people define situations. It is concerned with the societal processes whereby a community or society comes to define certain kinds of behavior as deviant, the nature of the labels that get applied, and the consequent actions and reactions of those being labeled as well as those doing the labeling.

It was Howard Becker who made explicit the emphasis on labeling in his often quoted statement that:

...social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying these rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From
this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an "offender." The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label.7

Lemert8 provided an early systematic theory of deviance which held that negative societal reactions played a prominent role in determining deviant behavior. The deviant person in this view is "one whose status, function and self-definition" are influenced and changed by the degree of deviance engaged in, by the nature of its visibility and by the kind of response it brings about. Similarly, "the critical variable in the study of deviance" was seen by Kai Erikson to be, "the social audience rather than individual person, since it is the audience which eventually decides whether or not any given action or actions will be come a visible case of deviation"9.

In assessing others, humans tend to single out and categorize certain features of behavior into what John Lofland10 refers to as "pivotal categories" which define persons and locate their essential status. People by their actions are identified and dealt with in terms of their imputed pivotal status. Since life is too complex for each of us to be able to correlate all the categories to identify and describe what kinds of people do what kinds of things, consistency specialists — otherwise known as behavioral scientists — emerge to keep track of such correlations. Their job is to show the rest of us what kinds of people engage in delinquent acts, take drugs, become members of delinquent subcultures, masturbate, and so on.11

The use of the pivotal category called "delinquent" is not arbitrarily determined but varies to the extent that persons are prepared to impute the category to others. The public is encouraged to recognize categories of deviance through what has been described as a moral entrepreneurship12 on the part of some people who, being convinced that a certain "deviant: exists, mobilize efforts to influence others to recognize his evil character and to do something about it.

Again, the man in the street has relatively little time to identify deviants effectively. This is left to the imputational specialists13 who are specially trained to code and impute meaning to behavior. The growing army of social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists school teachers and police in a sense insure the flow of imputations of deviance for their training alerts and prepares them to identify and detect deviants. Moreover, it is likely that as the number of imputational specialists increases, the number of people imputed to be deviant also increases.

The labeling school has not been without its critics.14 Some have questioned, for example, its theoretical status and prefer to see it as a frame-of-reference which tends to champion the underdog and reflects what Becker acknowledges to be an unconventional sentimentality15. Indeed, if it is a theory, it is not entirely clear whether it is meant to explain
deviance or reactions to deviance. Questions have also been raised regarding how much societal reaction is necessary to bring about a definition of deviancy, the nature of reciprocity involved and whether it is possible to have deviancy at all where the act is secretive and out of the view of others. It has been contended furthermore that the labeling perspective enters the fits well the sociology of the interesting in that the ideas advanced are sometimes considered great not because they are true but because they are simply interesting. Labeling theorists have also been criticized for viewing deviancy in relatively passive terms and for their failure to take note of the more aggressive, political and group responses to and the counter application of labels.

Whatever its shortcomings, for our purposes the labeling perspective does focus attention not so much on the individual child or youth but on the contest in which youthful behavior is being judged and acted upon. And, the emphasis on societal reactions suggests new insights regarding the role played by an informal and formal agencies not only in counteracting but also in initiating and sustaining the very deviance they set out to eliminate.

We turn now to a brief overview of some of the more salient features of our official approaches to juvenile delinquency.

The Official Approach to Juvenile Delinquency: According to the President's Task Force Report on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, one out of every nine children and one out of every six boys will be referred to the juvenile court sometime prior to their eighteenth birthdate. Self reports indicate also that perhaps 90 percent of all young people have committed at least one act which could have brought them before the juvenile court. Official intervention appears to be a universal threat to all children although the detection and disposition of offenders seems clearly to be biased to reflect wide discretion by the imputational specialists. Inasmuch as teachers, social workers, policemen and judges do reflect public attitudes and social class values, it is not surprising to find that "delinquency" rates are disproportionately higher among urban poor, among blacks and among those who are viewed to have "family and personal problems".

The most significant feature of our juvenile criminal justice system is its legal "overreach" or overcriminalization evidenced in the continued search for legal means to solve what are essentially socio-personal problems. As currently conceived, the definition of delinquency includes not only criminal behavior which is punishable if committed by an adult but also a wide range of so-called juvenile status crimes including truancy, incorrigibility, being in danger of living an immoral life, growing up in idleness, etc., which are illegal or objectionable only with reference to children.

As interpreted by Anthony Platt, the juvenile court continues to further the middle class biases of the early child saving movement. Dominated by women who were the "moral entrepreneurs" of the day, the child savers brought attention to and actually invented new categories of conduct which
in the process "consolidated the inferior social status and dependency of lower class youth, denying them the capacity for initiative, responsibility and autonomy".19

The disposition of those adjudicated to be delinquent by virtue of their childhood status differs little from those who have committed criminal acts. A national census of the almost 60,000 youths incarcerated in the 722 institutions throughout the country revealed for example that one out of every four boys and three out of every four girls were being detained because of status offenses.20

Any chain of behavior can be imputed so that a child may come under the jurisdiction of the court. One California judge arguing for the retention of juvenile court jurisdiction over simple juvenile traffic violations illustrated this when he stated:

that the broad powers of the juvenile court can be helpfully invoked on behalf of children whose maladjustment has been brought to light through juvenile traffic violations. A girl companion of a youthful speeder may be protected from further sexual (sic) experimentation. Boys whose only amusement seems to be joyriding in family cars can be directed to other more suitable forms of entertainment before they reach the stage of "borrowing cars when the family car is unavailable."

One negative consequence of this overreach is reflected in the tendency of parents, school teachers and other adults to expect the courts to solve problems which they cannot deal with. Legal definitions, however, tend to be arbitrary artificial and insensitive to the needs of growing children. In effect, recourse to the law narrows considerably the range of diversity permitted youth insofar as prescriptions for conduct tend to be universal and denies important ethnic and cultural variations.

The origins of the juvenile court in America has been compared to the "chaplain's prayer that opens a political convention, graceful and altogether unexceptional, but hardly determinative of subsequent proceedings".22 The court early sought to provide a special type of protection and treatment for juveniles. Through it the child was no longer to be accused of a crime, but was to be offered assistance and guidance; there was to be no stigma or record concerning criminal guilt; hearings were to be informal and held in private. In short, the court would give youth an advantage which would in the words of the early founders "protect its least fortunate junior citizens".
Ironically, it is this same set of conditions which today have raised the most significant legal issues regarding lack of procedural rights for children as revealed in the Gault Decision. To be sure, the struggle today seems more intent on providing equal protection to the young to say nothing of the advantages the procedures were designed to provide. As Justice Fortas pointed out ",..there may be grounds for concern that the child receives the worst of both worlds; that he gets neither the protections accorded to adults nor the solicitous care and regenerative treatment postulated for children." 

In general, our approach to delinquency is based on the over-riding assumption that children and youth are basically incompetent and not entirely responsible for their own behavior. The problem is presumed to lie with the child as it is further assumed that the state through its long established institutions does have the capacity and clear mandate for socializing the young.

Paul Goodman cites an intriguing study which revealed how younger children learned to use gymnasium apparatus under differing conditions. When older children were present and in a sense provided an audience, accidents were frequent; and when adults were present, there were fewer accidents but some children did not participate and some did not learn the apparatus. And interestingly enough when the children were left alone, all of them learned and there were no accidents.

There is some historical evidence that children, preadolescents and adolescents at least in crises situations can create their own societies and realize their potential for self-regulation. The Russian Civil War orphans in the early 1920's for example were forced to fight for physical survival after their parents and relatives had been killed. These youths did indeed organize their lives effectively and survived by preying on the rest of society. Similarly, a spontaneous organization of children five years of age and older emerged in the wake of the Columbia Civil War in the early 1950's. These children effectively managed to form gangs composed of smaller social living units which learned to exist against the rest of society.

In many ways youths today prefer to be non-participants of the past and have become dropouts from history. In spite of the pamperings, briberies, put-downs, tongue-laskings, and promises of a bright shining future, youths are refusing to reenact the past and may not even desire to keep the system in tack. They are what Leslie Fiedler refers to as "the new mutants" who face life with a new logic of its own. In contrast to his earlier counterpart, today's youths often feels no need to hide or disguise his rebellious deeds out of defense for god and motherhood. His escapades contribute directly to the growing inferiority complex and amateur status of his parents.
Perhaps our post-industrial society has signaled the beginning of a still more profound revelation which in Margaret Mead's view represents an entirely new cultural stage in our history. Beginning with a post-figurative cultural stage where children learned primarily from their forbears, and moving to a configurative culture in which both children and adults learned from their peers, we are now entering a pre-figurative culture in which adults learn also from their children. Whereas in the past, the older generation could lend experience to guide youth through life, today's elders cannot provide this help because there are no guides. Youth thus take on a new authority in dealing with what is a mutually unknown future.

June Bingham states the problem in what are perhaps more personal terms when she states:

Those now over 40 were often burdened by their late Victorian and pre-Freudian parents with a harsh conscience, a tendency to overblame themselves. They were sandwiched between a generation that questioned too little and a generation that questions too much. They themselves never had the white meat of the turkey. When they were children, the best parts were being saved, as a matter of course, for the adults; by the time they grew up, the best parts were being saved, as a matter of course, for the children. Having been children in an adult-centered world, they are now adults in a child centered world.

Implications for Determining Policy: In concluding this discussion, at least three major policy directions will be briefly considered. The first concerns policies aimed at narrowing considerably the range of juvenile acts which come under the jurisdiction of the juvenile courts with a corresponding diversion of cases to non-legal welfare agencies. The second reflects the need to reinforce judicial procedures to safeguard children's rights and insure due process of law for those accused of criminal acts. The third more broadly takes into account the interactional context in which youthful deviance occurs and argues for modifying social institutions to provide for a new and more responsible involvement of youth in society.

Clearly, policies need to be redirected so as to eliminate many of the poorly defined vague and non-criminal actions of youth from under the jurisdiction of the courts. Basically this calls for dropping juvenile status offenses and separating out for differential treatment the cases of dependency and neglect from the more narrowly defined set of delinquent acts. The courts would then be more properly used as an adjudicatory structure to deal with children whose alleged acts would be criminal if committed by an adult. The courts, in other words, should no longer be
used to regulate and control the moral behavior of youth. Norval Morris, in arguing for the elimination of victimless crimes, made the point most pointedly when stated, "It is improper impolitic and socially harmful for the criminal law to act the moral busybody to intervene in or attempt to govern the private conduct of the citizen."

This recommendation has found considerable support. Acknowledging the ineffectiveness of the juvenile court system, the President's Task Force Report recommended the complete elimination from the court's jurisdiction of conduct illegal only for children. Lemert in the same report held that the only defensible philosophy for the juvenile courts is one of judicious non-intervention with the courts remaining the "agency of last resort for children." Similar, Schur in recognizing the harmful effects of delinquency labeling advances the concept of radical non-intervention and flatly states that we "leave kids alone wherever possible." And finally, the Child Welfare League of America in its National Policy statement on the Rights of Children recognized the courts as the only legal authority that may limit or terminate parental rights, transfer legal custody of children, appoint guardians, grant adoption decrees, or commit children. But again the report held that the jurisdiction of the courts should extend only to those cases which would be subject to prosecution if committed by adults, while other juvenile offenses should be reserved for appropriate child welfare agencies.

Any effort to modify court jurisdiction and delinquency statues must also provide for the diversion of those children who will continue to need help for a variety of problems. Such problems as are often reflected in runaways, truancy, drug abuse, sexual experimentation could more effectively be defined as child welfare problems. To be sure the failure of governmental authorities to deal adequately with the full range of child welfare concerns and the limited involvement and accountability of the private agencies in the past resulted in a larger voice by police, courts and correctional authorities in the handling of juveniles in trouble. A renewed effort will have to be made to insure that the network of child welfare agencies is better equipped to handle children diverted to them. Somehow child welfare agencies must learn to provide programs which would eliminate the negative labeling and compulsory mandates which have met with obvious failures in the past.

Closely related to proposals which would narrow the reach of the juvenile courts and provide for greater diversity of youthful behavior, is the attention which should be given to insure uniform treatment and constitutional safeguards for children accused of committing criminal acts. Although there are age differentials just as there are other extenuating circumstances which need to be considered in any judicial proceeding, neither the childhood status of the accused nor the presumed superior parental wisdom of the judge can justify procedures which violate basic individual rights.
The juvenile criminal justice system can no longer deny children their rights. Procedures which have been adopted to protect the so-called "best interests of the child" are more a myth than reality. Much too often this has led to unfair unconstitutional, and even inhumane treatment.

While the ultimate source of change will come through legislation and judicial innovation, public expectations need somehow to be modified to accept a much more limited and formalized role for the courts. The public needs to be reconvinced if it is not already convinced, that the court should be engaged in that which it knows best—administering justice—and not practicing psychiatry, social work, family counseling which can be better provided by other service agencies. Schur put it bluntly when he stated that what was needed was "uniformly applied punishment not disguised as treatment."[3]

A final policy area is concerned with the broader interactional and structural aspects which give rise to definitions of deviance. As long as people play an influential role in creating the context for defining, labeling, and otherwise dealing with delinquent offenders, they must bear responsibility for modifying or reversing the self-defeating aspects of their activities. We should not overlook the obvious fact that the labelled deviants find it difficult to engage normally in a society which refuses to provide them with viable social statuses and role alternatives. The very processes which are responsible for the articulation of deviant behavior must also be re-engaged to ameliorate that behavior.

A few weeks ago, a special Presidential Panel released a report entitled, "Youth Transition to Adulthood"[39] which concluded that young people ought to have more interaction with adults; that they should be given greater chances to work and learn outside the formal established school system and that they should take on more responsibility not only for themselves but also for others as well.

Implementing these recommendations will not be easy. Our society is structured in accordance with our outmoded ways of thinking about one another. And out incapacity to learn to think differently leads to the suppression of some of our most vital elements. The rebellion of youth, for example, is mostly seen as a threat to an established order essential to the well-being of adults. Yet, it is through the process of rebelling that the adolescent asserts his own self-identity and makes his life meaningful.[40] We need social policies which encourage adults to recognize the wider diversity of behavior and accept youthful "upheavals" as natural events in the resolution of identity crisis.

This undoubtedly calls for educational programs aimed at confronting the negative societal reactions which emerge among adults and the counter actions of youth which tend to strain relations and cloud real issues. It would suggest institutionalizing conflicts through providing new opportunities for debate and shared problem solving activities in significant
arenas where community standards influence the behavior of youths. In the process, youth would be encouraged to "invent" significant roles for themselves and most importantly participate in society in ways that matter.

What is being recommended here in no small way calls for revamping existing institutions to more effectively accommodate the needs of the young. It affects families, schools, work, politics—all of which, our experience tells us, are not easily changed. To do less, however, would miss the point entirely.
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The ability of governments to meet the changing need for broader representativeness in decision-making processes is subject to continuing debate. As a contribution to this debate I propose that governments should find new approaches to broaden their representativeness and that non-governmental Social Planning Councils\(^1\) are one way of accomplishing this end.

**Is Representativeness More Than a Theoretical Ideal?**

Many social scientists have expressed concern that maximum political participation of all the people is an unrealizable theoretical ideal. Carole Pateman (1970:3) points out that "data from large-scale empirical investigations into political attitudes and behaviour undertaken in most Western countries over the past twenty or thirty years, have revealed that the outstanding characteristic of most citizens, more especially those in the..."

---

\(^1\)Social Planning Councils in Canada and the United States take many forms and perform varied roles. The following statement prepared by the Committee of Social Planning Councils of Ontario in September 1972, summarizes their potential role. "Briefly stated, Social Planning Councils are independent groups of citizens, sometimes closely associated with United Appeals, who are involved in exposing and defining social need and devising the best possible response to it. Their weapons are the power of persuasion based on publication of facts. To work effectively they must have the goodwill of the public. Basically they become involved in three kinds of activities which may be defined as follows:

- **Social Review:** The gathering of information about a community, its institutions, and the services that affect people.
- **Social Policy:** Choosing the best course of action to effect the well-being of the people of the community.
- **Social Development:** Advising and assisting groups involved in social action directed toward the social betterment of the community.

The report "Social Planning in Ontario" (Ontario Welfare Council, 1972) gives some indication of social planning activities in Ontario, Canada. Here 22 responding councils increased their total budgets 88% in 5 years, and of the 22 councils reporting, only 9 reported a budget in 1966.
lower socio-economic groups, is a general lack of interest in politics and political activity. .." Bloomberg and Rosenstock (1968) state, "The first fact, and it overshadows almost everything else, is that most citizens use their political resources scarcely at all... When actual involvement in roles most directly concerned with making community decisions apart from elections is examined, the proportions drop below the 10% level." This view on the impracticability of widespread political involvement is reinforced through housing studies, poverty groups, youth and aged programs, etc., where overcoming broadly based client apathy has been a contributing factor to the failure of many of these projects.

The point stressed by theorists such as Rousseau (1965), John Steuart Mill (1910) and G.D.H. Cole (1920) seems to have gone unheeded. Their point, supported by many recent studies, is that people learn to participate by participating. This process of learning to participate by participating complements recent Canadian and American Government policy which has been increasingly supportive of direct involved representativeness. The alternative appears to be an apathetic electorate dependent on voting in competing minority elites who indirectly determine for people what their real needs are.

The argument for such elitist leadership with limited citizen participation is accepted by many social scientists. It assumes that historical pressures towards centralized bureaucratic power are inevitable. As a result, citizens feel remote from politics and this further discourages direct citizen participation other than through their vote.

On the other hand both Thompson (1970) and Pateman (1970) present considerable evidence from social science research that supports the proposition that it is possible to substantially increase citizen participation with resultant political benefits for the society as a whole. They both independently conclude that greater participation develops more politically aware citizens and that education (learning to participate by participating) is a major variable in this process of increasing representativeness.

The Need for Representativeness

Aside from the social science research supporting the benefits derivable from broader representativeness in government, the speed of change creates an additional imperative for
governments to broaden their base of representativeness. Marvin Manheim (1970) has identified three critical dimensions of change. These are demand, technology and values. Within the context of broader representativeness in governmental decision-making these three dimensions of change can be viewed as follows:

**DEMAND** for broader governmental representativeness is increasing as population, income and education change. As the awareness of this demand extends to broader segments of the society, rising expectations of what government should do become almost endemic.

Changes in TECHNOLOGY affect the need for broader representativeness in government in many ways. It is often suggested that if technology can put men on the moon it should be capable of insuring that government can meet the needs of people. Computers can collect data and assist in analyzing alternatives that were too complex to comprehend prior to the cybernetic era. New systems analysis, such as Planning-Programming-Budgeting, that are dependent on new developments in technology, are in the process of implementation in governmental and non-governmental sectors. Technology is capable, if properly harnessed, of providing reams of information that can assist in the political decision-making process. However, if the information going into the system is not broadly representative, the processed data will reflect that deficiency.

VALUES, both public and private, are changing in respect to broader representativeness in the governmental decision-making process. It has become increasingly clear that groups affected by government decisions want an increasing say in what is legislated "for" them. No longer is it considered sufficient to design programs simply to serve users. Rather, a shift in value emphasis means governments must now identify which groups are adequately and inadequately served. Beyond the users, governments must now consider the unintended consequences to other groups. For instance, will an income maintenance scheme established for one group, encourage outsiders to stop working to take advantage of the benefits meant for others? There is little doubt that differences in values and rapid changes in the values of many groups are straining the governments' capacity to govern.

These changes in values, demand and technology further support the changing need for broader representativeness in governmental decision-making processes.
Existing Representativeness

Many governments have become increasingly aware of the moral and scientific debates on the need to broaden citizen participation in governmental decision-making processes. A recent article in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (Auerbach, March, 1972) points out that probably never before has government policy been so supportive of the rights of individuals and groups affected by administrative action.

There appears to be general agreement that modern complex government is more effective "if public policies seek to maximize consent and minimize coercion in their formulation and implementation. To this end, all claims made by individuals and groups in our society should be heard and considered. Furthermore, no governmental decision is just if any such claim is denied a hearing or consideration." (Auerbach, 1972, page 2).

Problems of Representation

Problems arise, however, when the assumption is made that power in our society should be distributed "by the maxim of each according to his claim" (Lowi, 1969, page 292). This may satisfy many claims of strongly organized groups, but not of the weakly organized or unorganized. There are also dangers in delegating increasing powers to agencies and groups without meaningful legislative standards to circumscribe them.

Another problem of this interest-group liberalism could be that government would merely ratify bargains negotiated by competing interest groups. This would have the effect of reducing the governments' responsibility to wield democratic authority. Therefore, a key problem in broader representativeness for government is how to make interest-group concerns known to the decision makers, who must then determine policy by some political action.

In other words, it does not appear practical at this stage of development of our governmental processes to allow each individual and group equal power to determine the outcome of decisions. However it does appear important for individuals and groups to increase their influence over these decisions.
The Case for Administrative Representativeness

I have alluded to the problem of the dangers of delegating increasing powers to agencies and groups without legislative standards to circumscribe them. Kenneth Davis (1969) points out that this danger has been overemphasized. He suggests that legislatures have long recognized that time does not "permit them to make every law they pass so detailed that it could speak directly to citizens and be endorsed directly in the courts. That is why administrative agencies were created. Today, the quantity of legislation considered forecloses even the possibility of the legislative prescription of meaningful standards in every case. Nor would such prescription always be wise.

Legislators cannot be expected to foresee and provide for all possible future situations and conditions. To achieve legislative objectives, close, even day to day scrutiny of these conditions and situations may be required to determine whether they are changing so as to call for modification in the applicable rules. As a practical matter, the legislature cannot assume this task, which often may demand specialized knowledge it does not possess."

Sometimes legislation extends only to the decision that the particular area should somehow be legally controlled. "To employ such a limited consensus in legislation which turns all the problems over to an administrative agency runs the risk of raising people's hopes and, inevitably, frustrating them. This makes it all the more essential for interest groups to participate in the ADMINISTRATIVE implementation of policy (as well as in the legislative processes themselves). Only then do they have any assurance that their special needs and circumstances, which the legislation was not able to reflect, will be taken into account by the administrative agency. Agency action then, too, will become more acceptable." (Auerbach, 1972, pages 5 and 6).

Unintended Consequences of Participation

I have pointed to a changing need for broader representativeness in government policy making. I have now further suggested that this broader representativeness must extend to the administrative as well as the legislative processes. It must be recognized, however, that opportunities to participate in administrative and legislative proceedings and to obtain judicial review of administrative decisions, do not guarantee the participating groups favourable outcomes. Unfortunately enlarged participation
creates dangers of its own. Daniel Bell points out that "increase in the number of claimants leads, inevitably, to lengthier consultation and mediation, and more importantly, to a situation wherein thousands of different organizations, each wanting diverse and contradictory things, simply check each other in their demands." (Bell and Held, 1969, page 142).

**The Role of Social Planning Councils**

A recent research study by Marvin E. Olsen (1972) further supports the hypothesis that participation in voluntary associations is "positively and somewhat strongly related" to political activity. Olsen emphasizes the distinction between "mobilization" and "mediation" participation. The mobilization version - "which underlies the social participation thesis - maintains that involvement in voluntary, special interest, NON-POLITICAL (emphasis is Olsen's) associations will in time activate individuals politically"......, whereas mediation "sees voluntary associations as mediating between individuals and the political system, focusing on the ASSOCIATIONS' actions (emphasis mine) rather than their effects on members." He concludes that the mobilization process is much more crucial than the mediation process in producing political participation.

Growing empirical support for the proposition that participation in ANY organized social activity is beneficial to political participation leads to an obvious question regarding what factors influence people to join and become involved in organizational activities. An underlying assumption of this paper is that Social Planning Councils can play a significant role in providing accessibility and encouragement for the involvement of people in voluntary associations. The voluntary associations involved in various ways with social planning councils have the potential for considerable citizen appeal because they deal with the perceived local immediate needs of people. They offer opportunities for both mobilization and mediation participation and therefore, can play a role in increasing representativeness in government.

I suggest that non-governmental Social Planning Councils can assist individuals and groups to focus on the needs of people. They can further assist in counteracting the sense of powerlessness and consequent frustration that is a growing concomitant of increasing participation.

Social Planning Councils have the potential to perform many roles.

- They form information centres and volunteer bureaus to
assist in linking people to the communities' resources established to meet their needs.

- They bring together organized groups and interested individuals around specific social problems, such as, day care and housing.

- They interpret complex legislation to local citizens and groups.

- They research into causes of social dysfunction.

- They collect data bank type statistics that focus on social problems.

- They assist in encouraging, developing and sponsoring innovating programs to meet the local social needs of people.

- They attempt evaluation and auditing of existing delivery of service systems with an aim to improving accountability to the local community, and to upgrading the quality of service provided to the user.

- They attempt to determine and publicize what is perceived as the local communities' most pressing social needs.

- They act as enablers with expertise in bringing coalitions of divergent interest groups through the broad range of alternatives facing their problem.

On the other hand Social Planning Councils are sometimes described as lacking a mandate to plan. They are often accused of being self appointed limited interest groups; of being agency oriented, conservative, status quo oriented, activist, non-activist, biased, lacking in power to implement, and so on. Criticisms such as these overlook the significance of the point that somebody is making political decisions that affect other people. If it is correct to assume that people learn to participate by participating and that participation in any form positively affects political awareness, then Social Planning Councils have a basic role to play despite many obvious limitations. This role underlies the many potential programs referred to above. This role is to reinforce representative processes in political decision making. The result is more individuals and groups have an added means for making their perceptions of their needs known to the decision makers. In summary, since Social Planning Councils address themselves to
perceived local needs and problems, they have considerable appeal, if properly organized, for plugging people and groups into this representative process.

The Intermediary Role of Social Planning Councils

Because of inadequate resources and lack of expertise few Social Planning Councils even attempt to undertake all the activities noted above. The point is that no matter what form the role of the local Social Planning Council takes, it acts as an intermediary between the legislative and administrative levels of government, and the individual person and groups who desire to do something about their problem.

I suggest this intermediary role is important from two points of view. First, it provides a local non-governmental widely representative source for gathering information from divergent groups around specific problems or issues. This information could and should form an important link in the governments' network of sources leading to broader administrative and legislative representativeness.

Secondly, it provides a local forum for concerned citizenry to discuss their concerns about inadequacies in our present system. In attempting to co-ordinate interest and support for their cause this citizenry come into contact through the planning council with other views which can substantially broaden their understanding on their problem, BEFORE they attempt to plug into the representative processes of administrative and legislative government.

In other words social planning councils provide one means of drawing concerned citizens into the political process. Through professional and volunteer social planning "enablers" people are indirectly encouraged to broaden their experience in learning how to participate. The result should be a gradual increase in interest, expertise and influence in politics and political activity.

Regionalization and Representativeness

The trend toward regionalization has its roots in the problems of representativeness. Existing governmental jurisdictions at the local level are fragmented with an overlapping of boundaries and a confusion of administrative centres.
This overlapping and confusion has inhibited decision-making at the local level and led to a concentration of power at the provincial or state and national levels. Here people are further removed from the real decision-making processes by what I have referred to as the historical pressures towards centralized bureaucratic power.

The rationalization of boundaries and removal of common administrative centres to the region gives the appearance of further shifting representative power from the local level. In fact, regionalization is an attempt to bring legislative and administrative power closer to the people. The rationale behind this shift is that at this level the needs of the area can be determined through a representative information system capable of producing decisions in the region, implementable for the region.

Social Planning Councils also face the problems of fragmentation with an overlapping of boundaries and a confusion of administrative centres. Somewhat removed from the grass roots citizen and local agency, these councils are moving towards a level of representativeness analogous to that of regionalization.

This trend to regionalization is consistent with the changing need for increased representativeness that reaches the real legislative and administrative decision makers. It is also consistent with the need to overcome the powerlessness resulting in part from participation that is in itself often increasingly fragmented.

In other words, if increasing power to make legislative and administrative decisions resides in the region, then social planning councils for the reasons discussed in this paper, should be providing non-governmental access for those affected by these decisions.

**Conclusion**

I have referred to a key problem of how to make individual and group concerns known to the decision makers without ignoring the weakly organized and unorganized—and without putting both the legislators and administrators in the position of merely ratifying bargaining negotiated between these interest groups. I have suggested non-governmental Social Planning Councils have a potentially significant role to play in the changing need for representativeness for the myriad of strong, weak and unorganized groups and individuals.
This role recognizes the feedback benefits resulting from the proposition that people learn to participate by participating, and that social planning councils can provide neutral professional expertise to help accelerate that learning process. This role for social planning councils, through the involvement of interested and progressively better informed citizens, allows for the collection and dissemination of information that could be an important source for augmenting citizen participation in social decision-making.
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Housing possesses certain characteristics which qualify it for an instrumental role in income redistribution policy. Housing is a commodity which for the poor is generally deficient in quality and frequently inadequate in quantity even at modest quality levels. The poor pay a substantial share of their income for housing. The majority of families with incomes under four thousand dollars spend over one-fourth of their total income on housing, while most of those with incomes under two thousand dollars annually normally spend over one-third for housing, as compared with less than one-sixth of average family income devoted to housing in the case of the total population.¹ And the poor are generally concentrated, in part because of a lack of cheap housing elsewhere, in neighborhoods where the pathology of poverty reinforces itself. In such areas public facilities, including schools, health care services, police protection and sanitation, are generally inferior.² Minority persons generally are compelled to pay prices for housing that reflect the racially discriminatory attitudes of whites.³ Poor minority persons, therefore, may be obtaining even less housing for their outlays of money and deriving even less in the way of public services as a result. Some of the economic costs incurred by the poor or by public agencies on their behalf as a result of inadequate housing may be indirectly reflected in expenditures for medical care. Social costs of deficient housing may be identified with poverty behavior patterns, such as the incidence of juvenile delinquency.⁴

Housing is one item among a stock of high priority economic and social goods with which the poor are inadequately endowed. The list includes sufficient food, medical care and education facilities, among many goods and services.⁵ The provision of housing by public agencies, in some contrast to most of the items of priority for the poor which may be provided by this source, commits the intervention of government for a period of extended duration because of the characteristic durability of housing.⁶ Unlike the alternative goods and services which government might furnish to the poor, a housing program once embarked upon employs resources which are not easily re-allocated for other purposes and represents a commitment duration of the useful life of the housing, in many cases. The amounts involved may be substantial even for a modest number of poverty family recipients.⁷

The private market by itself offers slight prospects for resolving the supply problems of quality housing for the poor. Among the many
factors contributing to the remoteness of a market type solution to the problem of housing the poor, are the characteristics associated with the location of housing and the structure of the housing supply industry. Location figures importantly in decisions relating to all housing, of course, but perhaps it is even a more critical factor in the case of location of housing for the poor in urban areas. Typically, there exists potentially more lucrative alternative uses for the land occupied by much of the low rent housing stock. However, particularly in urban core areas, this land can often be efficiently redeveloped in relatively large blocks and sometimes only in huge tracts. Urban renewal has played a key role in the contraction of the housing supply available to the poor. Private investors and the financial institutions which facilitate their acquisition and development of residential property are motivated by profit incentives while low-income housing situated on valuable tracts of central city area land represents an unprofitable form of investment.

The operation of existing low-income housing is no more attractive to investors than the construction of new units to house the poor. The severe constraints upon the ability of the poor to pay for housing do not affect the increasing costs encountered by landlords. In New York City, over one-third the cost of operation of low-income housing is represented by maintenance, while about one-fourth is real estate taxes and the residual represents interest and other forms of return to capital. Maintenance is the only significant item eligible for substantial reduction and to do so will appreciably reduce the quality and usable lifetime of the housing. When the savings through reduced maintenance are not sufficient to make the operation profitable the next, and the last, step is the accumulation of tax arrears on the property, after which the property is abandoned and defaulted to the city. The process inevitably leads to a reduction in the stock of housing for the poor.

The filter-down process is inadequate to offset the contraction caused by intolerable deterioration of low-rent housing, or its demolition or abandonment by landlords. Overall, there is no shortage of housing in the United States. Aside from cases of mis-matching housing and people by location, due to migration and other factors, it is only the poor who actually experience a serious deficiency of supply of the housing they can afford. No investors are interested on their own in building or operating low-rent housing. Government assistance is a required stimulant to attract and maintain investor interest in such properties. Without financial aid to investors from public sources, the filter-down process is likely to deteriorate to trickle-down. Further, an increasing amount of the total stock of housing in the United States, and particularly of that built in the post World War Two period, has been single family owner-occupied units. Typically, this is located physically distant from the poor and well beyond their socio-economic horizons. Generally, the poor, unassisted, are unqualified to be owners. And many of the poor are minorities who have been effectively deprived of opportunities to locate in many areas by discriminatory behavior of home owners, neighborhood
associations, financial institutions and even government agencies. The increment of annual housing stock expansion, on the average, is less than two percent, which is sufficient to provide for household expansion but inadequate to replace existing deteriorating and demolished residences for the poor.13

Presented with the dilemma that the poor cannot pay for a basic economic good like housing in amounts sufficient to generate increased market supply, pressure for government intervention is generated. Government is not a stranger to participation in the housing market, but until recent years this activity had been nearly exclusively on behalf of the more affluent. The FHA and VA mortgage guarantee programs have facilitated home ownership for approximately nine million middle class Americans since initiation in 1934, through provision of low interest and low downpayment requirements. Urban renewal, where it has resulted in additional housing units, has frequently provided urban housing for the more affluent at the expense of the poor. More low-income housing has been demolished than constructed under urban renewal, with a resultant negative effect for the poor.14

American society tends to identify two categories of poor as eligible for assistance. The one group includes the incapacitated, composed of the aged and infirm and households headed by females who are immobilized from securing paid employment by reason of their work commitment in rearing their children. The condition or circumstances of these persons make them ineligible to participate effectively in the labor force. Their sources of income may include charitable donations and limited assistance from relatives and others but, generally, their main means of support comes from public agencies. Another group experiencing poverty includes those considered employable but who are involuntarily unemployed and also the low-income employed. Even when fully employed, their incomes fall at or below that defined as the poverty level. The residual of the poor—a small fraction but, nonetheless, the focus of inordinate attention—includes the voluntarily unemployed, those who reject employment available to them or who have deferred entry into the labor market for various motives, including additional education. Whether this last group should receive public assistance has been a matter of considerable controversy, obscuring the issues involved in the case of the majority of poor, the incapacitated and the low-income, low-productivity employed.15 The majority of the poor, through no choice of their own, have slight capacity to effectively generate market demand for housing of adequate quality in sufficient quantity.

Cash transfers to the poor is perhaps the most obvious solution, in that it is simple and direct and would allow the low-income family to make its own market choice. However, there are serious objections to this. For one thing, even if the direct grants are intended primarily for improvement of the housing situation of the poor, there is little assurance the money will be spent that way. Possibilities of divergent consumption patterns with expanded shares of the increased income to, say, entertainment instead of housing, even though not in fact practiced by the poor, may be sufficient to convince the
more affluent and their public officials to restrain the levels of assistance. In practice, where such programs as AFDC dispense direct grants to recipients, these are most notable for their inadequacy in meeting all but the most basic needs at subsistence levels. Supposed work disincentives appear to be another common grounds for objection to direct grants. An unmentioned but implied objection undoubtedly originates in the fear of the more affluent that direct grants to the poor would, in effect, make their neighborhoods more accessible to the poor. Then, too, direct grants are not specific and the public more strongly identifies the social injustice involved in inequities as regards such items as housing or food than, say, clothing, automobiles or entertainment. Direct grants without specificity of purpose would be allocated to poor families only at levels inadequate to purchase satisfactory housing, even if the bulk of funds were so dedicated.

An alternative to direct cash payments that is equally as apparent as a solution is the direct provision of housing to the poor; in short, public housing. In practice, in the United States, the evidence offers slight consolation to public housing advocates. Notoriety surrounds a number of large scale public housing projects, such as Pruitt-Igoe in Saint Louis. New York City, which has one-half the total of public housing units in the United States, finds them to generally be high crime areas, with highly stigmatized residents who have slight positive identity with their projects. Rates of deterioration, partly induced by vandalism and tenant neglect, reinforce the unattractiveness of these large scale city public housing projects. Units in smaller communities, including suburbs of New York City, such as White Plains, have, in contrast, achieved satisfactory living conditions for tenants. Smaller units, widely dispersed among private and, ideally, higher income housing, tend to present acceptable solutions to public housing needs of low-income families. However, the hostility generated by the more affluent in such areas as the Forest Hills section of New York over the threat of public housing sites in their neighborhoods suggests that the capacity for such dispersal is probably quite limited.

A variation on the public housing pattern with its concentration of low-income residents may be seen as a mixture of social and economic elements. Conceivably, for one thing, the middle class might be more receptive to their officials appropriating funds for programs from which they might anticipate personal benefit. Presently established residents of areas adjacent to or in the vicinity of public housing sites are likely to view such developments more benignly if the project tenants more closely resemble themselves. However, in practice, the desired socio-economic heterogeneity frequently fails to occur. Government subsidized housing programs in Britain, intended mainly for lower-income wage earners, but without income restrictions, in fact serve, for the most part, the more affluent members of the working class and, also, many white collar workers in higher job categories. The new town housing in Britain tends to attract large numbers of higher paid workers, since the employment categories in new towns often fail to match the qualifications of working members.
of low-income families. The Dutch new town of Lelystad, where housing eligibility is closely related to job placement, and where government is attempting to encourage establishment of the more productive, high technology industries, has few low skilled, low-income workers in residence.2

An alternative to having the poor rent housing, whether from public or from private landlords, is to have them become homeowners. This would presumably give the poor a vested interest in society, as property owners, subduing anti-social characteristics which might otherwise surface. It would give the poor family an incentive to maintain its housing. The stability of payments under ownership would tend to insulate the low-income family from speculative or other unpredictable causes of housing price increases to which tenants are frequently subjected. Section 235 of the 1968 Housing Act, the home ownership subsidy program which HUD has now suspended under the 'housing moratorium', was intended to do just that. Under the program, housing was developed by private builders. In addition to new housing, older units which were determined to meet the standards established by HUD were also included. Private lending institutions financed the Section 235 housing, with mortgages insured at the market rate by FHA. The procedure involved subsidy-interest payments to the mortgage holding institution sufficient to cover the difference between the amount paid by the mortgagee, limited to twenty percent of adjusted income, and the total cost of the debt service. The total debt service cost represented interest, amortization of principal, taxes, insurance, mortgage insurance, and service fees. This program, which had involved approximately one-quarter million housing starts in 1970 and 1971, had come under severe criticism for the quality of the housing acquired by the poor in many cases. The financial arrangements frequently exceeded the capacity of the poor to pay, particularly when coupled with the costs of repairs and maintenance. Long-range limitations of this program involve the scarcity of housing conveniently located and suitably priced for low income families and the reluctance of government to commit the necessarily large scale resources required for long-term periods. This type of program does not appear to be a feasible solution to the housing problems of the poor, since it largely still confines them to low-income neighborhoods and, in many cases, unsatisfactory housing, while they become saddled with mortgage debt.21

Section 236 of the 1968 Housing Act, which like Section 235 has been suspended under the 'housing moratorium', was intended to stimulate nonprofit or limited profit housing with its rent supplement program. It incorporated some of the characteristic features of public housing and was designed to offer incentives to private builders and lending institutions. Under this program, rent obligations were defined on the basis of tenant income. In the rent supplement program, which assisted tenants incapable of fully meeting rent obligations in housing developed as a result of federal incentives, the lower rent limits were established at twenty-five percent of family income. This ratio of rent to income, arbitrarily advanced, was intended to provide evidence of the serious desire of lower income families to secure better housing. It also presumably reflected
their intent to utilize and maintain it properly. The more controversial limitation involved was that of the upper income limit set for eligibility for residence in Section 236 projects. After considerable debate among the officials involved and in Congress, proposals for setting upper limits at one hundred thirty percent of the income eligibility entry levels for public housing were accepted. The income levels set tended to be very close to median family incomes in most localities although, in fact, provisions had been incorporated for establishing special allowances, such as that of raising ceilings by three hundred dollars for each additional child of an applicant family. In 1970 and 1971, the first two years of operation of the program, nearly one-quarter million families were housed under the provisions of Section 236. Few of these families were in the lowest-income categories so that Section 236 made slight contribution to the solution of their housing problems.22

The poor may not have appreciably benefited from the housing constructed under the Section 236 program, but it proved to be a lucrative activity for building contractors and financial institutions. Section 236 housing has been developed, owned and administered by non-profit or limited profit sponsoring bodies. The projects were financed through conventional lending sources and the mortgages were insured by the FHA at the prevailing market rate. However, the mortgagor only paid at an interest rate of one percent, with HUD defraying the difference. Units completed tended to be rather expensive, as this was more profitable to both contractors and lending institutions. HUD acquiesced since officials were anxious to have as many units produced as quickly as possible to prove the feasibility of the program. Since rents under the program were established on the basis of mortgage calculations at one percent interest or at twenty-five percent of adjusted income, rental levels could be made fairly high for most tenants. The prospects for high rent levels in Section 236 projects acted to reduce neighborhood hostility to such development, but it also made the housing largely inaccessible to the poor.23

A housing allowance program offers some advantages over alternative schemes in terms of making quality housing available to the poor. Clearly, some alternatives have to be rejected as possible solutions because they simply fail to provide for an adequate supply of low-income quality housing. Direct income transfers would probably not provide for adequate amounts of money for low-income families to claim decent housing, even if none of it were to be mis-allocated for low-priority items by the recipients. Public housing as a possible alternative has largely failed in that the quality and the context make for an unsatisfactory residential situation. Similarly, subsidies to buildings rather than people offer slight prospects for resolving the housing needs of low-income families since the overall stock of housing appears to be adequate and, therefore, its expansion is in no apparent need of artificial stimulation. And making subsidized housing more attractive by encouraging greater socio-economic mix has generally resulted in subsidizing the middle class, frequently to the detriment of the poor. In the same vein, schemes for home-ownership by the poor have frequently saddled them with housing burdens.
at least as formidable as those from which it was intended they be liberated.

A housing allowance to occupants rather than buildings can discriminate clearly on the basis of income, so that public funds will not be mis-directed to the more well-to-do. The housing allowance to occupants would offer low-income families freedom of choice as to location and type of housing. While in practice their choice would be constrained by limitations of allowances, availability of housing in general and such factors as racial discrimination and family size, the options available to them would still be obviously greater than, say, in the case of public housing projects as the targeted destination of resources for resolving low-income housing problems. Rent allowances would facilitate the dispersal of low income families, giving them a 'low profile' and thereby tend to generate public acceptance of the relocation of the poor to neighborhoods where amenities might be greater than in the areas they vacated. Rent allowances would provide for greater mobility among low-income families than in the case of such schemes as home purchase, where the poor family might be committed strongly to one location of residence regardless of shifts in locations of job opportunities or changes in family size.

One variation of the rent allowance scheme, as suggested by Irving Welfeld, is a sliding scale of allowances, hinged not only to income levels but to the percentage of income expended by families on rent. The greater the share of gross income expended by a poor family, as a demonstration of the seriousness of its intent to obtain decent housing, the larger the government supplement. Welfeld suggests that if the program were to be directed to the estimated ten million households in need, it might cost from five to ten billion dollars annually. This compares favorably with the annual expenditures over recent past years of nearly four billion dollars, on average, for the existing collection of inefficient programs. It is likely that the percentage of total costs devoted to administration under a scheme of housing allowances to occupants would be substantially less than under alternative programs. In the case of housing allowances to occupants, an 'invisible' means test to determine the eligibility of each applicant could be run through income tax records. Computerized, this system for processing applications could prove to be quite economical. Public agencies would not have to assume burdens involved in construction, operation or even approval of housing units. Each low-income consumer of housing would have the prerogative of choosing the housing unit that consumer considers must suitable within the constraints of income plus housing allowance supplement. Conceivably, reinforcement of the allocation of supplements for housing, rather than for other goods and services, might be instrumented by the issuance of vouchers rather than cash. The vouchers would be transferable only for housing.

Rent allowances to occupants encounter some limitations. As mentioned earlier, racial and family size factors may diminish market choices for many. The elderly and disabled frequently require special types
of housing to which the market, even with the incentives of rent supplements, might find it unprofitable to respond. If a rent allowance scheme is conducted in a localized area, such as New York City, it may succeed in retaining the poor within the confines of the city but it would not seem to offer any incentives for the more affluent to stay as well. As the more affluent gravitate to the suburbs, the ratio of poor to wealthy — and the problems of the city — would continue to rise. An efficient rent allowance scheme would have to be flexible, to allow for changes in the market prices of housing as supplements were issued and the demand for higher priced housing rose, otherwise the greater outlay by the poor for housing might buy little more than less money had previously bought. Required would be a system to control rises of local rents, such as a fair rent tribunal or a flexible rent control structure.

A program of rent allowances to occupants would seem to suggest stronger prospects for resolving the housing problems of the poor than would the other alternative programs explored here. In terms of a strategy of income redistribution, rent allowances to the poor might be palatable to the general public, since the funds could be earmarked strictly for housing and specifically to those identified as in need. Since most American families are adequately housed, it would seem advisable to avoid inauguration of a general scheme to assist the entire public so that the poor might also receive aid. The impact of a strategy of income redistribution through housing allowances in resolving the problems of poverty is unlikely to be dramatic. However, the resolution of housing problems through subsidies to tenants may alleviate some aspects of the poverty problem with the injection of relatively modest public resources. Importantly, the spatial concentration of the poor may be lessened. The dispersal of the poor and the resultant relief from congestion of their numbers as they bid for housing throughout wider areas is likely to diminish some of the problems which tend to create poverty cycles. For one thing, the models and facilities available to the children of low income families are likely to increase. For many of the poor, improved access to medical and educational facilities are items of high priority. For some of the poor, enlarged employment opportunities are part of the escape from poverty and these may be expanded by the geographical residential dispersal of the poor. For some of the poor, importantly including many of the elderly, economic improvements are only part of the answer. Social arrangements, perhaps incorporating carefully fostered living groups in specifically designed housing, may be engineered to answer the needs of many of the elderly. If the possibilities for dramatic solution of the problem of poverty through tenant subsidy programs appear modest, it should be remembered that such programs generate slight social and economic disequilibrium since the income redistribution involved is respectably small in terms of government expenditure and gross national product. A rent allowance scheme, in conjunction with other programs of assistance to the poor, can achieve some impact in the alleviation of poverty.
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In recent decades, there has been considerable attention devoted to the nature of interest group conflict and emerging structural changes in the American economic, social and political system. The economic changes have perhaps been the key indicators of emerging trends. These changes have been reflected mainly in the amount of economic activity and occupations devoted to services since the late 1950's; the increasing concern with technological growth; the close collaboration between national government policies and planning and the private sector; national governmental assistance for urban and suburban problems, and more recently, the increased mandates of interest groups for national policies on natural resources and population growth. The major social problems of education, welfare and related aspects of family planning have been closely intertwined with the emergent economic developments. And, concurrently a significant amount of the debate in the political arena has reflected these socio-economic concerns.

The basis for much of the discussion and analysis has been directly related to public policy formulation and the increased demands for adequate and/or efficient services by all segments of the public. Developing from these demands are issues which have significantly brought into focus, current and potential conflicts among social, class, and racial interest groups regarding priorities, levels of benefits, and goals of service organizations.

Many of the conflicts are specifically and more narrowly related, however, to the large lower income subsector of the population located in metropolitan areas. And, these are greatly accentuated by the historical failure of the U.S. to develop urban, or related planning or social welfare policies which would take into account or compliment the profound changes in the private economic sector.

This absence of policy and often theoretical understanding of the changes of the socio-economic structures, has been gradually altered with the growth of a body of theoreticians and technicians forecasting trends in the social and economic sectors. However, the adoption of broad structural administrative policies based on new conceptualizations for the public sector have been subjected to greater scrutiny than in any period prior to the service era. The major dimensions of scrutiny and accountability has resulted from both clients, and salaried service workers pressuring designated public management officials on all levels for formal rights and inclusion in organizational decision-making.
These current and potential conflicts among various interest groups are emerging as a unique development in American history. Institutionalized procedures of both older, and developing client organizations, are continually reflecting the objectives of client interest groups traditionally underrepresented or politically powerless in influencing organizational procedures. Additionally, professional unions and associations in most service organizations are continually demanding rights regarding responsibilities to clients and the organization. The trends, particularly in the older urban areas, indicate that the client organizations in which conflict has been most persistent regarding benefits to clients and professional responsibilities, will be the ones in which goals are most difficult to define or redefine in the future. And, if trends of the past decade are reliable indicators, it will be in those client organizations which are most susceptible to the inclusion of racial and class biases, that major conflicts involving the public, professionals, and management will occur. Succinctly, the emerging trends in the social, economic, and political structures, indicate that many of the more difficult areas of defining goals for a significant segment of the population in the service era will rest on the nature of conflicts among social and ethnic interest groups both internal and external to client organizations. The ability therefore of public officials to mediate solutions which can be adequately managed in client organizations as structural changes in the larger society accelerate, will be a major factor in future social welfare decision-making.

Theoretical Perspectives

The increased involvement of the public in non-market decision making, accompanied by more rigid standards for service occupations, defined by both professionals and the public, has been one of the more salient factors observed as a result of the structural changes in U.S. society. The broader changes, problems, and theoretical demands of the emerging post-industrial society have been conceptualized by many analysts in several disciplines. Basically, the broader developments and projections emphasize the growth of the service sector and public employees; an increasing reliance on advanced knowledge guided by technicians managing the governmental and economic sectors; the greater utilization of abstract theoretical knowledge to manipulate the pace of social and economic change; continued advancement of technological knowledge and forecasting...
techniques; and, an increased reliance of long range planning to meet the needs of services, markets, and resources in both the private and public spheres.

Coinciding with these changes there has been an increasing class differentiation which has become more important in determining governmental benefits in a metropolitan society. Related, also is a growth of collective bargaining among salaried professionals seeking to maintain or operationalize a wide range of non-wage securities, if not, influence the goals of service organizations, and their institutionalized patterns.

The linkages between the aforementioned features and problems of the emerging service society cannot be fully described as a complete model. Moreover, most analysts have avoided any detailed discussions of emerging racial patterns, although they are often implicit in their observations of emergent class conflicts.

Yet, many of the racial patterns can be included in descriptive models of the future, simply by inclusion of projected demographic variables for the forthcoming decades. Specifically, the projections for the Black population indicate a continued concentration in central cities, and a high dependency ratio. Therefore, a significant segment of the Black population under most efforts at prediction probably will constitute an important segment of the population requiring social welfare services, with the avenues of upward mobility significantly decreased in the goods-producing sector, and extreme competition with other groups for the advanced knowledge and skills necessary for class mobility.

Basic education and the ability to continually advance one's knowledge within a profession, already prevail as a key factor in many professions, and these trends will probably become more important in others. Indeed, continuing education in the area in which one is employed has become a prerequisite for advanced occupational status in many fields, including, but not limited to nursing, medicine, and teaching on the higher educational levels.

The policies and procedures effectuated and institutionalized in organizations responsible for basic skills or services, or related to advancement of professionals will therefore become more critical as technology advances. Indeed, the very nature of professionalism will have to be redefined in many occupations.
However, the most basic social welfare conceptualizations and problems in large measure will rest on the public-at-large, particularly Blacks, within service or catchment areas of the organization responsible for clients. The authority, an increasingly sophisticated Black client sector is willing to invest in the hands of professionals in determining policies outside of legally defined professional arenas, is likely to be the key dimension. In addition, the relationship between racial conflict and social welfare services will reflect the degree to which professionals collectively bargain for procedures effecting institutionalized organizational policies related to racial conflicts (perceived or real) in the community, and the extent to which professionals of different ethnic groups ally with their ethnic interests outside of their professional membership ranks in influencing the direction of client organizational priorities and benefits. Briefly stated, a major determining factor in the service society will be the extent to which organized professional workers effectuate a redistribution of power and authority in client organizations and their institutionalized procedures, and whether the public, particularly Blacks, view such changes in their interests.

The Study Design

The basic assumptions of this analysis are that professionals in the public sector will increasingly focus on policies in collective bargaining with management which reflect a concern with policies and procedures which effect the structure and goals of the organization, and their professional relationship to the public. Coinciding with these changes has been a continuous and heightened concern of professionals within membership groups (unions or associations), with ideological causes reflecting their ethnic group interests in the public, and the manner in which policies and priorities are developed and institutionalized within client serving organizations.

The assumptions of this analysis were specifically related to the theoretical developments outlined in the previous section, and limited to conclusions regarding Blacks.

In the analysis, the demands of professionals related to procedures, policies and goals of the organization by professional groups, were analyzed by studying the emphasis on non-wage factors, that could (1) alter professional-management patterns; (2) increase professional decision-making, and (3) influence client professional patterns.
The groups included in the analysis were educators, social welfare workers, and professionals in health. This study analyzed all agreements maintained by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for 250 workers or more. The non-wage items for educators included class-room size, promotion, and evaluation procedure; for welfare workers, caseload, promotion, evaluation, and payments for additional education; and for personnel in health, patients treated, evaluation, promotion, and payment by management for higher education.

The three groups of professionals comprised 276,550 workers or 77% of the 358,012 professionals covered by agreements on file at BLS as of June, 1973.

The assumptions in the analysis regarding growth of Black professional organizations were analyzed by documenting the dates of organizational charter, from a compilation of Black organizations in the Directory of National Black Organizations by Charles Sanders and Linda McLean.

Findings

Education Personnel

The educational personnel covered by agreements analyzed, primarily included regular teachers (excluding agreements for principals) in city public schools. A limited number of these agreements included specific language regarding substitute teachers, and four of the agreements were for college faculties.

As indicated in Table I, there were ninety-three agreements analyzed which covered 235,450 educational personnel, or 70 percent of the professionals included in the analysis. The largest number of agreements were for unions or associations covering 250,749 professionals, primarily in smaller or middle sized cities. And, all the agreements were negotiated in 1965, or after except the agreements covering New York City personnel.

Class-room size/Pupil teacher ratio

Specific language on the number of pupils per teacher were included in 62.3% of the agreements analyzed. In general,

* It is important to note that this comprises only a sample of all union or association membership.
the larger the number of education personnel included in the agreements, the more specific the language on the number of pupils per teacher. A summary of the agreements indicated that most of the agreements set forth desirable class size, limitations, and indicated to the extent possible, that the board recognize its responsibility to maintain the desirable median/maximum in class room size.

In most of the collective bargaining negotiations studied in the school system, policy on class size was negotiated, while in others the administrators unilaterally established guidelines or regulations.

The specifications for class size varied. Many agreements included a detailed itemization of class size while others outlined minimum and maximum figures; maximums that should not be exceeded. In the latter case, if maximums are exceeded, principals are to inform the teacher in writing, stipulating the reason to the teacher and superintendent of schools. In most cases, statements of reason may also be available for examination by the union.

Among the most specific language outlined regarding class size was the agreement for New York personnel. The agreement listed four exceptions where maximums regarding class size may be exceeded: 1) when no space is available, 2) where conformity to established guidelines would place additional classes on short-time schedules, 3) where conformity would result in half-classes, and 4) in the case of specialized or experimental educational programs.

In addition to the above factors, a few agreements contained provisions to pay teachers at a specified rate for overload assignments. However, in these agreements teachers could have no more than one period of overload teaching per day. And, finally, a substantial number of the agreements made special provisions for class size in atypical situations; (the exceptions being classes in music, art, physical education, team-teaching, classes for the physically handicapped, special adjustment classes, and the educable mentally retarded.)

Evaluation

Among the ninety-three agreements studied, 60% contained specific evaluation procedures. The evaluation procedure provisions contained a variety of different items, from an introductory statement of intent for the evaluation, to the persons responsible for aiding the teacher to improve performance.
However, most of the agreements contained very specific language for non-tenured teacher evaluations, as well as the frequency of the appraisals. On the whole, non-tenured teachers were evaluated twice annually and tenured-teachers once every three and/or five years. A few agreements for tenured-teachers stipulated annual evaluations or evaluations which could be made at the superintendent's discretion. In school systems where these procedures were adopted for tenured teachers, the same rules applied to them as applied to non-tenured faculty.

The officials responsible for evaluating teachers were usually the administrator (principal) or the general administration, and peer and self-evaluation were absent from the majority of the agreements.

The right of the teacher to be informed of evaluations was specifically outlined in the majority of the agreements, and most of the agreements mandated that the appraisal of the teacher be conducted with the full knowledge of the teacher and without the benefits of mechanical surveillance devices. Yet, central to the interest of this study, few of the agreements in the public school sector included language on community participation in evaluating teacher performance.

**Promotions**

Specific guidelines on promotions were included in fifty-five (55%) of the agreements. In general, positions paying a salary differential and/or those of a supervisory or administrative nature are classified as promotional positions for educational personnel. Promotional positions generally include the positions of coordinator, department chairman, counselor, administrative assistant, assistant principal, principal, assistant superintendent, and sometimes specialist. In most of the agreements, the school board or the superintendent's office must publicize vacancies of higher job classifications on school bulletin boards (a frequently mentioned item in the agreements), or in periodic bulletins or newsletters from the administrative office.

The general requirements for promotion included: appropriate professional background, experience, appropriate degree, certification status, prior service that has been rated satisfactory, length of service in system, and good references or recommendations. In some systems, tests (written and oral) are given with each item assigned specific percentage points. And, generally when examinations are provided, there are subjective considerations included. These factors include:
health, character, personality, capability and relations with the public in the larger cities. However, such items were broadly written in general terms, and for the most part, discretionary.

Social Welfare Professionals

Social welfare professionals were the second largest group of workers analyzed. Included in this analysis as indicated in Table II were eight agreements covering 22,400 workers, primarily in New York City and Los Angeles.

The small number of agreements for social welfare workers is reflective of the recent collective bargaining emphasis and the limited number of agreements on file at BLS. This analysis indicated that only the agreement in New York City for 250 workers or more was negotiated prior to 1970.

This small number also limited any detailed consideration of the non-wage items. As indicated in Table II, only two of the agreements included specific language on case load requirements per worker. General language was included in the agreement between New York City and the Social Service Employees, but it was not specific in either duties or performance. In addition, while promotional guidelines were specifically outlined in the agreements, they were not detailed in regard to client relationships. And, regular evaluations by administrators were not outlined in detail for workers, either in frequency or purpose.

A more salient factor relating to procedures for upward mobility was the emphasis placed on payments by government for advanced education in social welfare professions. The benefits to workers for advanced educational work ranged from full tuition with partial pay, or other agreements which would provide incentives for study at approved colleges or universities. And, while stipulations are fairly common for advanced education among teachers, the option appeared to be much broader for social welfare workers in choice of study and mobility either within or outside the respective organization.

The most important aspect of the agreements relating to the growth of collective bargaining among welfare workers, was the emphasis placed on maintaining jobs for workers even if technological advancements necessitated changes in the structure of organizations. Language specifying this factor was included in the agreements between the County of Los Angeles and the Joint Council of Los Angeles Employees Associations Service Employees, and the agreement between New
York City and the Social Service Employees.

However, based on the limited number of agreements negotiated as of 1973 it is difficult to determine the impact on non-wage items on organizational structures or the public among welfare professionals.

Health Professionals

There were twenty-five agreements analyzed for health professionals covering 18,700 workers as indicated in Table III.

Each of the agreements analyzed for 250 professionals or more were negotiated after 1970, and the majority of the agreements were for 500 workers or less.

The agreements covered nurses, doctors, dentists and related professional technicians. Nurses constituted the largest number of the agreements and doctors the fewest.

As indicated in Table III, the non-wage items chosen for analysis among health professionals varied considerably. Specifically, only three of the twenty-five agreements analyzed contained criteria on patient load per professional worker, and, the language on this item was written in general terms.

Evaluation and promotional consideration, however, were specific in most of the agreements, and frequently, but not exclusively, related to patient care. Indeed, evaluation and promotional procedures, particularly for nurses, could be considered a major item in the context of most of the agreements. Nurses appeared to be concerned with evaluations which appraised their professional duties, and specified the procedures and basis for monetary gains and administrative duties.

In addition to the above factors, a major aspect of the agreements was the emphasis placed on shift differentials by management for workers. Many of the agreements specifically outlined procedures for shifts in duties outside of regular schedules, and when notification of shifts was to occur.

Finally, advanced education among health professionals has increasingly become a major aspect of upward mobility and tenure as indicated. In Table III, about half of the agreements contained provisions for payment of additional education. Succinctly, based on the limited number of agree-
ments analyzed for this study, the major non-wage factors among health workers, excluding doctors, appeared to be an emphasis on defining professional roles and status within organizations by management.

The Growth of Black Professional Organizations in the Service Society

The growth of Black professional organizations in the service sector has largely coincided with the emphasis on collective bargaining among professional workers. The reasons for the coinciding growth are important to note as they relate to both services and the future structure of client organizations. There are several factors which stimulated the growth of these organizations. First, the civil rights movement, and federal-local programs of the 1960's provided an initiative for Black professional groups to organize; second, the politicization of Black lower-income clients regarding services and accountability of client organizations provided a need and goal for Black professional groups to attempt to meet; third, Blacks as a result of exclusion in the private sector have traditionally emphasized the service area as a means of upward mobility, and clearly had a special interest in maintaining or increasing their professional status as collective bargaining accelerated; and fourthly, younger Blacks, many of whom were involved in civil rights activities, have viewed these professional organizations as opportunities for alternative service structures in the Black communities.

As indicated in Table IV, the majority of national Black organizations in the service sector were formed after 1965. Prior to that time, the preponderence of the national organizations were in the health and educational areas, with the Urban League and the National Medical Association encompassing many of the duties in the social welfare area and medical spheres.

These older organizations still perform valuable functions. However, there are noticeable differences in the functions and goals of these two organizations from those organizations which developed after 1965. A major difference is the degree of specialization among the newer organizations; their frequent incorporation of militant positions voiced in the Black community, and often the impatience of the loose membership towards traditional approaches of solving social welfare problems in the Black community.
Yet, regarding this analysis, perhaps the most important factor is that Blacks in these areas are largely unionized in the professional areas, which have become most organized in recent years. Indeed, although Blacks as of 1970 comprised only 6.5% of the white collar workforce, they represented 16.6% of the union membership in these organizations, and were more unionized in the educational and health fields than other workers.11

And, even though it is difficult in this research study to provide any accurate figures on the number of Blacks who belong to both unions or associations, and Black service organizations, it is safe to assume that the number is substantial, particularly in larger cities.

This observation viewed in the context of the findings on the non-wage items in the previous section would tend to suggest that Black professionals have gained substantial benefits in recent years from collective bargaining agreements which solidify their positions within the organization. Historically, this is important for professional Blacks in the service area, especially in view of the traditional emphasis on upward mobility in these occupations.

However, the importance of Black professionals benefiting from collective bargaining agreements and their organizations within unions or associations is a more difficult proposition than the one stated in the previous paragraph. Traditionally, in sociological literature there has been an interesting and fruitful dialogue concerning the role of the Black professional, the Black community, and value systems. Yet, few of the studies linked Black professional roles to changes in the character of the economic system. And, as indicated consistently throughout this analysis, changes in the socio-economic structure have an important bearing on the nature of discussions of Black professionals. In this regard, three factors can help clarify this observation. First, as noted previously, Black professionals have an important stake in the emphasis of social control mechanisms established for the larger professional group, but they cannot ignore an increasingly sophisticated Black client group; secondly, the demands for racial integration in service areas has raised conflicts for those Black professionals who relied on client service segregation as a means of security and mobility; and thirdly, the multiple forces accounting for the growth of the service era described in this study, have gradually meant that the security of Black professionals has rested on their ability to organize and alter social control processes within or-
ganizations, and the socialization process leading to professional status.

In this context, as Charles Sanders has indicated in an important study of Black professional groups in health and welfare organizations, issues leading to institutional change in the service sector regarding Blacks, have been more important for Black professionals than changing the goals of the service organization or the collective bargaining agent. Sanders concluded that Black professionals in these fields did not challenge the more covert racial procedures of traditionally white professional organizations, but only raised issues related to the Black community. His findings would indicate that the growth of Black professional groups are more important in many cases for security, than changing the overall goals of professional groups. And, Robert Barlett, in a more limited analysis concluded that professionalism had a stronger influence on Black professional's perceptions of the Black community than ethnicity, class, or place of residence.

These findings suggest that processes which alter professional standards regarding the Black community are more important in non-wage areas, than changing structures. Yet, as aforementioned since these studies do not construct models based on overall socio-economic changes, they miss the point that professional security among ethnic groups is an important aspect of political change and politicization. In fact, although political scientists have traditionally emphasized professional security as a factor of politicization, sociologists have been interested less in rewards, and more interested in client-professional relationships.

Succinctly, these observations indicated that as American society has become more occupationally oriented towards the white collar worker in the service areas, Blacks who have traditionally emphasized education in these areas for middle-class status, have become an important force in determining both the processes of goal determination of services for the Black community, and in influencing the direction of institutionalized procedures in client service unions for their class interest. At this point, these organizations are not particularly ideologically oriented, but the conflicts and issues they have raised are important in terms of the emerging racial and class conflicts, and must therefore be considered an important dimension of analysis of post-industrial capitalism.
Conclusion

This analysis has attempted to present one dimension of the conflicts among professionals serving the public, which are important in the American service era.

Since, the study focused on emerging trends, there are few rigid conclusions which can be developed. However, the findings do indicate that professionals in the service sector are an important force in outlining the institutionalized procedures of client organizations.

The influence which professionals are exerting, is an important dimension for several reasons. First, the growth of collective bargaining among professionals can not be divorced from the broader economic changes in American society. Secondly, the goals of the service-welfare sector are increasingly being defined by the scope of duties professional workers will assume and; thirdly, the structure of client serving organizations in the future probably will be determined more by legal professional agreements than traditional means of informal consultation.

The impact that these trends currently and in the future will have on the Black community in terms of institutionalized patterns within client-serving organizations are in many respects hypothetical. However, it appears, that broader social, and subsequent institutional changes in the service sector, will depend largely on how Black professionals view the interests of the broader Black community and their own professional goals.

In observing these phenomenon, it is therefore crucial that theories of the institutionalization of race reflect the emerging developments in the service sector, and observations of the service society reflect potential racial patterns.

The crucial dimension is class conflict between lower income clients seeking social changes, and professionals seeking to maintain institutionalized structures. Additionally, the manner in which ethnic biases are incorporated into policies and procedures related to services for the Black community will be an important aspect of social change.

Social change has become more intertwined with the influence of professionalization, technology, and class biases than in any previous era. Professionals, as indicated in the findings of this study, are dramatically focusing on more defined responsibilities and power. Thus, a Black client
group demanding accountability of professional responsibility must face this reality, and the fact that changes in non-wage factors increasingly must be approved by professional unions or associations. Therefore, it should be expected that community demands for professional responsibilities will have to be proven frequently through approved union studies with client participation subject to union-management negotiation.

These developments regarding Blacks, client serving organizations, and unions, require close attention. The emphasis on non-wage items, could in fact alter many of the current race relation theories, and observations.

This article suggests that the theoretical developments needed for the future in terms of Blacks and post-industrial capitalism have not been adequately defined, but that the conflicts regarding institutionalization of procedures in client serving organizations are a significant indicator of the directions which must be studied.
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### TABLE I

**Educational Workers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Workers</th>
<th>Number of Agreements</th>
<th>Union or Assoc Members Covered by Rank Size</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>250-749</td>
<td>27 included</td>
<td>23 included</td>
<td>29 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 not included</td>
<td>22 not included</td>
<td>16 not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,650</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>750-1249</td>
<td>6 included</td>
<td>5 included</td>
<td>3 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 not included</td>
<td>3 not included</td>
<td>3 not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1250-1749</td>
<td>8 included</td>
<td>7 included</td>
<td>3 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 not included</td>
<td>3 not included</td>
<td>7 not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,950</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1750-2249</td>
<td>5 included</td>
<td>4 included</td>
<td>3 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 not included</td>
<td>1 not included</td>
<td>2 not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2250-2749</td>
<td>1 included</td>
<td>1 included</td>
<td>2 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 not included</td>
<td>1 not included</td>
<td>0 not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180,050</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2750+</td>
<td>18 included</td>
<td>18 included</td>
<td>18 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 not included</td>
<td>5 not included</td>
<td>5 not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235,450</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>65 included</td>
<td>58 included</td>
<td>58 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 not included</td>
<td>35 not included</td>
<td>35 not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Workers</td>
<td>Number of Agreements</td>
<td>Union or Assoc. Members Covered by Rank Size</td>
<td>Caseload</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>250-749</td>
<td>1 included</td>
<td>4 included</td>
<td>0 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 not incl</td>
<td>0 not incl</td>
<td>4 not incl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750-1249</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1250-1749</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1750-2249</td>
<td>1 included</td>
<td>1 included</td>
<td>1 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 not incl</td>
<td>0 not incl</td>
<td>0 not incl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2250-2749</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,750</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2750+</td>
<td>0 included</td>
<td>3 included</td>
<td>0 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 not incl</td>
<td>0 not incl</td>
<td>3 not incl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2250-2749</td>
<td>2 included</td>
<td>8 included</td>
<td>1 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 not incl</td>
<td>0 not incl</td>
<td>7 not incl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Workers</td>
<td>Number of Agreements</td>
<td>Union or Assoc. Members Covered by Rank Size</td>
<td>Patients Treated</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>250-749</td>
<td>4 included</td>
<td>15 included</td>
<td>10 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 not included</td>
<td>5 not included</td>
<td>10 not incl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>750-1249</td>
<td>0 included</td>
<td>2 included</td>
<td>1 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 not included</td>
<td>0 not included</td>
<td>1 not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,950</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1250+</td>
<td>0 included</td>
<td>3 included</td>
<td>1 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 not included</td>
<td>0 not included</td>
<td>2 not included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 included</td>
<td>20 included</td>
<td>12 included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 not included</td>
<td>5 not included</td>
<td>13 not included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV
National Black Organizations in Service Areas: Date of Charter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Organizational Charter</th>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Social Welfare</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Every program designed to decrease poverty is based upon assumptions either as to the nature and causes of poverty or what is necessary to help the poor improve their lot (Spilerman and Elish, 1970; Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity, 1966; Valentine, 1968). Often these assumptions are only implicit, and supervisors of the program might not even agree with the assumptions if they were stated. Nevertheless, a program would itself make no sense unless certain statements about poverty were true. For example, a program of economic development to increase employment opportunities assumes that, first, much poverty is due to structural features, especially a shortage of jobs in the labor force, and that employment of the poor will be a major factor in decreasing poverty. On the other hand, job training assumes that there are jobs, but that the poor are not qualified to fill the openings.

The amount of support or opposition to programs in the area of poverty depends not only upon cost and apparent effectiveness, but also upon the concepts of poverty extant in the public view. As sociologists are increasingly involved in applied work in the area of poverty, the necessity of knowing the assumptions and concepts found among leaders in the public and private sectors is of paramount importance. Failures in communication and actual disagreements can only be minimized if the sociologist is aware of the implicit assumptions in programs and the often unexpressed concepts held by those who are to accept or reject his recommendations.

The Research Problem

The problem of the research reported in the following pages is to determine the nature of concepts of poverty held by one of the most important groups in the area of poverty programs, the County Board of Commissioners. More specifically, the research problems may be divided into the following parts:

1. the nature of explanations of poverty given by county commissioners;
2. whether these explanations are structural, or place the responsibility on inadequacies of the individual;
3. whether there is a "single factor" concept in explaining poverty, or the recognition of multiple factors;
4. the extent to which county commissioners differentiate types of poverty situations as results of differential factors: unemployment (Lumer, 1965), the problems of the aged (Bond, et al., 1954; Loether, 1967; 47-62), recidivism or intergenerational poverty

*This study was co-sponsored by the Agricultural Extension Service and the Agricultural Experiment Station, Project Number 0203-4827-15 of the University of Minnesota. The authors acknowledge valuable comments from Dr. Willis Goudy and Dr. Cherry Kinney.

It is important to point out that the research problem in no way relates directly to the "correctness" of the theories or concepts, but rather points to the extent to which such theories are believed by county commissioners and, therefore, would become part of the definition of any situation in which county commissioners participate.

The Importance of the Problem

The dirth of research on the county commissioner is matched by the absence of reporting of their actions and concepts in the press. Actually, the importance of the concepts held by the county commissioners can be established on the grounds of the importance of their power in state politics, their control of budgets for programs for the poor, and by the tendency to submit new programs at the federal level either to their approval or control.

1. Programs which were sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity were, in the early years, based on propositions which are part of the sociologists' definition of the situation for the most part. However, the far more heavily sponsored programs for the poor are those conducted in welfare departments, using mainly state and local funds with some reimbursements from the federal government, and in turn responsible to the County Board of Commissioners. The guidelines themselves are determined to some extent by commissioners, because of their key position in the political structure of the state. The flexibility found in these guidelines consists mainly of definitions of necessities which are open to the discretion of the County Board of Commissioners.

2. Many federal programs are accepted or rejected by the county on the basis of the policy of the County Board of Commissioners. Examples are food stamps and the Expanded Food and Nutrition Program, conducted by the Extension Service. Other federal programs, also accepted or rejected by the Board, are conducted by local persons hired by the Board, responsible to a policy-making body which is approved by the Board, and administered in a manner commensurate with concepts held by Board members. The trend currently is in the direction of this arrangement, rather than away from it.

3. The traditional work with poverty, county welfare, is the greatest effort by far made by our society to improve the lot of the poor. In 1968 in a midwestern state, the time and place of the present research, the total budget for all programs sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity was $23,084,385. This figure is only slightly more than 11% of the total budget that year for welfare, which was $206,285,344, and, more dramatically, was only slightly above the administrative costs of the welfare program alone. Several components of the welfare program far exceeded the War on Poverty funds: AFDC, $40,382,000; Medical care, over $89,600,000; and assistance to families
in which the head was unemployed, $28,600,000. The likelihood of new programs replacing county welfare in the near future is small. Such basic institutions do not disappear in a short time because of the interdependence with other institutions. Hundreds of thousands of persons employed in administering welfare would be thrown out of work. The $89,000,000 for medical assistance assures smaller communities of maintaining hospitals and physicians, since this money goes directly to the agencies involved. The poor must get medical care or not get the aid. For these and other reasons, the welfare program whose policies are set by the County Board of Commissioners would appear to be a major part of the total effort of the society to reduce poverty for some time to come.

The magnitude of the control exercised, formally and informally, by county commissioners is such, then, that to ignore them or to be ignorant of their thinking will greatly increase the difficulties of sociologists being heard by an audience with the clout to adopt and implement sociologically sound recommendations.

The Concepts and Situations

The commissioners were asked in this study to explain poverty-related phenomena in each of four situations: unemployment, second generation welfare recidivism, school drop out, and the need for economic assistance among the aged.

In each of these four situations, the commissioners were presented with four alternative explanations. These concepts or theories were developed out of conversations with county commissioners and other local leaders before the questionnaire was developed. The statements most often heard were then compared to various theoretical approaches found in the professional literature for purposes of classification (Borgatta, 1968; Brachet, et al., 1968:1-17; Schlesinger, 1955; Lumer, 1965). These theoretical positions were then translated back into statements which corresponded as much as possible to the original statements most often made by commissioners and local leaders. The statements are not worded exactly as they appear in conversation, but the problem of validity is great when a correspondence between public statement and sociological concept is sought. This problem is no more or less true of the present research than that found in most attitudinal studies. Each item must both reflect a person's viewpoint and, with at least face validity, be a manifestation of a theoretical construct.

The four concepts included in the study were:

1. The theory of inherent inferiority (Hofstader, 1955; Fishman, 1966:1-22). The assumptions of the inferiority of the poor, in general, and those on welfare, in particular, are expressed in several ways by persons in lay leadership positions. The key expressions in each of several situations are listed as the first explanation offered in the groupings in Tables I through IV. There is some support in the literature for this proposition, and such findings are sometimes known by respondents of the type in this study. For example, a higher incidence
of mental retardation is found among the poor (Harley, 1969; H. Miller, 1965), and scores on IQ tests appear to be correlated in roughly a linear relationship to status variables (Blum and Rossi, 1969). The argument, at its best, would be that humans vary in ability, for whatever reason, and those who are inferior would be sifted to the bottom in the process of competition for status rewards—a social Darwinistic approach (Hofstadter, 1955). It matters little in programs for adults whether this inferiority is biological in nature or due to early care. Researchers who report mental retardation suggest that it is due to lack of adequate pre-natal care and poor nutrition (Miller, 1965; Hurley, 1969). Ryan (1971) has suggested that biological inferiority and "social inferiority" are functional equivalents.

2. The concept of fortuitous misfortune (Mills, 1943; Ryan, 1971: 14). In discussing the causes of poverty with local leaders, the statement that the poor have "bad luck" or are "losers" frequently occurs. Welfare funds are available for the poor who have accidents or illnesses. Research indicates that there is a higher incidence of chronic illness among the poor, they have lower levels of health, their parents are less apt to see that they have vaccinations and immunization shots (and this would mean that as adults they would more likely have these diseases) (Blum and Rossi, 1969; Herzog, 1963; Keyserling, 1964; Lumer, 1965; Roemer and Kisch, 1968).

3. The theory of culture of poverty. The concept of culture of poverty has received much attention in professional literature (Lewis, 1965; Barinin and Yeager, 1964; Knupfer, 1947; Rodman, 1963; Schneiderman, 1964; Valentine, Goodwin, 1967). The theory as expressed by local leaders is much more narrowly defined, and elements of it are sharply distinguished from each other. As used in this study, the culture of poverty refers to belief systems, interests, and goals, and includes such statements as "they don't want to work," "they like it where they are," and "they do not value education."

4. The theory of structural disadvantages. The idea of a social structure at the minimum involves how other people treat the poor, but some expressions were heard to involve systematic discrimination through such "structural" features as criteria in decision-making which excluded the poor from participation in middle class advantages, agency programs (e.g. school curricula) aimed at needs of those who have money, and lack of community resources to solve the problems of the poor. Clearly, however, the greatest number of statements had to do with economic structure, especially the availability of jobs at the local level. Research literature has been amassed over the last four decades to show that not only minority groups but the poor generally are disadvantaged in a wide variety of areas. In more recent literature, it has been found that the poor earn less over their lifetime, fail to meet the ever increasing standards of employment, find the myriad of voluntary organizations aimed at problems which are not theirs, experience disadvantages at the hands of the law, and health practice generally is given less to the poor than to middle class children and adults (Blum and Rossi, 1968; Broom and Selznick, 1968; American Bar Association Series, 1969; Fernbach, 1965).
These four concepts lend themselves to other types of classification which would be useful for sociologists. The first three (inferiority, fortuitous misfortune, and the culture of poverty) represent explanations of poverty resting the responsibility on the characteristics of the individual. Only the fourth concept points to problems in the social and economic structure itself. The findings with respect to this dichotomy are very clear-cut, as will be seen.

Another division of the responses would be into true and false. The approach taken by the researchers on this issue was that statements which depict the situation are not necessarily true but are part of the folk wisdom as reflected by statements made by numerous local leaders in discussions which led to the development of the instrument of observation. Our interest is to identify the structure of beliefs about the poor, and the roles of information, mis-information, selectivity of facts, and folk wisdom handed down through the generations. (For a review of the widespread perceptions of poverty, see Goudy, 1970, "Shoot Them If They Won't Work: A Study of Socioeconomic Status, Economic Aspirations, and Attitudes Toward Poverty, the Poor, and Public Dependence"). As much as county commissioners work with poverty, we found even such basic terms as welfare and poverty to be handled interchangeably in many cases. To make the distinction in our questionnaire would be to introduce meanings not present in the phenomena we are studying.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

The Universe of Study

The universe of study consisted of all members of the County Board of Commissioners in a midwestern state. Each county has five such commissioners. A non-voting member of the Board is the County Auditor. We discovered that, although non-voting, the auditor is a most influential member of the board in most counties, due probably to his greater familiarity with the budget. We, therefore, included the responses of the auditors as well as commissioners.

The administration of welfare in the state and the social and economic conditions affecting poverty are so variable throughout the state that a decision was made to include the entire population of 435 commissioners and 87 auditors in the study. A sample might miss some of the more unique situations.

The Mailed Questionnaire

The questionnaire was mailed in four waves and the response rate was 89.5%. Over half of the refusals were newly elected commissioners and auditors who felt they had insufficient experience to respond. No effort was made to convince them that their response was valuable unless the refusal seemed tentative.

Not all of the questions were answered by every commissioner returning a questionnaire, and therefore the non-response rate will vary a small amount from one type of poverty situation to another.
Constructing the Questions

The statements which reflect any one theory differ depending upon the situation which the commissioners are asked to explain. This difference makes comparison of the explanations from one situation to another somewhat hazardous. However, the decision had to be made whether to use consistent statements or to use those statements which most closely reflected the rhetoric of the commissioners themselves. It was decided that the sustained contact with the commissioners made possible by many meetings with them in connection with other responsibilities of one of the authors gave a uniqueness to the present research that should not be neglected. Of the two evils, then, it was decided to surrender consistency in favor of avoiding responses to words and explanations not familiar to the commissioners. One needed research area would be a quasi-replication of the present study using similar or identical statements to reflect any one theory across all of the poverty situations considered.

ANALYSIS

The first problem of the analysis is to determine the extent to which the county commissioners subscribe to each of the four explanations of poverty: inferiority, fortuity, the culture of poverty, and structural factors.

Concepts of Unemployment

The commissioners were asked to explain why many of the people on welfare are unemployed. The responses were quite uniform, with two-thirds of the commissioners subscribing to each of the explanations which attributed unemployment to some characteristic of the individual (see Table I). On the other hand, only slightly more than one-fifth admitted to the unavailability of jobs as a factor in unemployment.

The inadequacies of the employment structure are problems with which the leaders of the county and local communities must concern themselves and for which they feel some responsibility. To subscribe to the structural explanation of poverty would be to admit of failure on the part of local leadership, which includes the respondents themselves. The respondents would also be perceiving behavior quite different than most other members of the society perceive it, which appears to be a "we" "they" orientation (Kaplan and Tausky, 1972; Ryan, 1971; Rytina et al., 1970; Goudy, 1970). An interesting contradiction in the definition of the labor force and employment structure on the part of the commissioners is found in sustained discussion with them. In areas other than poverty and welfare, the structural explanation is found. For example, the "fact" of the need for employment opportunities to retain youth in the community is not only readily admitted but introduced into a conversation by local leaders themselves. However, in these same conversations the immediate transfer of the generalization about "joblessness" to the welfare situation brings an immediate change to explanations of personal responsibility for unemployment on the part of the adult. This same explanation is also found among poor people themselves.
Another possible factor in the overwhelming subscription to the personal explanation as opposed to the structural may be the definition of the structural explanation as questioning the very system through which the commissioners have succeeded in gaining a position of influence and success. Such an imputation is not as uniquely selfish of the commissioners as it may appear since the central concept in this definition is that of achieved status. Sociologists have long been more critical in the selection of research problems and theoretical formulations in the area of ascribed than achieved status, indeed, in the area of poverty itself.

Concepts of Recidivism

The commissioners were asked to explain why many children from welfare families stay on welfare even when they are adults. Previous studies of welfare recidivism in the state in which the data was collected found that 39% of the people on welfare at the time of the study had been children from welfare families, and these studies are well known by commissioners (American Public Welfare Institute, 1961; Harrison, 1955).

The most widely held definition was that of inferiority, with four-fifths subscribing to this explanation (see Table II). Nearly three-fourths of the respondents indicated that the intergenerational welfare recipients "had learned to like welfare," the cultural explanation. Fewer, about three-fifths, felt the explanation rested in the poor health, diet, and living conditions experienced by the intergenerational recidivists when they were children.

The structural explanation was worded: "Many did not get the same advantages as other kids from schools and employers." The proportion subscribing to this structural explanation fell below half, with about two-fifths so responding. Even so, this response was double that found subscribing to the structural explanation of unemployment.

To some extent we may see a tendency to justify the welfare program in comparing the findings in Table II with those in Table I. When the commissioners are faced with the failure of the welfare program in "getting people off welfare," as they are in the question concerning recidivism, the proportion responding to three of the four explanations increases. Such a search for causes somewhat obscured the fact that the structural explanation doubled in popularity. This increase is possibly due to the halo effect of thinking about the second generation welfare recipients in terms of their childhood experiences, as may be seen more clearly in the following question.

Concepts of School Drop Out

The commissioners were asked why children from welfare families drop out of school more often than children generally. The responses clearly indicate the halo effect connected with youth referred to above. The suggestion that these children are less intelligent received approval from only 37% of the respondents, whereas the inferiority notion was accepted by 60% or more of the respondents in all the other
situations in which explanations were called for (Table III). The suggestion that the schools were not geared to the needs of these children was rejected at an even higher rate, with fewer than one-fifth checking this explanation as true. The schools fared even better than the local economy in shedding responsibility for meeting the needs of the welfare family.

The overwhelming response (about 97%) favored the explanation that placed responsibility neither on the children nor on the system but upon the parents of the welfare families: "Many are not taught the value of education by their parents." The second most frequently approved explanation was that of fortuity: "Many have less energy, need glasses, and have other health needs." Although slightly more than half subscribed to this explanation, two comparisons lessen its importance. First, compared to the 96% responding in terms of the culture of poverty, the 51% is hardly impressive. Second, in all three of the other situations (unemployment, recidivism, and the aged, reported below) the fortuity explanation was subscribed to by more than 60% of the commissioners. The general pattern of response in the explanation of school drop out is a tremendous increase in the cultural explanation and the uniform and tremendous decrease in the other explanations.

Concept of the Aged Poor

The commissioners were asked why so many of the aged need economic assistance. Each of the four explanations was subscribed to by at least half of the respondents, but the general pattern was changed greatly. The cultural explanation ("that many never liked work") was the least popular among the explanations and was far less often approved than in any of the other three situations. The structural explanation, on the other hand, was by far the most popular and was subscribed to by more than twice as many commissioners as was the case in explaining any other poverty situation.

The county commissioners are usually thought of as primarily representing the rural population and the aged are much over-represented in the rural areas. Thus, these conditions may represent one explanation of the unusually high proportion of commissioners endorsing the structural explanation. This explanation in reality may be reduced to several alternative patterns. One of these is that commissioners themselves are from among the rural aged, and, therefore, the structural explanation would relieve the respondents' own age-status group of responsibility for their own plight. However, neither age nor status, as measured by educational attainment and occupational status, had much relationship to response pattern. Another version of this explanation is that the greater exposure to the aged poor resulting from the disproportionate percentages of the population to be found in the rural area helps the commissioner "see" the more subtle forces resulting from structure impinging on the life chances of the aged. However, farmers, who were commissioners in the more rural counties, did not respond differently from other commissioners. The realities of the jurisdiction of county commissioners is that only in certain areas, e.g. road building and maintenance, is their limitation set at the city boundary. In the area of welfare, commissioners supervise most of the funds even
in the largest metropolitan area.

It is more probable that the explanation of the endorsement of the structural explanation of poverty among the aged comes from the general cultural milieu in American society. Economists have used the example of how the aged have been "caught" by inflation in order to show the maining of the shrinking dollar with great effect.

Cross classification of the situations and concepts by age, education, and occupation showed very little change in the percentage distribution.

Discussion

Several patterns of response may be inferred from the findings presented above. First, it is obvious that the responsibility for poverty is placed on the individual rather than the social structure in most problems connected with the poor and with welfare. The exception noted is that of the aged, and that may be explained by the general cultural notion resulting, no doubt, from a halo effect surrounding the notion of the aged. If such is the case, why not a similar response connect with youth, who have probably an even greater and brighter halo? The answer may rest in the particular "personal" responses most often endorsed: both "inferior talents" and "liking welfare" come from the parents. In other words, the personal explanation can be endorsed, therefore preserving the sanctity of our mobility system without, in fact, destroying the aura of youth.

A second pattern is that the commissioners do not subscribe to a single, simplistic doctrine to explain all poverty situations. Indeed, the most highly endorsed explanation varies almost completely depending on the poverty situation being explained: a structural explanation of poverty among the aged, with fortuity the second highest; the cultural explanation of school drop out; and the inferiority followed by the cultural explanation of recidivism; and the three personal explanations almost equally endorsed in explaining unemployment.

A third pattern is evidenced by the fact that a simple majority subscribe to at least two and usually three of the explanations for any one situation. The single factor fallacy is not evident. In terms of any educational program with this power group, the finding is of utmost importance. It has been the experience of the present authors that, in an educational setting, persons who subscribe to a single factor explanation are likely to weigh an alternative single factor against the one they presently endorse, and therefore the effort to conceptualize poverty and its associated behaviors as resulting from a complex of factors on the part of the educator is extremely difficult.

Perhaps of paramount importance is the fourth pattern, that the responses of this most important power group seem to reflect the increasing body of research findings which describe other sectors of our population, the belief in achieved status. The greater experience which commissioners have in deciding on programs to resolve the problems of the poor does not in fact seem to give them different perceptions of
priorities and causes. As professionals become more and more involved in the design and conduct of programs for the poor, the discrepancies in concept between the professional and the public are likely to be found between the professional and power groups. There was some early evidence that such might not be the case, but this appears to be more hope than analytical conclusion (Larson and Potter, 1971).

One recommendation of central relevance to sociologists can be easily seen from the above patterns: that whatever sociologicistic explanations seem appropriate in understanding poverty and thus seem a basis for poverty programs need much more effective dissemination than has previously been experienced. It should be noted that the single situation in which the structural explanation of poverty was more highly endorsed than personal ones was essentially economic—that of inflation. It would seem, further, that certain conditions exist which might make such a task easier than previously thought, at least by these authors: commissioners do differentiate poverty situations in terms of explanations; they are not guilty of the single factor fallacy; and they can be educated right along with the public generally, since they seem to endorse concepts held by the public. The documentation of their importance in the decision-making process on poverty programs, presented earlier in this paper, would seem to make them, in the rhetoric of resource development, a most important target group for education in the sociology of poverty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHY ARE MANY OF THE PEOPLE ON WELFARE NOW UNEMPLOYED?</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO STATEMENT (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority: many are inferior workers</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortuity: many are ill or handicapped</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural: many don't want to work</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural: there are not enough jobs to go around</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE II

**COUNTY COMMISSIONERS CONCEPTION OF CAUSES OF POVERTY**

**Associated with Aged - expressed in percent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANY OF THE AGED NEED ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE. WHY?</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO STATEMENT (%) TRUE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority: many were poorly equipped at birth to prepare for economic security</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortuity: many were ill or handicapped for many years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural: many never liked work</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural: many were caught by rising costs of living and changing patterns of care of aged parents</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE III

**COUNTY COMMISSIONERS CONCEPTION OF CAUSES OF POVERTY**

**Associated with Welfare Recidivism - expressed in percent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOME CHILDREN FROM WELFARE FAMILIES STAY ON WELFARE EVEN WHEN THEY ARE ADULTS. WHY?</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO STATEMENT (%) TRUE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority: many inherited inferior talents from their parents</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortuity: many had poor health, diet and living conditions</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural: many learned to like welfare</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural: many did not get the same advantages as other kids from schools and employers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS CONCEPTION OF CAUSES OF POVERTY

Associated with School Drop Out - expressed in percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHILDREN FROM WELFARE FAMILIES DROP OUT OF SCHOOL MORE OFTEN THAN OTHER CHILDREN. WHY?</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO STATEMENT (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferiority: many are less intelligent</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortuity: many have less energy, often need glasses, and have other health needs</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural: many are not taught the value of education by their parents</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural: schools are not geared to their needs</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Public Welfare Association
1961 National Study by Institute for Social Science Research, North Carolina.

Barr, Sherman

Blum, Zavaha and Peter H. Rossi


Borgetta, Edgar F.

Brachet, Viviane, Zavaha D. Blum and Peter H. Rossi
Brainin, Sema and Harold C. Yeager, Jr.

Broom, Leonard and Philip Selznick

Coser, Louis A.

Coser, Louis A.

Feagin, Joe R.

Fernbach, Frank L.

Fishman, Leo

Folsom, Marion B.

Gladwin, Thomas

Goldstein, Bernard

Glazer, Nonay and Carol F. Creedon

Goodwin, Leonard

Gordon, R. A.

Goudy, Willis John
Gordon, Margaret S.

Hannerz, Ulf

Harrison, Ethel

Herzog, Elizabeth
1963 "Some Assumptions About the Poor." Social Service Review 37 (December), 389-402.

Hofstadter, Richard

Hurley, Rodger

James, Dorothy B.

Kaplan, H. Roy and Curt Tausky

Keyserling, Leon H.

Knupfer, Genevieve

Lane, Robert E.

Larson, Calvin J. and Harry Potter

Lewis, Oscar

Loether, Herman J.

-78-
Lumer, Hyman

Miller, Henry

Mills, C. Wright

Minnesota Welfare Department. Research Division, Minneapolis, Minnesota Personal Communications

Moynihan, Daniel P.

Orshansky, Mollie

Pinner, Frank A., Paul Jacobs and Philip Selznick

Podell, Lawrence

Rodman, Hyman

Roemer, Milton I. and Arnold I. Kisch

Ryan, William

Rytina, Joan Huber, William H. Form and John Pease

Schlesinger, Benjamin

Schneiderman, Leonard
Simmel, George  

Sleigman, Ben B.  

Spilerman, Seymour and David Elesh  

Staff of the Duke Law Journal  

Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity  

Tiffany, Donald W., James R. Cowan and Phyllis M. Tiffany  

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare  

Valentine, Charles A.  

Weissberg, Norman C.  

Willie, Charles V.  
We live in an age of specialization and usually find it beneficial, perhaps even essential. However, we have been aware since Marx's time at least that the division of labor has its cost. And though we may be a long way from the un compartmentalized utopia where an individual might do four different kinds of work in a single day, we cannot afford to let the assumptions which underlie the separation of important jobs and functions go without periodic reexamination. The separation of the work of the sociologist (or, indeed, any social scientist) and the social worker is one area where reconsideration is overdue. In examining the taken-for-granted bases of this division of labor, we may find they obscure more than they clarify.

One version of the conceptual basis for the distinction between social work and sociology was offered by Robert McIver in a series of lectures at the New York School of Social Work (later Columbia School of S.W.) in 1931. McIver's lectures came at the end of a period of widespread discussion of the relationships between sociology and social work. (Pankin, Leighninger, & Leighninger, 1973) This period, c. 1926-1932, was followed by a time of mutual indifference between the fields and McIver, having anticipated this development, was trying to keep the possibility of collaboration alive by establishing a division of labor while stressing interdependence. It is impossible to tell, at least at the moment, what influence McIver's argument has had; we feel, however, that his formulation is close enough to popularly held but seldom articulated notions to merit our detailed attention. (e.g. Lubove, 1956, P. 33; Kahn, 1959, P. 274; Chambers, 1967, P. 105)

"The relationship of sociology to social work," McIver asserted, "is that of a science to an art." (1931, p. 1)

An art manipulates, controls and changes...; a science seeks only to understand.... An art individualizes, a science generalizes. An art lives in concrete embodiments.... A science lives in abstract relationships.... Each has its own task to perform, and while each needs the other, neither can ever perform the task of the other. (1931, p. 2)

The lecture, the first of a series of five, goes on to discuss this relationship of sociology as science and social work as art and to make many helpful suggestions on contributions each might make to the other. Unfortunately, few of those suggestions seem to have found their way into practice. Instead of focusing on the words "each needs the other," social workers and sociologists seem to have heard only: "each has its own task."

The reasons for the failure of collaboration are numerous and will take further work to give each its proper weight. The inability of sociology to provide cookbook procedures for dealing with specific situations that could compete with Freudian prescriptions (Lubove, 1965, pp. 64-114; Woodroffe, 1968, pp. 118-150), the continuing preference
among social workers in particular and Americans in general for individual rather than social explanations of social problems (Heraud, 1970, p.8; Hinkle & Hinkle, 1954, p. 74), the politics of status and professionalization (McIver, 1931, pp. 18-19), and the politics of national public policy all played a part in this separation. The conceptual distinction, however, may be as important in keeping social work and sociology apart as any of these other factors.

McIver seems to base his art/science distinction on two broad points: 1.) manipulation vs. understanding and 2.) generalization vs. specificity. The first argument, that art (and social work) "manipulates, controls and changes" while science (and sociology), stands apart and "above", seeks only understanding, may be seen as a version of the classic Weberian science/value or objective/subjective distinction. For Weber, the relativity of values could be tolerated if the security of absolute scientific truth was preserved. McIver, who follows Weber on a number of points, thus leaves it to the social worker to decide to what ends the sociologist's knowledge will be put. "Social work must find its own standards of value...without aid and without hinderance from science...." (1931 pp. 2-3)

The second point, that art "individualizes" and is concerned with the concrete, the detailed, the particular while science seeks generalizations and "abstract relationships", is another traditional distinction of Weber's time. It is most clearly formulated by Windleband but probably should be traced to Plato's "divided line." The implication is that the social worker is immersed in the complex and concrete details of a particular case and, moreover, must seek a practical resolution to the problems presented. The sociologist, on the other hand, can afford simply to observe and has the benefit of distance. He is concerned with statements that are trans-situational. He establishes typologies, categories, and patterns. He is responsible to an abstract ideal, "knowledge", and not to particular clients.

Also implicit in the generalization/specificity argument is the suggestion that the social worker's tactics in practice are a matter of "native skill and acquired experience" (McIver, 1931, p. 13) and have only a tenuous relationship to scientific knowledge. Mary Richmond, in her landmark social work text Social Diagnosis, expressed this more clearly and in a manner truer to the art analogy:

...The practitioner of an art must discover the heart of the matter himself -- it is of the essence of art that he shall win his way to this personal revelation... (1917, p. 103)

A recent version of this same distinction may be found in Jack Douglas' title article in The Relevance of Sociology (1970, p. 187):

It is this concrete and particular, this immediate existence full of uncertainty and contingency, which concerns us most about man. And it is this realm of experience that we can understand most fully only through poetic and artistic forms of knowledge.
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Let us, then, take these two conceptual distinctions, derived from an analogy of the relationship of art and science and being used to distinguish social work from sociology, and examine each in detail.

When Weber promulgated the idea of value-free social science, he was being pressed hard not only by German nationalism, which threatened to turn university classrooms into jingoistic indoctrination sessions, but also by German historicism, whose ever-growing mountain of historical and cross-cultural data produced a doctrine of cultural relativity which called into question all absolute standards of goodness, truth, and beauty. Weber's strategy of yielding to cultural relativity in values while holding to objective universality in science proved to be a very successful holding action. This position, which lies behind McIver's manipulation vs. understanding distinction, is still maintained by many American social scientists. Yet, an increasing number are beginning to suspect that Weber really lost the battle with radical sociology of knowledge. Having witnessed the uses of sociology by business and industry for productivity and market research, having survived Vietnam and Project Camelot, social scientists are more willing than before to agree that "...the value-free doctrine of social science was sometimes used to justify the sale of one's talents to the highest bidder...." (Gouldner, 1962, p. 206; see also Birnbaum, 1971, pp. 214-231; Friedrichs, 1970, p. 84)

Having seen a change in the physical sciences from Newtonian simplicity to Einsteinian complexity and a corresponding change in philosophy of science from positivist absolutism to the more conditional and pragmatist viewpoints of Whitehead and Popper, having seen the arrival of the sociology of knowledge to the physical sciences in the work of T.S. Kuhn, many social scientists are ready to deal with the full impact of Mannheim's statement made in 1926:

At this point we may relativize ideas, not by denying them one by one, not by calling them into doubt, not by showing that they are reflections of this or that interest, but by demonstrating that they are part of a system, or more radically, of a totality of Weltanschauung, which as a whole is bound to, and determined by, one stage of developing social reality. From this point on, worlds confront worlds -- it is no longer individual propositions pitted against individual propositions. (Wolff, 1971, p. 69)

Both sociologists and social workers must now face the possible interdependence of values and scientific knowledge. They both must cope with the possibility that their value positions may affect their judgments of fact. They both must recognize the dependence of their theoretical frameworks and methodologies on untestable assumptions about human nature. They both must realize that they have responsibilities to people in the form of agencies, foundations, industries, governments, and clients of all sorts as well as to knowledge, and that these responsibilities may dictate and limit both theories and actions. Finally, both must confront the dependence of their thoughts and actions on macro-social and historical factors that form the context of their work.
McIver's second basis of distinction, generalization vs. specificity, has been much less challenged by recent scholarship than the first argument; yet, we hope to show that it is equally troublesome. The central problem, both with art and science and the analogical extension to social work and sociology, is that this approach treats as an exclusive characteristic what is really a matter of relative emphasis. Generalization and individualization or abstraction and concreteness are better seen as points on a continuum than as dichotomous qualities. Both science and art rely on elements from both ends of the continuum: patterns and generalizations at one end and unique details at the other.

The scientist, whose business it is to find, through properly controlled variables, the patterns of reproducible events, must distill these patterns from the unique. Generalizations come from clinical studies, testable hypotheses from observation, mathematical models and computer programs from a review of intuitive findings. On the other hand, the artist and critic, who wish most to produce a moment of unique feeling, both express themselves through patterns. In order for a work of art to affect an audience, some common ground must exist. All subject matter and media have some inherent pattern.

(Leighninger, 1971, p. 30)

It is true that scientists and artists have developed different styles of communicating as well as different emphases on the continuum of generalization/specificity. One must also note differing emphasis on sensory or affective intensification and on the size of the audience being addressed. However, none of these characteristics are sharp enough to serve as boundary criteria separating art from science. (Leighninger, 1972a) It might even be argued that the similarities are more important than the differences.

The implications of this for McIver's argument is that it may be very misleading to think of social workers as dominated by the concrete details of their specific case situations. Whatever a social worker does in a particular situation will be influenced by basic assumptions about man and society and by theoretical frameworks, partial or systematic, overt or unrecognized. The fact that one has less chance of controlling, simplifying, or experimenting with the complex details of situations may actually increase rather than decrease dependence on generalizations. (Malinowski, 1954, p. 79ff)

This leads to another dimension of McIver's second argument: the concept of "experience." McIver, Richmond, and Douglas all make frequent reference to experience as a way of talking about an individual's encounter with specificity and concreteness. Douglas states most clearly and in the extreme what both McIver, Richmond, and others seem to have in mind:
Any form of scientific analysis involves the imposition of some form of presuppositions upon the "raw" experience of everyday life...all analyses of human experience that go beyond the practical considerations of goals and means involved in an immediate situation do in fact wind up changing everyday experience. At the least, they add to that experience the conclusions for reflection which were not part of the experience itself. (1971, p. 187)

This picture has a certain attractive romanticism but does little to help us understand everyday experience, much less the experience of the artist or the social worker. It can be argued that everyday experience is far from "raw" in the unorganized and unreflective sense that Douglas seems to mean. (for a review of physiological and psychological pre-conditions to perception presented for use in social work education see Goldberg and Middleman, 1973; see also Blumer, 1969, pp. 1-60) The presuppositions are already there in all likelihood and may even be essential for experience itself. Only if the scientific presuppositions are different from the folk presuppositions can experience be "changed". Perhaps Douglas assumes that these presuppositions are always different. In any case, the experience of artist and social worker, which we are most concerned with here, cannot, it seems to us, be unreflective and insensitive to larger issues and problems if effective art or casework is to result.

Let us look again at the basis of the analogy: the artist. A working artist, particularly the ones we would regard as the "best," most serious, most successful and enduring, can be observed to take considerable pains with his product. It is the subject of deep reflection. If it indeed deals with the specific, concrete details of everyday life and can in fact help us understand "important realities" where science cannot (Douglas, 1971, p. 187), it does so through careful organization, thoughtful selection, and controlled stylistic technique. It may even be considerable as a sociological theory itself. (Leighninger, 1972b) For detailed testimony to this by an artist one might consult Ben Shahn's The Shape of Content. (1957) From the sociologist's point of view, the theories of Mead, Dewey, and Kenneth Burke (discussed in this context by Duncan, 1966) all stress the overlap of experience that the artist must have with his audience in order to communicate and provide the understanding valued by McIver, Richmond, and Douglas. One would think that the successful social worker would likewise be one who is diligent in using personal experience, empathy, and generalizations (theory) to orchestrate a response adequate to the complexities of the situation. (Bruyn, 1966; Blumer, 1969; also c.f. the kind of sympathetic introspection suggested by Mills, 1959, p. 196)

We hope that the conceptual distinction of sociologist and social worker based on an art/science dichotomy may now be regarded with some suspicion. Let us continue with a brief discussion of developments in sociological theory that further undermine an easy and clear division
of labor and instead contribute to what some social workers would call "role blurring". As we have said, McIver's discussion of separation is based on Weber's separation of values and scientific knowledge. This position has not only dominated American sociology but has also resulted in the deemphasis of other Weberian doctrines on the process by which sociological knowledge might be acquired. As the dominance of Weberian value-free sociology ends, the Weberian stress on social meanings and interpretative understanding may receive more attention. A re-discovery of Marxist sociology and the sociology of knowledge together with the emergence of ethnomethodology and the resurgence of interactionist sociology (Sprietzer and Reynolds, 1973) provide other spurs to a reconsideration of the business of acquiring sociological knowledge and putting it to use. In this new discussion of the relation of theory to practice, social work and sociology come closer together than they have been in half a century.

Unlike the fact/value distinction which dominates mainstream sociology, Weber's argument for the importance of understanding social meanings has been taken seriously only by those on the margins of sociology. Those sociologists most responsible for keeping alive the tradition that the meaning that social acts have for the actors themselves is a central datum for sociology and that the sociologist, in order to adequately represent those meanings, should become an active participant in the group he wishes to understand, are the Symbolic Interactionists. They have their own version of Weber's argument which derives from the social psychology and pragmatist epistemology of George Herbert Mead. For Mead, "the structure of society lies in... social habits, and only insofar as we can take these social habits into ourselves can we become selves." (Strauss, 1964, p. 33) Individual action

...is a construction and not a release, being built up by the individual through noting and interpreting features of the situations in which he acts...[and] group or collective action consists of the aligning of individual actions, brought about by the individual's interpreting or taking into account each other's actions. (Blumer in Manis & Meltzer, 1972, p. 148)

In order to study society, according to the interactionist, it is necessary to "...catch the process of interpretation..." through which social action is structured. "To catch the process, the student must take the role of the acting unit whose behavior he is studying." (Blumer in Manis & Meltzer, 1972, p. 151)

Another development in sociological theory, ethnomethodology, which is in part an outgrowth of the interactionist tradition incorporating elements of European phenomenology, places even more emphasis on the everyday meanings of social acts. Participant observation, a standard research method of the interactionists, has become even more flexible under the influence of phenomenology, which places stress on the intuitive benefits of participation. (Bruyn in Pilstead, 1970)
The rediscovery of Marxist sociology has been another impetus to the reexamination of questions on how sociological knowledge is acquired as well as to what uses it is put. Marxists urge a more direct relationship of theory to practice, a dialectical relationship requiring constant interaction. Marx's eighth "thesis on Feuerbach" states:

All social life is essentially practical. All the mysteries which urge theory into mysticism find their rational solution in human practice and in the comprehension of this practice. (1947, p. 199)

Although the activist imperative of most Marxist sociologists is not shared by most ethnomethodologists and many interactionists, all seem inclined to agree that more direct involvement by the sociologist in the substance of his inquiry is essential for adequate sociological knowledge. Involvement is not only a source of strategic information for the student of social processes, but it may also be seen as the only way to interpret the findings of other, more traditional methods. Survey research, laboratory experiments, demographic data all may require comparison with data from "natural observation" and experiments in "natural settings". As Jack Douglas has concluded, summarizing all these trends:

...as our conceptions of society change, our conceptions of the nature of (scientific) sociological knowledge will also change. We shall come to see sociological knowledge and all scientific knowledge, as necessarily grounded in our personal involvement in common sense practical activities, we shall become convinced that the real question is not whether but how we should be involved. (1970, p. 210)

(Despite the criticisms leveled above at one small part of Douglas' discussion, the piece as a whole admirably covers many complex issues; and much of our argument is indebted to his clear and comprehensive presentation.)

Though we are probably not likely to see the distinction between sociology and social work disappear under the converging trends of sociological theory combining involvement with reflection and practice with theory, we may at least imagine a period where transit between the two different activities will be easier. Moreover, as pressures for vocational training threaten to lead to greater curricular specialization, it cannot hurt to think occasionally of the things that social worker (or any practitioner) and sociologist (or any social scientist) have in common:

1. They both need to confront the influence of values on their theories and actions;
2. they both must recognize the influence of patrons (people who pay them) on what they do, and

3. deal with possible conflicts between those interests and the interests of those they would like to help;

4. they both theorize, developing general explanations for the things they encounter and general strategies for getting more information;

5. they both practice, test, or act in the complexity and concreteness of social reality.

If a focus on common or shared traits seems to obscure important facts, one must remember what is obscured in the focus on separation. It hides from the social scientist his reliance on values and practical involvement and his possible dependence on patronage. It shields from the social worker his reliance on theoretical frameworks, his responsibility to think beyond particular situations and cases and to help create new knowledge. If a political scientist can move from wholehearted involvement in getting someone elected to a critical analysis of the whole political system, why can't sociologists and social workers switch jobs now and then? This has its practical and conceptual perils, but it might lead to a more realistic and effective performance by both.

REFERENCES


Chambers, Clarke A. Seedtime of Reform (Ann Arbor Paperbooks) 1967.


-88-


Richmond, Mary. Social Diagnosis (New York: Russel Sage) 1917.

Shahn, Ben. The Shape of Content (New York: Vintage) 1957.


The Development of the Swedish System of Social Welfare

By 1931 the Swedish economy had fallen from its post-World War I position of productive and financial eminence within the world market. Domestic unemployment and shortages of capital within the nation led to a general rejection of the old policies of balanced-budget government. When the Social Democrats gained control in 1932 a new consensus blurred party lines, a consensus of opinion upon the need for governmental action. With the guidance of the theories advanced by the "Stockholm School" of economics, state regulation of the economy became a reality. This government intervention into the economy set the stage for the initiation of a broadly based program of social welfare. Instead of burdening the economic development of the country, welfare programs came to be seen as means to stimulate consumption and investment and as an aid in the reduction of unemployment. For the best of entrepreneurial reasons Sweden proceeded to develop the world's most advanced system of social welfare programs.

Coupled with this was a widespread concern over the lack of population growth. Gunnar and Alva Myrdal's 1934 work, Crisis in the Population Question, raised the specter of an absolute loss in population due to a well documented and prolonged decrease in the birth rate. Not only were the politicians' and the public's eyes opened by the problem; the Myrdal's proposals for solutions came to be viewed as most appropriate, considering the gravity of the problem and the new economic activities of the government. The remedy was carefully spelled out: increased family size as encouraged by a redistribution of income and a series of welfare schemes designed to provide adequate resources for families and improved material standards at the same time. Their book served as a catalyst between the newly discovered economic benefits of social welfare programs, humane concerns, and the enactment of these.

Sweden acted. A law establishing voluntary unemployment insurance was passed in 1934. A new scheme of old age pensions was adopted in 1935. In the same year pre- and post-natal benefits for mothers and loans to help newlyweds set up house were initiated. In 1937 the Riksdag developed programs of grants to the children of widows and invalids and to orphans. Advance allowances to illegitimate children were provided as were subsidies for school lunches. In the area of family housing state loans for construction in urban areas were initiated in 1933. Paid vacations of twelve days per year of work were guaranteed in 1938 and were increased to four weeks in 1963. Such programs held the promise that the family of moderate means could work, live, and play in a style not too unlike that of their wealthier, childless counterparts.

Planning for further developments occurred simultaneously. Royal commissions on housing, population, and social services were established in the '30's, after the Myrdal's had felled the cat. Reforms in the regulation of sexual activity and abortion, public support for families, the regional redistribution of industry, provisions for relocation and retraining of workers, health and accident insurance, unemployment insurance, and old-age pensions, not only were planned, but captured the attention of the public.

Following the interruption of World War II, many of these reforms were enacted, all with the goals of economic prosperity, full employment, and improved standards of family living.

Research Objectives and Findings

Our research was guided by an interest in the attitudes of social workers toward their personal work situation, their occupation, its place in the society, and other matters. It seemed likely that in a welfare state, the position of the profession and the attitudes of its practitioners would reflect its key position within the society. If such expectations were borne out, we might be able to make predictions concerning such attitudes among American social workers should the welfare program be greatly expanded.

If occupations are arranged along a dimension defined in terms of complementarity of goals and methods with those of dominant institutions in the society and in terms of public opinion concerning the goals and activities of the occupations, it seemed reasonable to expect that social welfare would rank high on such a dimension in Sweden. Such a high position seemed justified by the influence exercised by representatives upon governmental legislation and by the respect accorded it by the general public. Social work in Sweden thus was considered to be an entrenched occupation.

We wished to compare such an occupation with one which occupied a position of estrangement from dominant institutions and public opinion, particularly another service profession. Since dentistry is the only private general service profession existing within a society in which most other services are provided by the state, it seemed likely to occupy a position of occupational estrangement, relative to social work, in Sweden.

We compared samples of dentists and social workers in terms of four sets of attitudes: their perceptions of the relative degree of entrenchment or estrangement of their occupation, their attitudes toward social change, their alienation from their occupation, and their alienation from their personal work situations.

For example, in probing the respondents' perceptions of estrangement and entrenchment we asked such questions as:

--How many people are there, roughly, who really appreciate the importance of dentists/social workers?

--Are there many strong interest groups who would like to have dentistry nationalized?
--Should the state give more consideration to the opinions of social workers when it is dealing with social welfare legislation?

Twenty items were included in our measure of attitudes toward social change. They deal with issues which are of general public concern in Sweden and for which various attempts to affect change are continually being launched. For example:

--There are good reasons for lowering the minimum age for voting.

--The introduction of the comprehensive school here in Sweden is basically a bad thing.

--The monarchy should be maintained as it is.

Occupational alienation concerned the workers' alienation from various aspects of his occupation which are likely to be experienced by any member of that occupation. For example, persons were asked their responses to such statements as:

--One of the social worker's problems is that he doesn't have enough clearly defined rules to follow in his work.

--The leading persons in our profession reached their positions because of their knowledge.

--The average dentist has more freedom of choice to go about his work than people in most other jobs have.

With respect to the worker's perception of rewards in his personal work situation, we asked such questions as:

--Do you have opportunities to try out new ideas in your work?

--Does your work give you full opportunity to use your abilities?

--How interesting is your work?

In general we expected to find the social workers to perceive their occupation as more entrenched and to be more amenable to programs of social change. Dentists were expected to perceive their occupation as more estranged and to be less in favor of social change.

Despite the intervening influences of idiosyncratic work experiences and differential internal structure of work activities (i.e., bureaucratic and non-bureaucratic), we expected the dentists to be somewhat more alienated from their occupation and from their personal work situations than social workers.

Such expectations were dramatically rejected by our findings. Social
workers perceive their occupation as estranged from dominant institutions and public opinion, whereas dentists do not. They are also more alienated from their personal work situations and their occupation. Furthermore, they are no more likely to favor social change than are dentists.

In terms of perceptions of occupational estrangement and entrenchment fewer than half the social workers and more than three-quarters of the dentists believe the activities of their professions are adequately appreciated by the public, that members of their professions have the prestige they deserve, and that public opinion is favorable to their goals and activities. Neither social workers nor dentists believe the state provides adequate funds for research in their fields and both groups perceive the existence of hostile interest groups within the society, but in both cases the responses of the social workers are more likely to be estranged than are those of the dentists. (See Appendix A)

Social workers are also more alienated from their occupation. Only one-third see success as a function of goal relations with clients; only a quarter see knowledge and ability as important elements in occupational success; and the same small proportion perceives a greater degree of freedom of choice in their work activities, relative to other workers in general. In all these matters dentists are notably less alienated. Both groups, however, are dissatisfied with pay in their professions and believe that many of their colleagues are more motivated by money than by desires to serve the public. The latter findings are not surprising when we consider the pragmatic rather than the idealistic historical development of social services in Sweden. Both occupations are pragmatic, but social workers are more alienated from their occupations. (See Appendix B)

In general social workers are less likely to perceive their work as fulfilling than are dentists. Our items in this instance indicated that social workers are less likely than dentists to view their job as providing them with opportunities to use fully their training and knowledge, more likely than dentists to view their work as too routine, and somewhat more likely than dentists to choose a different occupation were they once again about to begin their training for a career. They are also somewhat more likely to report more frequent uninteresting periods in their work. (See Appendix C).

A majority of both dentists and social workers favor change in a wide variety of issues which are of continual interest in Sweden. The social workers lean more heavily toward favoring change, than do the dentists, in such areas as educational reform, the further development of publically provided dentistry and equal pay for women. They more frequently disagree with such traditional issues such as maintaining the monarchy, the belief that prejudice cannot be eliminated, the desire to re-impose stricter discipline on youth, and with such old saws as longing for the "good old days" and that "the world is changing too fast."

The dentists, on the other hand, are more eager to see a change in the political party then in power (the Social Democrats), are more in favor of the state expanding its use of experts in policy-making, and are in favor of the development of commercial radio in the nation. They also tend to favor
a change in the Swedish foreign policy of neutrality a bit more than do the social workers, although the majority of each occupation questions such a change. They do, however, favor a change in the nation's policy toward the Common Market and would like to see a tax break for those with moonlighting jobs.

In general we might conclude that dentists are somewhat more traditional and that they favor the development of interests of private entrepreneurial enterprizes. Social workers favor the expansion of public programs involving human needs and human rights. We might well expect similar findings among corresponding American occupations, so that the impact of existence within a welfare state seems to be of little importance upon the attitudes toward social change among social workers.

**Theoretical and Practical Implications**

The findings involving attitudes toward social change offer some clues as to why our hypotheses were not borne out. It seems likely that the influence of relative occupational estrangement in Sweden may be limited by intervening variables involving the organizational and knowledge bases of occupational activities and such characteristics of the culture as historically developed models of occupational success.

Briefly, bureaucratic work organization in and of itself may exert a powerful influence upon such attitudes as those with which we have been concerned. The argument here would be that despite its favored position in Swedish society social work there is a bureaucratic enterprise and dentistry is not. The well known influences of this type of organization might be expected to shape the attitudes of social workers into those of perceptions of occupational estrangement and alienation from the occupation and the personal work situation. And our measures might be predicated upon assumptions concerning work activities which are unrealistic in bureaucratic settings.

A further characteristic of the work situation is the knowledge base upon which the occupational activities must operate. Occupations in which goals and means are scientifically validated and readily measured are likely to generate attitudes of certainty, clear-cut criteria of success, and security of evaluation of one's work activities, one's value to society, and the value of the occupation to society. On the other hand, vague and un-systematized knowledge generates insecurity of self, rigidity, and inconclusive evaluations of activities within various social contexts. Social workers would, therefore, be likely to offer alienated and estranged responses.

Another element, not usually included in studies of occupations, may also be in effect. Various institutionalized work arrangements may be expected to generate corresponding folk models of occupational success. These cultural models would differ from each other along lines of difference between organizational activities of the occupations. Thus, there might be bureaucratic, entrepreneurial, free professional, and service models by
which members evaluated their own work activities and situations as well as the standing of their occupation. Such models are historically developed and are unlikely to be of equal status. Rather than the members of an occupation using a model "appropriate" to its activities, it might be employing that of another type of work activity upon which the culture places higher status. Bureaucrats, instead of using a bureaucratic model of success, might in a highly individualistic culture apply an entrepreneurial model in evaluating their occupation and their occupational activities.

Thus, an intervening set of influences—work organization, the knowledge bases of occupations, and cultural models of occupational success are seen as possible explanations for our finding that Swedish social workers are alienated and estranged even though they operate in an "ideal" setting, ideal to American eyes, that is.

This assumed congeniality of setting for Swedish social workers must be questioned. They share with their American counterparts the characteristics of bureaucratic organization and a paucity of scientifically validated knowledge concerning the adequacy of their explanations and the efficacy of their activities. They also share existence in societies which have a long and powerful tradition of capitalism and private entrepreneurship (ninety percent of all Swedish industry is privately owned). They may both be sharing models of occupational success in which the characteristics of the captain of industry serve as bases for evaluation.

These findings and considerations indicate that it may be unreasonable to expect advances in the financing, organization and power of social work in western societies to be paralleled by perceptions of self fulfillment and worth of occupational activities. The development of social work in the United States to a point equivalent to the Swedish experience may yet yield distinct attitudes of alienation and estrangement among American social workers.

It seems that in no capitalistic society can those who represent the government by engaging in bureaucratic activities predicated upon uncertain knowledge and aimed at providing public services really satisfy the needs of people in such a way that they will gain favor and prestige within the society and accordingly evaluate their work situations.

Without satisfaction, social workers may, however, be expected to develop feelings of security as a result of the expansion of social welfare services. The Swedish social workers, for example, overwhelmingly support and wish to increase research measuring the efficacy of their programs. Such an orientation toward research is not generally found among American social workers and may reflect an insecurity of occupational position and activities.

Security may, however, bring establishmentarian attitudes. Swedish social workers follow the Social Democratic party line on such matters as opposing the development of commercial radio, opposing changes in the policy with regard to the Common Market. Corresponding attitudes might develop with the further development of welfare programs in the United States.

Such a development of conservatism within the welfare state is often
seen as a result of the increase in power, influence, and status of the agencies of the welfare program. In Sweden social welfare is one bloc within an incomplete yet far-reaching balance of power between different interests and groups. Each group in such a setup is limited by others and changes in policies and notions rather than dramatic, are part of an inch by inch process. Such conservatism in the development of social policy is, of course, a reality in the United States, but social welfare is hardly an equal participant in our more limited pluralism. Changes in policy are likely to be sponsored by other, more powerful interests in the coming years.

Such changes in social policy, judging from the Swedish experience, are likely either to be firmly linked with economic goals or to be based on an entrepreneurial model whereby the provision of services are based upon consumer demand at freely set market prices. In either case, the role of the social worker in America would be dramatically changed. Adjustments of the workers' conceptions of role, organization of work activities, bases of knowledge, and models of success would be required. Such a transition would likely evolve instances of alienation and estrangement among social workers. The expansion of social welfare services would not seem, in and of itself, to offer a promise for the amelioration of such problems.

The planning for the expansion of welfare services would hopefully include analyses of possible means for the reduction of estrangement and alienation among social workers.
Footnotes


3. Discussions concerning the addition of dental programs to the services provided by the national health service are frequent in Sweden.

The two occupations occupy reversed positions along the dimension of occupational estrangement—entrenchment in the United States. Such a reversal provides a basis for a cross cultural comparison of the effects of this dimension upon attitudes and perceptions among members of the occupations in the two societies.

4. Questionnaires were administered to random samples of members of the Stockholm Dentists' Association and social workers with professional degrees and at least three years' experience with the Stockholm Child Welfare Bureau. Data from students in the Social Welfare program at the University of Stockholm are not included.

The samples were very small (18 dentists and 47 social workers) and a response rate of only 60 percent among social workers and 49 percent among dentists was attained. Consequently, the findings are tentative.

The questionnaires were developed with the cooperation and assistance of Swedish and American sociologists and representatives of the two occupations, who screened the items in terms of salience to members of the occupations. They also provided information concerning the relative estrangement of the occupations and assisted in polishing the (Swedish) wording of the questionnaires.

5. The dimensions set out by Seeman in his conceptualization of alienation are employed, but the referents are occupationally specific. See Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," American Sociological Review, 24 (December, 1959), pp. 783-791.


7. Such models of success would be part of the ideology of an occupation. Although these ideologies are widely known to sociologists, such a dimension has not been explored. For illustrations of analyses of occupational ideologies see Ronald M. Pavallco, Sociology of Occupations and Professions, Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, 1971, esp. pp. 192-195.

8. A related phenomenon is noted by Dibble in his comparison of "parochial" and "ecumenic" ideologies among occupations. Ecumenic ideologies are those
that are adhered to by many outside the occupational group from which they developed, thus becoming part of the perspectives and orientations of occupational groups, large segments of the public, or even whole societies. See Vernon K. Dibble, "Occupations and Ideologies," American Journal of Sociology, 68 (September, 1962), pp. 229-241.

9. Public opinion may well continue to provide a basis for such negative assessments. A study of rank and file members of the Social Democratic party revealed that this group is rather hostile toward social welfare. Less than a majority were in favor of increasing the family allowances; many wanted a reduction. Thirty to forty percent of the members agreed with the Conservative, rather than the Social Democratic policy on social welfare. See Olle Vejde, Structure and Attitudes of the Social Democratic Party in Sweden, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Stockholm.


11. Such a program is frequently considered in Sweden. See Samuelsson, op.cit., p. 265.
### APPENDIX A

Percentage of Dentists and Social Workers Offering Occupationally Estranged Responses to Various Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Dentists</th>
<th>Social Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
<td>53 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>23 (4)</td>
<td>74 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Opinion</td>
<td>12 (2)</td>
<td>98 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Funding</td>
<td>61 (11)</td>
<td>96 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antagonistic Groups</td>
<td>53 (9)</td>
<td>72 (35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX B

Percentage of Dentists and Social Workers Offering Alienated Responses to Various Aspects Internal to Their Profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Dentists</th>
<th>Social Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success due to client relations</td>
<td>72 (13)</td>
<td>33 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money rather than service orientation</td>
<td>65 (11)</td>
<td>72 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success due to knowledge and ability</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
<td>72 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of pay in profession</td>
<td>33 (6)</td>
<td>36 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom in work activities</td>
<td>23 (4)</td>
<td>72 (34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C

Percentage of Dentists and Social Workers Perceiving Their Work Activities as Unfulfilling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Dentists</th>
<th>Social Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inability to use training</td>
<td>11 (2)</td>
<td>49 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work too routine</td>
<td>22 (4)</td>
<td>51 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to try new ideas</td>
<td>39 (7)</td>
<td>38 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of dull periods</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
<td>18 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting work again</td>
<td>59 (10)</td>
<td>74 (34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX D

Percentages of Responses in Favor of Social Change for Dentists and Social Workers for Various Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Dentists</th>
<th>Workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Political Party in Power</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longing for &quot;good old days&quot;</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to stricter discipline of youth</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition to school reform</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing public dentistry</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State's use of experts in policy-making</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice cannot be eliminated</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal pay for women</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate commercial radio</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain monarchy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change policy of neutrality</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change policy with Common Market</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World changing too fast</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make income tax lighter for &quot;moonlighters&quot;</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LETTERS FROM THE EDITORS

Dear Friends and Colleagues:

A new venture such as publishing a scholarly journal is a many splendored thing. The excitement accompanying the process is simultaneously exhilarating, a little frightening, full of hope, and occasionally despairing. The excitement comes from the opportunity to read many fine papers and to play a major role in creating the vehicle for publishing them. The frightening aspect involves the payment of bills when there are no resources available except for initial loans and subscriptions. The hope stems from the many complimentary comments that our readers take the time to send us. The occasional despair results from the lapses in time when subscriptions arrive. Nevertheless, it is an experience that has been one of the highlights of my career because of the many fine people I have had the opportunity to meet.

As this second issue is being printed, we are halfway to our goal for subscriptions. If with your help we can double our subscriptions, we will be self-supporting. We are already working on the spring and summer issues. We would welcome your contributions. If you have a paper you would like to submit, please send three copies to Ralph Segalman, Department of Sociology, California State University at Northridge, Northridge, California. If you would like to help us in the decision making process concerning what to include in the Journal, we welcome your participation on the editorial board. Send your curriculum vitae to Ralph.

In recognition of the significant contribution our Journal is making to the profession of Social Work and Sociology, the University of Connecticut, School of Social Work is making its printing facilities available to us at cost.

The format of this issue has been changed to make it more readable. In the process of publishing this Journal, we are learning a great deal. We trust that these efforts meet with your approval and support. It is a rare opportunity to be in at the beginning of such a venture. Won't you join us? We welcome your manuscripts! We welcome your participation on the editorial board! We welcome your support!

Norman N. Goroff
Publisher and Managing Editor

The Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare is the product of many years of discussion and scholarly work conducted by various members of the Division of Sociology and Social Welfare of the Society for the Study of Social Problems. The first issue contained papers published in previous years. In the opinion of the editor, these were papers which were of lasting value and worthy of circulation beyond the meeting halls of the S.S.S.P. For those who have not yet secured a copy of this issue, we suggest securing one from the publisher while these are still available.

The Second Issue also contains papers from past meetings and from the most recent meeting held in the Fall of 1973 in New York. Authors are sociologists, social work educators, economists, and practitioners. The issue is both timely and of lasting quality.

We have been pleased to learn from many social work educators that the first issue has been ordered for use in course work. The list of positive reactions to the Journal is long.

Ralph Segalman, Editor
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PUBLISH AN ABSTRACT OF EVERY TALK OR PAPER YOU PRESENT AT ANY FACULTY, LOCAL, REGIONAL, OR INTERNATIONAL GATHERING
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MICROFICHE YOUR DOCUMENTS FOR DISSEMINATION WITH A ROYALTY TO YOU

2

BREAK THE LANGUAGE BARRIER BY READING ENGLISH SUMMARIES OF DOCUMENTS ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED IN 19 LANGUAGES

3

BE AWARE OF WHAT IS DEPOSITED BY WHOM IN THE CLEARINGHOUSE FOR SOCIOLOGICAL LITERATURE

4

HAVE AT YOUR DISPOSAL 400+ SERIALS WITHOUT CLUTTERING YOUR SHELVES (WE ARE YOUR PERIODICALS LIBRARIAN)

5

RECEIVE ALL OF THE ABOVE FOR $100 (ASA RATE IS $85), MICROFICHE EDITION $35 IF YOUR LIBRARY SUBSCRIBES) & 1,600+ PAGES OF TEXT, A LISTING OF 7,000+ AUTHORS, & 21,000+ SUBJECT ENTRIES.
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