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THE WELFARE CALCULUS
ALLOCATIONS AND UTILIZATION WITHIN THE AMERICAN STATES

John E. Tropman
School of Social Work
University of Michigan

Introduction

Within the history of the American states, the attitude toward "welfare" had been fundamentally ambivalent. On the one hand there is a great thrust in this country toward charity, and toward helping the poor. Much is given each year to United Funds across the country (860 million in 1972-73), and the Christmas listing by the New York Times of the 100 "neediest cases" results in much spontaneous offering of aid. On the other hand, Americans are singularly suspicious of institutionalizing this impulse. These suspicions leave the United States behind other comparable countries in providing social welfare benefits. Indeed, so suspicious are we about helping the poor that, for a long time, we really knew very little about them. As late as 1958, Galbraith's volume THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY celebrated the most pervasive myth about America - that we were wealthy with cases of need in the minority (Galbraith, 1958). Figures collected by the Census one year later - in 1959 - revealed that 23.4\% of the American families had incomes of less than $3,000. Seemingly, we just did not want to acknowledge the amount of poverty. Rainwater comments that "Perhaps so long as economic exploitation of the poor was central to the working of the economy, no broad awareness was possible" (Rainwater, 1969:9). For whatever reason, we were unaware.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the absence of public awareness was matched by insufficient scholarly attention to problems of poverty.

Social scientists have been very slow to provide detailed information on what has become apparent as the central fact about the American underclass - that it is created by, and its existence maintained by, the operation of what in other ways is the most successful economic system known to man (Rainwater, 1969:9).

1 This is an average of state figures.
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Whether or not one agrees with the second part of Rainwater's assertion, and Piven and Cloward (1971) certainly do, his initial point is surely correct. And what is true generally about poverty was true to an even greater extent about welfare. There is not available a general public analysis which shows where welfare fits in relationship to poverty in general or to potential clients in particular, even though techniques for this kind of analysis are available (Reiner, 1968). Perhaps least is known about the topic of major interest here - welfare rates and welfare grants, and their relationship to each other and general social structural variables, although some work has been done (Dawson and Robinson, 1965; Gordon, 1969; Collins, 1967; and Kasper, 1968).

This general lack of appropriate public and scholarly attention left the country quite unprepared for the rate and cost spiral which affected the AFDC program, especially during the 1960's. The basic response of the country was that there must be many "chiselers" somewhere, the trends were deplored singly and collectively, the citizenry reemphasized the importance of work, social workers were damned, and the program itself was faulted. Although the Nixon Administration used the impetus generated by this upheaval to propose a new welfare system, little information was generated on the whole problem. Indeed, most of the few pieces available were done during that period (Schorr, 1968).

Welfare Grants and Welfare Utilization

The purpose of this paper is to look specifically at welfare grants and welfare utilization as a first step in providing greater comprehension about the welfare system and its relationship to the poor. There are a number of reasons for this focus. The welfare rates and grants are the specific elements which, as we noted, fall continually under public scorn. Whatever feelings and attitudes exist on the part of the general public become translated into the level of utilization the state is willing to endure, and the amount of money the state is willing to provide. And it is these rates and grants specifically which cause outcry. Additionally, if, as we suspect, the welfare program does serve some macroscopic functions in the social structure, then along with some variations within and between states, there should be some uniformities as well. Hence, we are interested in seeing if welfare utilization and grant level can be accounted for in a sociological way.

There are several theories currently available which can account for the level of welfare use in a state and/or the amount of the welfare grant. The most obvious one is advanced by Collins (1967) viz., that these variables respond to the amount of need in the state. Hence, the greater the need, the higher the level of use and the higher the grant.

A second explanation, and somewhat more general, sees the welfare program as an attempt to "buy off" the poor in relationship to the level of demands/violence within the state. This argument
advanced by Piven and Cloward (1971) is a version of the old "bread and circuses" approach by which elites keep masses occupied and tractable. Galbraith goes a step further along these lines by suggesting that the political importance of the poor has diminished as the actual number of poor has diminished, specifically, from being a majority of a population to being a minority. Hence, as the number of poor decreased, grants should decrease.

The fourth explanation, and the most general one is also advanced by Piven and Cloward (1971) and is, in some ways, a response to the detail demanded by Rainwater (1969). It is argued that the function of welfare is that of "regulating the poor" in such a way as to keep a low-wage work force available.

Each of these explanations has a problem. The relationships between "need" and welfare rates and grants is tenuous at best (Dawson and Robinson, 1965). While there is no questions that urban riots and violence had some effect on the system, as well as the strident demands from "welfare mothers," rates and grants went up all over, in every state. Additionally, one should keep in mind the possibility, which I think is very real, that urban violence, welfare protest, and increased welfare utilization and aid were not causally related to each other, but all the relatively simultaneous consequences of a general loosening of traditional norms within the decade of the sixties. In other highly "normatized" areas such as marriage and sex, a similar relaxing of traditional norms was observed.

Galbraith's hypothesis does not account for the fact that the political situation of the poor has always been "poor," apparently regardless of their number. Further, in this interest group "pluralized" society, a group which comprised 20% of the population would surely be significant. And finally it turns out that, as the proportion of poor decline, grants go up, something which goes contrary to Galbraith's hypothesis.

Could welfare regulate the poor? Quite possibly. Yet most of the people on welfare are old (Old Age Assistance), blind (Aid to the Blind), disabled (Aid to the Disabled), or mothers and children (Aid to Families with Dependent Children). Sociologically, an interesting observation about these categories is that they are, in a sense, free from the "mobility contest" (Turner, 1961). And it has never been clear in our system to what extent work norms obtained vis-a-vis women. Furthermore, until recently, there was a very large gap between the number of "poor" and those on welfare, a condition which still obtains in poor states today. Hence, one would have to question the notion that welfare maintains a low wage work force when people do not even seek the benefits to which they would be entitled.
Because of the problems, one is led to look for explanations of welfare rates and grants in the middle range of theory (Merton, 1958). One such explanation might be that welfare serves, in a Durkheimian sense, to solidify majority norms of work, and to reflect a less dominant, but present, norm of charity. In terms of welfare rates and grants, one would expect them to be sufficient to satisfy the charitable impulse, yet low enough to be undesirable (Tropman, 1971). Durkheim comments about collective sentiments that "The community as a whole must experience them more vividly, for it can acquire from no other source the greater force necessary to control these individuals who formerly were the most refractory" (Durkehim, 1950).

Welfare as Less Eligibility

These two impulses - charity and scorn - generate a pattern of welfare utilization and appropriation which has been identified for some time, and specifically as early as 1834 in the English poor law reform. The principle is "less eligibility." It means that the condition of the poor shall be "less eligible" than the condition of the lowest laborer. The original language states:

It may be assured that, in the administration of relief, the public is warranted in imposing such conditions on the individual relieved as are conducive either to the benefit of the individual himself, or the country at large, at whose expense he is to be relieved.

The first and most essential of all conditions, a principle which we find universally admitted, even by those whose practice is at variance with it, is that his situation on the whole shall not be made really or apparently as eligible as the situation of the independent laborer of the lowest class (De Schweinitz, p. 123).

Hosbawn comments that:

The residuum of paupers could not admittedly be left actually to starve, but they ought not to be given more than the absolute minimum, provided it was less than the lowest wage offered in the market - and in the most discouraging conditions. The poor law was not so much intended to help the unfortunate as to stigmatize the self-confessed failures of society (Piven and Cloward, p. 34 n. 67).

One might only add that the avoidance of welfare even by those who would be entitled, might be, in fact, the avoidance of engaging in such a self-confession.
If we look in some detail at the "less eligibility" statement, we know that part of the requirement, viz., "...his situation on the whole..." is met by the general stigma which attaches to welfare recipients. What remains is the way in which the actual levels of "relief" are set, both in terms of the actual monies received (grants) and the number of people enrolled on the program (rates of utilization). Since these two variables interact, we might expect to find that as rates of use go up, the amount per recipient goes down. Indeed, we would expect that these two areas would be the ones where the state could exercise the operational controls required by the less eligibility principle. Something like this was anticipated in a report on "Workfare" which appeared in the New Republic.

Because states must contribute a share of the federal welfare payment, those with the largest welfare budgets were beginning to worry that welfare would bankrupt them. California and New York launched drives to get the "chiselers" off the rolls; they began searching for a way to reduce welfare costs by changing the standards of eligibility (New Republic, July 7 and 14, 1973).

And Steiner comments that:

States may not establish waiting lists in Public Assistance, but they may divide their money into smaller shares for more people (Steiner, 1971).

...states may either stretch a fixed state appropriation to cover whatever number of categorical assistance applicants are found eligible or fix benefit amounts and meet those amounts by making supplementary appropriations where necessary (Steiner, 1971:23).

The dilemma, then, is clear. If states are to meet the less eligibility criteria, then some measures must be taken to insure that welfare is not too easy to get (monitoring of the rates) and that the grants are charitable but undesirable (monitoring the grants).

Could such manipulation occur? It could. It is already known that grant levels may be changed. Perhaps even more important is the extent to which the state is willing or able to add to the basic grant special grants for special circumstances - clothing, etc. Some states operate on an as needed basis, and some states simply operate on a flat grant basis for special needs. In any case, it is clear that the grant level can be adjusted to meet less eligibility criteria.
Rate manipulation is another problem. As noted, wait listing is prohibited, and any needy person presenting himself who is eligible is to be offered aid. Yet herein lie a host of possibilities. Steiner devotes an entire chapter to the "politics of eligibility" (Steiner, 1965, Ch. 5). It is also known that the number of potential enrollees in the program is considerable as compared to the actual enrollees (Piven and Cloward, 1971). Further, eligibility determination may take a long or short time, and people may be removed from the rolls by administrative act, even though they have a right to a fair hearing concerning the action. In short, if states operate on the less eligibility principle, they have the opportunities to adjust the system consistent with such a principle.

There remains an additional point. Less eligibility, as it has been described, is a relative concept. It implies, first, an upper parameter, but not a lower one, for welfare activities. Secondly, and important here, is the fact that states vary greatly in the number of poor they have to provide for, and the resources they have with which to make that provision. The differences in state situations creates different pressures which the state has to consider. In poor states there is likely to be a pressure toward extensivity - that is, to help many people, even with only a little help. In richer states, as the number of poor decrease and the wealth increases, there is likely to be a pressure toward intensivity - that is, to improve the condition of the individual recipient. We would assume that states would respond in this way - poor states by increasing the level of enrollment in the program, and rich states by increasing the level of the grant.1 These hypotheses are illustrated in Figure 1, which contains the 8 variables used in this analysis.

At this point, a summary is in order. In looking at some data on rates and grants in welfare, we would expect to see the following: 1) that grants meet a "less eligible" calculus; 2) that as rates get too high, grants are adjusted to continue the overall less eligible condition; the converse may also occur; 3) that less eligibility operates as a maximum parameter; 4) that rich states tend to increase grants while poor states are pushed to increase rates.

1It must be remembered that these increases are really differences in relative rates, since both rates and grants increased during the sixties.

2It is possible that if grants become high, they may be lowered or more people may be enrolled, thus lowering the average.
Methodology

For purposes of analysis here, eight variables are used, collected for each state, excluding Washington, D.C. The four dependent variables are:

Rates and Grants

1. Welfare Utilization, 1966 (cases per 100 families)
2. Welfare Utilization, 1971 (cases per 100 families)
3. Grant - 1968 (Mean monthly payment)
4. Grant - 1971 (Mean monthly payment)

These dependent variables will permit inspection of rates and grants at two points in time, even though the utilization and grant figures do not match exactly. The independent variables are as follows:

Need

5. Poverty - 1959
6. Poverty - 1969

1 The rate was calculated from figures in Welfare in Review, 1967 and the Statistical Abstract, 1968.
2 The figure was calculated from figures in Welfare in Review, 1972 and the Statistical Abstract 1972.
5 City-County Data Book, 1962. Poverty there is defined as the % families with means less than $3,000, 1959.
6 Statistical Abstract, 1972. Different levels are given for families of different sizes. Farm incomes are set at 85% of the povcut figure. For all families, the total non-farm povcut in 1969 was $3,410. The comparable figure in 1959 was $2,719 for all families. See Tables 538 and 542. However, as we shall see, the correlation between them is very high, so the change in definition does not make a great deal of difference, to mention nothing of the ten year time difference. Using the recalculated figures for 1959 ($2,719 rather than $3,000) for all families, the United States contained 22.1% poor as opposed to 23.4%.
Ability


The mode of analysis is correlational, in which we seek to examine the relationships between several variables taken two at a time. It is certainly recognized that more complex forms of analysis would perhaps be useful, and in another paper we plan to explore some of these. However, for purposes here, the correlational approach seemed appropriate. Additional data is presented in terms of average values.

As suggested earlier, we reasoned that the amount of poverty in a state and the ability of that state in terms of wealth to provide benefits would be important considerations. For this reason, the degree of poverty or the degree of state affluence might be important as an influence on the mentality of state toward the provision of benefits. Hence, we thought it appropriate to dichotomize the states by poverty and by ability. This was done. It turned out that there were only three of the 25 poorest states which were not also in the 25 high poverty states (Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri). Examining the correlation coefficients overall, the "high poverty" states behaved almost identically to the "poor" states. Hence, it was arbitrarily decided to present the data only by rich and poor divisions. Basic information data for these variables is present in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Mean Values of Basic Welfare Variables, Utilization, Grant, Need, and Ability, for the Nation and Subdivisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Variables</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Rich</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Utilization 1966</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Utilization 1971</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Per Recipient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 1968</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
<td>$44.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 1971</td>
<td>$45.70</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty 1959</td>
<td>23.46%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty 1969</td>
<td>11.60%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Personal Income 1968</td>
<td>$3,198.00</td>
<td>$3,640.00</td>
<td>$2,752.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Personal Income 1970</td>
<td>$3,698.00</td>
<td>$4,137.00</td>
<td>$3,259.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two additional calculations are included as points of reference. First, because less eligibility is often referred to in terms of the minimum wage, a calculation of the per capita results of different levels of the minimum wage, assuming a family of four, is presented. The per capita figures are presented because there is often a confusion between individual and family income on this point.

It should be noted that the minimum wage is quite difficult to ascertain. It is currently $1.60 for non-farm and $1.30 for farm workers. This yields either two levels or an average of $1.45. It is significant that raises in the minimum wage have been proposed and defeated in congress. Most recently the senate passed a bill permitting a pay floor for non-farm workers of $2.20.

Secondly, the per capita value of the poverty cutoff was calculated, in order to inspect the relationship between per capita grant levels and the povcut line. Here again, per capita was calculated in order to avoid the individual/family confusion.

**Findings**

Let us begin with the first major contention - that welfare allocations are provided on a less eligible basis. Several standards which grants could be "less eligible than" are available. Most common, and the one referred to by Hobsbawn, is that the grant should be below the minimum wage. Relevant data are presented in Table 2. Overall, in the nation, grants are below even the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumed Minimum Wage, per hour</th>
<th>Monthly Total (160 hours)</th>
<th>Minimum Wage Per Person, Per Month</th>
<th>Proportion of States Where AFDC Grant, Per Recipient Exceeds the Minimum Wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family of Four</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lowest minimum wage, supporting this interpretation of less eligibility. However, rich states, by 1971, has an average of $55.00 per recipient, surpassing the lowest (rural) per capita minimum, (although rich states tend to be urban) and 18% were paying more than the $64.00 non-farm per capita minimum. Hence, the less eligibility hypothesis is sustained, with exceptions.

A second approach would be to look at the per capita value of the poverty cutoff as the minimum which the poor can be below. Such a measure stands in danger of suggesting that a poverty relief program is, technically at least, a poverty creating one. Relevant data are presented in Table 3.

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nation and Subdivision</th>
<th>Mean AFDC Grant, Per Recipient</th>
<th>Mean Value of Povcut, $ Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>$37.00</td>
<td>$72.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>(72.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>(72.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>$45.70</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>(75.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>(75.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Poverty Data as 1969

- To secure the mean, monthly value of Povcut we took the total non-farm requirement for 1969 and 1970, divided by 4, representing average family size, and then by 12 for the monthly figure.

For both 1969 and 1970, the per recipient grants fall markedly below the per capita povcuts. Indeed, even using the rural povcut, at 85% of the povcut figure, the grants would not even come close. On this measure, the less eligibility hypothesis is also sustained.

There is, however, a third approach we might wish to take, one which looks at less eligibility as a moving point, always in some low but fairly constant relationship to how "other people" in the state are doing, financially. One way to such a measure would be to look at the AFDC grant, per recipient, as a proportion or the per capita personal income of the state. Relevant data are presented in Table 4. Perhaps this table most clearly illustrates the operation of less eligibility. Despite great increases in
TABLE 4
Mean Monthly AFDC Grant Per Recipient as a Proportion of Monthly Per Capita Personal Income by Year for Nation, and Subdivision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Rich</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>13.87%</td>
<td>14.49%</td>
<td>13.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly P.C. Inc. 266.55</td>
<td>303.67</td>
<td>229.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>14.04%</td>
<td>15.99%</td>
<td>13.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly P.C. Inc. 308.22</td>
<td>364.80</td>
<td>271.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

welfare enrollments, and increases in grant levels, the relationship between the average grant per recipient to the per capita personal income remains very similar for rich and poor states and the nation, and at two points in time. More detail on this point is provided in Table 5. The data in Table 5 reveal elements

TABLE 5
Mean Monthly Grant, Per Recipient, AFDC, 1971, and Percent Grant is of Monthly Personal Income, Per Capita, 1968 and 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Grant 1968</th>
<th>Grant 1971</th>
<th>Per Capita 1968</th>
<th>Per Capita 1971</th>
<th>Grant 1968</th>
<th>Grant 1971</th>
<th>Per Capita 1968</th>
<th>Per Capita 1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ala</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>69.70</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal</td>
<td>43.60</td>
<td>57.40</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>28.80</td>
<td>28.20</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>39.80</td>
<td>52.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cona</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>69.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dela</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>35.60</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>24.90</td>
<td>28.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>44.40</td>
<td>71.60</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>46.80</td>
<td>31.60</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>58.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>32.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>32.60</td>
<td>43.30</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>49.20</td>
<td>52.90</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>29.70</td>
<td>40.40</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kan</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>55.90</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Md</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>43.20</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>40.20</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>55.80</td>
<td>69.30</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>43.40</td>
<td>64.60</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mich</td>
<td>43.20</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>30.80</td>
<td>31.80</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miso</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>72.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>31.60</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>31.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>47.90</td>
<td>68.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebr</td>
<td>36.80</td>
<td>45.70</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>34.60</td>
<td>38.30</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nev</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>19.70</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td>64.60</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>44.60</td>
<td>48.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>71.80</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>44.50</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>29.90</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ore</td>
<td>40.20</td>
<td>31.10</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>38.20</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>38.60</td>
<td>62.60</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>46.80</td>
<td>62.80</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>41.80</td>
<td>54.80</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>47.80</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash</td>
<td>47.60</td>
<td>57.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>27.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisc</td>
<td>50.30</td>
<td>64.50</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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concealed by the averages displayed in Table 4. The range of ratios runs between a low of .05 to high of .23.

There is now confidence that less eligibility acts as both an upper parameter in specific cases, and as a general rule overall. Empirically, it appears that 25% of the per capita personal income is the limit for AFDC grants. Interestingly enough, in 1970, this would be $77.00, or only $2.00 more than the per capita povcut. Hence, the 25% figure links to another measure of less eligibility - that the grant should not go over the povcut level.

If less eligibility operates as it appears to operate and the welfare budget has limitations to it, we would expect, as noted previously, to see negative relationships between rates and grants. While the processes which may govern both would be admittedly different, the simultaneous control which the state welfare department has over both would suggest at least some attempt to use one to control the other. Relevant data is presented in Table 6. As

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate and Grant</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Rich</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate 1966/Grant 1968</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate 1971/Grant 1971</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate 1966/Grant 1971</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate 1971/Grant 1968</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

can be seen for the nation there is a low level intercorrelation in the direction hypothesized. The rich/poor breakout suggests a reason for this low level. All rich-state correlations are positive between rate and grant. All poor-state correlations are negative between rate and grant, and reasonably strong. Apparently, and one would expect this, rich states are able to maintain a less eligibility posture with modest increases in both rates and grants, while poor states must sacrifice one or the other.
Given these results, it is clear that the third general area of investigation - the extent to which states respond differentially on the basis of need and ability, has already received some support. Rich and poor states are responding to the grant/utilization picture in systematically different ways. Specifically, we suggested that states with greater need would respond by enrolling more people, and states with less need and more ability would respond by increasing grants. If this hypothesis obtains, we should find that the relationship between rates of utilization at two points in time is stronger in rich states than in poor, (indicating greater change in rates in poor states). Also, we should find that the relationship between grants at two points in time is stronger in poor states than in rich (indicating a greater change in grants in rich states). Relevant data is presented in Table 7. Indeed, the high national correlations break out exactly in the direction expected by the differential response hypothesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rates and Grants</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Rich</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate 1966/Rate 1971</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 1968/Grant 1971</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlations are all, of course, high. Relatively speaking, however, the lower ones are exactly in the direction predicted by the differential response hypothesis.

Differential response to 'situations in the state' relates us back to the model developed in Figure 1. Specifically we hypothesized that as poverty proportions increased states would respond with an increase in rates, and as ability increased states would respond with an increase in grants. Relevant data is presented in Table 8.
### TABLE 8

Correlation Relationships between Rates of Utilisation 1966 and 1971; Mean Monthly APDC Grants, Per Recipient, 1968 and 1971, State Need and State Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate and Need</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Rich</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate 1966/Pov 1959</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate 1966/Pov 1969</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate 1971/Pov 1959</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate 1971/Pov 1969</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant and Need</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Rich</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant 1968/Pov 1959</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 1968/Pov 1969</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 1971/Pov 1959</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 1971/Pov 1969</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate and Ability</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Rich</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate 1966/Per Cap.1968</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate 1966/Per Cap.1971</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate 1971/Per Cap.1968</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate 1971/Per Cap.1971</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant and Ability</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Rich</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant 1968/Per Cap.1968</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 1968/Per Cap.1971</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 1971/Per Cap.1968</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 1971/Per Cap.1971</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the nation, the correlations point in the direction of the hypothesis. As poverty increased, states responded with increased rates, although at low levels, while grant levels are strongly, and negatively associated with poverty increments. However, while increments in ability are positively and strongly associated with increments in grants, they are also positively, but mildly, with increments in rate.

Some potentially different interpretations emerge when we look at the rich/poor state breakout. The poor states present the clearest picture. As poverty increases there, they respond with increased rates and decreased (relatively at least) grants. As ability increases, they respond with decreased rates and increased grants.

The rich states are more complex. As need increases in rich states, both rates and grants go down. As ability increases, rates and grants go up. Further, in rich states, rates seem unrelated to recent measures of need (poverty 1959). These correlations behave very differently even though the two measures of need are highly inter-correlated (+.94). Overall, and in poor states especially, the differential response hypothesis seems to be sustained. In rich states another pattern seems to be developing.

Discussion and Implications

Overall the three main hypotheses - less eligibility, rate and grant manipulation, and differential response, have been sustained by the data. In the less eligibility case, three separate types of comparisons were used, and in each case, grants fell generally below the less eligibility line. Empirically, we can suggest that less eligibility could be set at less than 25% of the per capita personal income of a state. This conceptualization permits the less eligibility figure to rise as states become fiscally better-off.

Given what appears to be a maximum, however, does not set the range or the levels within which rates and grants operate. It was hypothesized that need and ability would be very salient factors. And indeed, rich states do have the looser relationships
between grants, and poor states between rates, which would be required. Yet the poor states seem to present the clearest picture of adjusting rates and grants to keep within overall limitations, and the clarity of the poor state pattern emerges even more strongly in assessing the differential response hypothesis. Hence, in terms of differential response, the hypothesis is of limited value in explaining rich-state behavior. Several additional possibilities present themselves.

Firstly, it may be that rich states are simply more complex systems than poor states. The increase in complexity would result in lower correlations on a few specific measures because of the extensive inter-linking with other factors. One would assume, under this explanation, that as poor states became richer, they too would evidence a decreasing clarity of interrelationships. However, the rich-state values are not a great deal lower than the poor-state values. As revealed in Table 8, the median rich-state correlation, regardless of size, is .355, while the median poor-state level is .485. The evidence is in the direction of the complexity hypothesis, but not conclusively.

A second explanation might relate to the fact that rich states are approaching less eligibility maximum. When this happens, even though they have less need and greater ability to respond, they may begin to peak out. Hence, as need increases, within rich states, rates and grants are trimmed to meet less eligibility parameters (New York reduced its grant between 1968 and 1971). New York may have reached a maximum figure, because it alone, in 1968, had a grant ($71.80) which was over the minimum wage @ $1.60/hr. ($64.00 per person per month, family of four) and within 80¢ of the 1968 povcut ($72.50). It shared at 21% the highest grant/per capita personal income ratio. Like New York, the other high state "regressed to the mean" by 1971, but was able to do so with a higher grant.

Certainly at this point questions remain. Three are of importance here. On an empirical level, one might ask about the elements within the state which affect less eligibility levels below the maximum. There is clearly a variation, one which runs from payments at 8% of per capita personal income to a high of 23.0% (1970). Clearly we could look into social factors which account for this variation. Such factors as social class, migration, unemployment, political culture (Beer, 1969), and the structure of the state's decisional apparatus might be relevant here, and indeed, we already have some developing evidence on this point. Additional empirical work will be helpful in this area.

---

1 This hypothesis was suggested by William Birdsell.
Secondly, assuming that the less eligibility hypothesis holds up, one might then ask about the cause of less eligibility itself. Why should a nation as wealthy as ours take the view, or act in the way implied in less eligibility? If people are poor, why should we not help them out of poverty, rather than seeing to it that they always remain in poverty? An exploration of this question requires another paper. However, the elements of an answer may be, as we suggested, Durkheimian in nature, focusing on the reinforcement propensities of success that derive from dislike of the poor. The less eligible poor automatically confer eligibility and legitimacy on the non-poor. Similar to the functions of crime, the functions of dislike of the poor may serve to increase the solidarity of the non-poor group, and reinforce the mythologies which support the existing order.

Finally, there is perhaps a larger question posed by those data. We are faced with a real and interesting policy conundrum in the need/ability squeeze. As states have more need they have less ability. Apart from the tautology, there may be, here, a general property of systems which is of a serious sort. Most generally, the more a system needs aid the less able it is to provide that aid for itself. A recent thesis on urban renewal has substantiated this same point for cities in developing urban renewal programs. The more a city needs some renewal, based upon measures of dilapidation etc., the less able it is to pull together a project proposal (Hudson, 1973). It is especially clear that poor states, which have no "reserves" in terms of a wealthy populace which can be convinced to provide more tax revenue, must continually manipulate rates and grants in order to make out. And we are considering here only one social program. When others, such health, education, the penal system, etc., are included, the situation may become truly grievous. The theoretical question, then, is the extent to which a "need ability squeeze" is a general property of systems. From a policy viewpoint, the question of how assistance is best provided under such conditions becomes critical. In the case of welfare, the Federal government is already providing grant-in-aid help, but not enough, or in the right manner, to remove poor states from this situation.
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Sociological theory has provided two models that attempt to explain social power and decision making in America, the elite model (Mills) and the pluralist model. Mills saw power in America like particles dispersed in a triangle—with more and more power at the top, but more people at the base of the triangle. For Mills there was a powerful elite that ruled almost like a monarchy and decision making on all fronts was vested in them. Rebellion as utilized in Merton's paradigm would turn this triangle upside down in setting up new goals and new means, as well as distributing power throughout the system. The only problem has been that when rebellion takes place the new goals and new means may be established, but the power triangle has remained essentially the same with power vested in a few people. Dahl, Truman and others have proposed a pluralist model, where social power is dispersed throughout the social structure, and power and interest groups rise and fall with each new issue. That is, contrary to Mills, there is no power-elite, but rather several power groups that arise as each new issue arises.

Sociological theory has thus provided two models which assesses social power and (decision making) on a macro level. However on a micro level and in terms of what goes on in making a policy decision, sociology has been terribly remiss, leaving the task to political scientists.

The central theme of this paper is to present as a case study one issue and how decisions were made regarding it. No attempt to generalize beyond this case is made in terms of sociological theory and decision making. However, it is the author's contention that the instances described herein are not atypical and that decision making regarding human needs in social welfare basically follow the pattern described.

Laws regarding funding are also of prime concern in this paper.

No one argues the need for alternatives to incarceration and institutionalization. Nonetheless, structural as well as interpersonal barriers exist which prohibit the provision of service to consumers who need it. That is, groups who are defined as needing services by a group of trained professionals in the field, i.e. dependent and neglect kids, are denied this help because funding agencies stipulate that certain criteria must be met before service can be rendered, i.e. adjudicated delinquent. Thus, the group who most desperately needs the service is systematically denied it by the funding
agencies who set policy on what client group projects will or will not be funded. It would appear that with this age of accountability funding agencies will be playing greater rather than lesser roles and situations like this will be magnified rather than diminished. It has become a time when the tail has begun to wag the dog, and what starts out as a bagel ends up as a pretzel!

What I have tried to show in this paper is the behind-the-scenes politicking that must be carried out in order to get a project operative. I have never seen this presented and hope that it will be useful to others who will attempt such projects in the future. It may be possible that a data bank on these accounts could be started and that a history of such events could be initiated. From this we may learn from other's experiences and Sociology and Human Services may become more accurate in their formulations of models for studying (Sociology) and proposing (Human Services) designs for human behavior.

The program design presented may aid others interested in formulating such projects. Our main purpose in selecting the components presented was not to create another institution. The house is to be a home, providing a warm, supportive environment for the child, preparing him for life as an adult in his community.

It has been claimed by some, most notably John Irwin ("Problems with Community Based Programs," paper read at the Alabama Council on Crime and Delinquency, September 1973, Huntsville, Alabama), that community based corrections is nothing more than a sham. He states that too often community programs serve as a safety valve and deflect energies away from their true areas of need. Community based treatments tend to mollify prisoner demands and to make them satisfied with small concessions. Instead of making real changes in the criminal justice system, community based treatment programs actually subvert the energies directed toward positive social change. Frankly speaking, Irwin sees community based corrections as being the worst form of chicanery and having the latent function of doing much that it was not intended to do. Community corrections is a smoke screen hiding the real problems of the criminal justice system.

Community corrections, it is further asserted, is highly discriminatory in its selection of prisoners, tending to choose those most likely to succeed. It tends to favor the white and middle-class at the expense of the black, Chicano, and lower-class. Another criticism leveled at community corrections is that it is nothing new and tends to involve nothing more than surveillance in the community or part-time lockup.

Other major points of contention surrounding community corrections are whether or not a true choice is involved and what are the ramifications of failure in a community program? The arguments here are more subtle than may
appear on first glance. After all, what is the real choice between staying incarcerated or becoming part of a group home or halfway house? This question may be more philosophical than real, but nevertheless, the man may really prefer to stay in the institution rather than becoming part of a program in the community. His chances of successful rehabilitation may also be greater if he remains in the institution than if he resides within the community. Secondly, what lies in store for the man who fails in a community program? His chances of ever being paroled are likely to be quite slim. He may be returned to prison never to be remembered.

Another consequence of community based treatment (CBT) programs is that they often are covers to make behavior modification more acceptable as a treatment modality. It seems that almost every CBT program is run on a "behavior mod" model. This would appear to be true because of the measurement gains that so often are claimed by behavior modifiers. However, whether or not treatment effects are carried over into long term life-space effects is moot at this point in time. Finally, I think it appropriate to consider the treatment of the deviant (delinquent, criminal, mentally ill) as it relates to the treatment of the lower segments of society. Can we treat criminals better than lower-class people who do not break the law? Theoretically speaking, can we dichotomize labelling theory with its emphasis on the effects of agencies on people going through them and social structure as a generating force of deviance (a la C. Wright Mills)?

All of the above are thoughts which have entered my mind over the past year while trying to get this group home off the ground.

If we reflect upon prior movements we should be able to learn from them. An awareness of the causes and implications of past choices should encourage us to greater experimentation with our own solutions to present day social problems (Rothman, 1971:295). I find it interesting that in general the fields of Human Services tend to be without a sense of history. We tend to feel that many of our programs are novel in their approach (in order to secure a grant usually), and that they will open many new avenues of success for us once applied. A concept that strikes me immediately as being at the heart of this matter is community based treatment as opposed to incarceration. It may be that we are going down the same road but a different path. I have in mind discussing a residential treatment program for adolescent males, which I have been working on for two years. The project will be discussed in a developmental fashion in order to give the reader some insight into the anguish, happiness, distrust, joy, paranoia, and success which all of us involved in this project felt.

The project was engaged in, in concert with organizations that the Program in Human Services at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, works with: the State Department of Corrections and Eastern State Psychiatric Hospital. To fulfill the requirements for a degree in Human Services at U.T.,
a student is required to complete a minimum of one quarter (ten weeks) in the field, gaining direct on the job experience. This has the unintended, but most vital effect of getting the instructors out of the classroom and into the learning-living laboratory. The dynamic of the interaction between classroom and "field" has tended to yield much excitement and a fervor to try new approaches. This project (originally) was a product of this fervor. As I stated at the outset a sense of history on our parts may have saved us a great deal of torment. But more of that later. I just want to discuss our formation of a residential treatment program for adolescent males, sometimes referred to as a halfway house.

Back in October, I was briefed on the idea of starting a halfway house here in Knoxville. Dr. Kronick, the director of Human Services, told me he was conferring with many prominent citizens of the area and would have a mass meeting with them as soon as there was a substantial amount of research done. That was where I came in. Jan Guffie and I were assigned to research anything and everything we could find on any type of halfway house, existent or non-existent ones, and to look into problems that other halfway houses have run into so that our house could learn from their mistakes.

I went to work right away ransacking the library's resources going from abstract to abstract and back again . . . . After finding out the names of many existing halfway houses, I wrote to them in hopes of some worthwhile information. But, realizing that it would probably take them weeks, if not months to reply I decided there must be a quicker way. I contacted Senator Howard Baker's office to see if they would let me use their WATS line for this most worthwhile cause, and they agreed . . but only for three phone calls which I could make the following Tuesday morning. In the meantime, I had found a very useful book by Raush and Raush, The Halfway House Movement, which greatly influenced my decisions on whom I was going to call. I had decided to call Fountain House in New York, Woodley House in Washington, D.C., and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington.

Before that Tuesday arrived, we (the researchers which had now extended to five plus Clark Luster, the director of Riverbend School at Eastern State Psychiatric Hospital, and Dr. Kronick and a few graduate students) had a meeting. It was at that meeting that I found out that the Knoxville halfway house would be for kids from Eastern State. I was greatly upset because my research implied that the house should not deal with anyone under age by law. When dealing with juveniles one has to deal with the problems of school and supervision, etc. I thought that this would limit the whole idea of a halfway house which is to try to get the client out of his
dependent role and into an independent one that society demands. In dealing with juveniles one has to assume responsibility for the child by law of the State and therefore one has to make decisions for him such as making him go to school. No one has to make decisions for the eighteen year old; he can choose if he wants to work, go to school, or do nothing. (Candace Broudy, 1972: Unpublished manuscript)

Thus as you can see at the outset, because of limitations imposed by funding agencies, a great deal of the flexibility which we originally had hoped for was gone. Preliminary research showed that we would be taking on a group that historically had not done well in halfway house settings. Thus, here for the first time we have a knowledge of history but go charging on at it like Don Quixote tilting at windmills.

Nonetheless a small coterie of interested people began to form around our idea. A dentist, physician, realtor, housewife, stock broker, bank executive, and lawyer made up the original hard-core group. As history would have it the great federal god swept down upon us and IV-A was gone. Gone for a lot of folks. The task now became to give up the ship and chuck the whole idea or to search elsewhere for funds. Being masochists we chose the latter course. Three of us ventured to Nashville (the state capital) to see people both in the Department of Corrections and the Department of Mental Health. The morning was spent with two gentlemen, H.H. and N.B. from mental health. They said that they were interested in a residential treatment project and that a possible source of funds was the Law Enforcement Planning Agency. The strong point here would be that L.E.A.A. had never before granted funds to mental health for a residential treatment center in the state of Tennessee. Thus the possibility of bringing together corrections and mental health to run a facility had a great service integrative potential and on paper it looked like something radically new. Thus our hearts swelled high with anticipation that the project now six months old might still come to fruition. It should not go without saying that this initial meeting with professional bureaucrats was without turmoil. "Let's not mess around and ask us to rewrite the proposal if you have no intention of ever funding it." "You realize the merits of your project mean absolutely nothing, but you've come to the right place. We'll do the politicking for you." The afternoon was spent with the Department of Corrections. They had absolutely nothing to offer. With the IV-A cuts most of them didn't know if they had jobs themselves or not. A wholesale bail-out appeared imminent. At this point the Department of Corrections was ruled out as a possible funding source and our full energies now geared toward the Department of Mental Health. But Corrections was to be heard from later!

As luck would have it, L.E.A.A. decided to fund the project and now the task was to secure matching funds at the ratio of one of ours to four of theirs. Medical, dental, and social-psychological services were utilized for one-half of the match with the remaining one half ($6,200) required to be hard
cash. Several possible sources were selected and contacted: Knox Children's Foundation, Rotary, Sertoma, Knox City and Knox County governments. A written proposal and program design was sent to each of these. And nothing much happened. The proposals just sat there. With a July 1 deadline staring us in the face and with even less program time (less than one year) available, a problem was certainly evident. Thus one of our board members, N.C., a bank executive prevailed upon the mayor to see us and see us he did at 6:00 P.M. that day. We left with a commitment of two-thirds of the cash match and a tremendous letter of support. Within a week Knox Children's Foundation came up with the other third of the cash match ($2,000). But we weren't out of the woods yet!

Due to L.E.A.A. stipulations the grant was going to have to come to the Juvenile Court of Knox County, and we would sub-contract the grant from them. Once again flexibility in being able to select the kids we wanted would have to be sacrificed in order to gain the needed funds. Needless to say, had we found sufficient funds from private sources the flexibility which we so highly valued at the outset would never have been an issue. Now the Court became a co-partner with us and to satisfy L.E.A.A. stipulations, all youths coming to our facility would have to be adjudicated delinquents. A far cry from our original client population--dependent and neglect.

Having travailed six months we are finally at the point when stage I of the paper work is over and we can begin to talk about the house itself and the young people who will live in it. Our first consideration in selecting a house was the neighborhood. We felt the neighborhood should be as free as possible of "deviant behavior," drug dealing especially (including marijuana and pills--uppers and downers). This ruled out almost immediately the area surrounding the university. The university area had many positive points in its favor, including large old houses with sufficient space for twenty young people, and a tolerance level for delinquent boys. The neighborhood climate was such that no one would have complained about the new invaders. Nevertheless, the decision was made to look elsewhere for suitable housing. Criteria which would be used in making site selection would include: large enough house, nearness to schools (especially one with a vocational program), within walking distance to buses, and the possibility of part-time jobs within proximity to the house. It might be noted here that all the boys would either be in school or working. No one would just be sitting around the house. A full description of the program design is presented later. The house which was finally selected is located in an area geographically quite similar to the university area, but one which as yet has not experienced the same type of behavioral invasion.

The house itself is a rambling two-story affair which presently is being used as a boarding house. It is quite spacious, will yield sufficient room to house two boys to a room comfortably, and allow the director and live-in couple ample room for some privacy of their own. The neighborhood people
appear not too threatened by their new neighbors and we hope that the house will yield no more annoyances than any couple with a large family. With the backing of the city fathers, especially the mayor, we feel that the neighborhood may actually gain (some notoriety), from the presence of the residential treatment center.

The boys who will live in the house will be selected after their screening by a committee composed of board members and certified professionals. We hope to be able to select boys that will do well in this type of setting and to exercise at least some degree of freedom in choosing our initial client population.

In terms of evaluation (of success) the following criteria have been established: (1) Rate of recidivism - as compared to youths sent to correctional schools do those housed in a residential treatment center return to crime at a lower rate. (2) School success and employment record - how well do those in the halfway house do compared to those who are incarcerated and to a similar control group made up of non-delinquent boys.

It is from this point that we hope to become operational. I feel that the running of the house will be much easier than all the work which has proceeded it. It may be that the client groups human services people wish to help are not as much in need of it as are our own brethren in the helping professions.

The following is a description of the program design of the residential treatment center. Many of the ideas presented are not really new with some practices dating back to 1790. Nonetheless, we are convinced that these practices are steps in the right direction of dealing with deviancy, of children and youth, and possibly many of the following remarks could be generalized to adult crime, poverty, and mental health.

In providing therapeutic environments for children and youth who have been identified as experiencing behavioral disorders, emotional disturbances, and delinquent or pre-delinquent behaviors, the ecology of the child is often so unstable as to warrant long-term or at least extended residential placement. In situations where the family life of the youth is inadequate or non-existent alternatives for placement include foster homes, group homes, custodial institutions or correctional facilities. In many instances these placements are quite beneficial to the child and serve to facilitate his future growth. At times these placements prove to be non-existent, unavailable, or not designed to handle the child with severe problems. If these facilities are available to treat the disturbed or delinquent child, the waiting list may be extensive or the location may be too far from the child's home community.
The kind of child who needs long-term or extended residential care may be seen in two ways. From the preventive viewpoint, the child who is a first offender or who has just been identified as experiencing difficulties could be spared the effects of institutionalization if he were maintained with a halfway house or group home located near his community. A second type of child or youth who could benefit from the halfway placement is the resident of a custodial or correctional institution who has benefited from his stay or who has completed his sentence but is still unready to move directly into the home environment.

In order to meet this problem, a group of concerned citizens from the Knoxville area has been meeting since September 1972, to develop a halfway house program within the area. This group is composed of both lay and professional people, business men and housewives who are empathetic to the problems faced by the child going into or coming out of correctional institutions. Initially, the meetings were held to define areas of need, to locate a suitable halfway house facility, to generate program policy, and to procure the financial resources which are imperative for program operation. The result of these meetings and the efforts of these people has resulted in the following program.

PHILOSOPHY

When a program is being developed, it is important that a philosophy be clearly defined. Such a philosophy serves as a foundation for any structure that is designed and is reflected in the program's policies, operations, and success/failure ratio. The philosophy underlying the proposed youth residential center includes the following principles:

1. Treatment Within the Traditional Structures of Society. The major components of an adolescent's life include family, school, church, employment, and other social influences. According to societal norms, a youth is expected to make an adequate adjustment in all these areas. Whenever he fails in one area, society initiates remedial procedures. Oftentimes, in the case of juvenile delinquency, the remedial procedure means institutionalization. It then falls to the institution to provide all the major components in his life—family, school, church, job training, etc. Seldom, however, does a youth fail in all these areas. Rather than removing him from the environment altogether, a youth residential center should provide an opportunity for him to continue functioning in those areas in the community where he is well-adjusted while focusing treatment on the areas of weakness, especially family life.

Regarding family life, many youth come from badly deteriorated family situations. Such conditions are significant, perhaps critical, forces in generating delinquent behavior. When the delinquency-inducing impact of a slum
neighborhood is added to a destructive family setting, placement of the youth away from the home becomes increasingly necessary.

Placement in a youth residential center in lieu of institutional confinement has several obvious advantages, provided the youth does not require the controls of an institution. Such placements keep the offender in the community where he must eventually work out his future. They carry less stigma and less sense of criminal identity, and they are far less expensive than institutionalization.

2. Provide a Period of Readjustment from the Institution to Society. Current literature in criminology and delinquency indicates that society has an obligation to assist the youth in experiencing a successful reintegration upon his release from a correctional institution. The period immediately before his release is one of particular anxiety and loss of confidence. There are the uncertainties of return to the problem situations probably involved in his offense, questions concerning his acceptance by his community reference groups, and difficulties of school readjustment. The gap between institutionalized treatment and the readjustment to the outside community should be bridged by a youth residential center.

3. Provide an Appropriate Model. The age group that the center will serve (12-18 yr.) is a critical age in personality development. If maturity may be associated with independence, the period of adolescence is that period between childhood dependence and adult independence. During these years the youth experiences a rapid rate of growth physically and a high degree of emotional conflict. Traditionally, the tension among parents and child and peer group is heightened, and the question of individuality vis-à-vis conformity is raised repeatedly. It is important that any program designed for adolescents reflect such issues. It should provide parental/adult/authority models as well as peer group supports.

4. Development of Self-Awareness and Direction. It is almost a truism in contemporary psychology that one's image of himself lies at the root of most human conduct. How a person sees himself will greatly determine how he behaves. What is more difficult to accept is that one's self-image is the result of what people, rightly or wrongly, have told us that we are.

The period of adolescence is important in discovering who we are. It is a time when the so-called "identity crisis" occurs. The adolescent seeks to be accepted by others while, at the same time, he seeks to be himself. Conformity appears to be the price of popularity, and yet it asks the submission of individuality. Adolescents who make this submission slavishly do not build up a sense of who and what they really are and are constantly confused. Conformity to the peer group, and the acceptance of the many status symbols of adolescent society, can tend to imprison a young man or woman just when they are seeking to be free and to be themselves. The more acceptance a
youth receives in his family, the less he will be subjected to the pressures of his peer group and their arbitrary standards.

In the case of juvenile delinquents, strong family ties are lacking and, consequently, the acceptance and understanding that follow from such a setting. A youth residential center should substitute for the family and provide the familial support and understanding that the youth needs to develop his own self-awareness and identity.

5. Creation of a Home Atmosphere. As a youth grows toward adulthood, he needs to achieve personal confidence in himself. In so doing, he may sincerely question answers given him. He questions authority--parental, societal and religious. He even appears to be very sure of himself, although this self-assurance may be a cover-up for his real uncertainty. His questioning is his attempt to discover and determine his convictions.

This is a time when he needs the sensitive understanding of some parental models. Such figures need to be present daily interweaving counseling and direction with the day-to-day routine of living. All too often, juvenile delinquents are lacking this guidance, except when the institution may provide some professional help on a scheduled basis. It is unrealistic, however, to postpone guidance and direction until some future counseling session. Problems of behavior do not occur on schedule, but must be handled as soon as possible. A youth residential center should provide this intervention in a natural counseling atmosphere. It should help the youth recognize relative values so that he will be able to accept responsibility for his decisions or actions. Overall it should assist the youth resident to acquire the necessary social and/or occupational skills which will allow him to successfully function as a member of society without resorting to delinquent behavior.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE

The youth residential center (halfway house) is designed to serve: (1) youths who need a structured home-like atmosphere with professional counseling available rather than commitment to a state correctional institution, and (2) youths who have been institutionalized in a state juvenile correctional institution and are now deemed ready for re-entry into society but who lack adequate parental and/or guardian support.

The first objective of the home is to assist each resident to adjust to the rules and regulations established to ensure a home-like environment. The second objective is to enroll the resident in community programs including educational, religious, social, cultural, and recreational programs. The third objective is to assist the residents through group and individual counseling to identify and resolve day-to-day problems which they are not able to resolve on a personal basis.
METHODOLOGY

1. Referral and Admission Procedures. All referrals are made by the Juvenile Judge of the Knox County Juvenile Court, or his designee, to the program director of the youth residential center. Upon receipt of case information an admission committee, composed of the Program Director, the Director of Children and Youth, Eastern State Psychiatric Hospital, and a liaison representative from the Knox County Juvenile Court, will meet to discuss the appropriateness of the referral. Case information will include social, medical, educational, and, if available, psychological information. An additional consideration for admission will be the day placement plan for each prospective resident. The day placement plan will include information about the public school in which the resident will be enrolled, the job in which he will be working, or the training program which he will be attending.

Admission to the program is contingent upon vacancies within the youth residential center and the composition of the resident group at the time.

2. Orientation. Upon arrival in the youth residential center each new resident undergoes a thorough two-week orientation. This period is designed to acquaint the youth with the operational procedures of the home and to assist him in adjusting to it. During this time some of the areas that are covered include the following:

Ordinarily, time of arrival is anytime Sunday afternoon. Since plans for the coming week are finalized at the House Meeting on Sunday night, a resident is expected to arrive no later than 6:00 P.M.

Each new resident is assigned a room with a roommate. In addition, one of the more responsible, experienced members of the home is assigned as his "Buddy" to help him become acquainted with the routine of the home as quickly as possible.

Each new resident is given a copy of the House Rules containing a written explanation of the programs of the home, what is expected of each member, and what each resident can expect of the home. Also, he is given a map showing the relationship of the home with the surrounding community, including churches, schools, recreation centers, movies, stores, etc.

Some housekeeping duty is assigned to each new resident along with an explanation of the necessity that each member is expected to contribute to the smooth functioning of the home.

An initial meeting with the staff is held for each new resident to explain the purpose of the home and to evaluate the resident's needs in relation to the home. At this time such important issues as
family background, job interests, educational, medical, and dental needs, etc. are discussed.

Each resident must attend the weekly House Meeting to be held on Sunday evenings at 7:30 P.M. The purpose of this meeting is twofold: (1) to evaluate the preceding week(s) and (2) to plan for the coming week(s).

Each resident is placed either in school, job training, or some employment, and an explanation of the responsibilities of such a placement is given.

3. School or Job Attendance. Each resident of the youth residential center will be expected to attend public school, work in a regular job, attend a job training program or some other routine placement each day.

4. Religious, Cultural, and Recreational Facilities. All residents are encouraged to participate in the various community activities such as concerts, plays, art exhibits, etc. Basketball and softball teams will be entered in the city recreational leagues. Church attendance is encouraged and the ministers of each resident is contacted. In addition, small classes with art, woodwork, or music may be offered in the home some evenings during the week.

5. Professional Consultation, Medical, and Dental Services. Professional consultation, medical, dental, and eye care is provided as needed through public health and/or welfare facilities. A professional consultant and medical doctor are advisors to the program. Their services are readily available.

Residents covered by family medical plans or military dependents are treated in accordance with the provisions of their respective medical plans. This information is obtained during the initial interview and is readily available to the staff in case of sickness, accident, or injury.

The staff is to use extreme caution in dealing with medical problems. It is better to make a trip to the emergency room and be certain than not to do so. The staff is not to administer any drugs not prescribed by a doctor nor to attempt treatment of any ailments or injuries, except as first aid measures until a doctor's services can be obtained.

6. Community Volunteer Services. In addition to the above services, volunteers from various civic clubs and organizations, e.g. Sertoma, Big Brothers, Boys Clubs, Boy Scouts, as well as private citizens, will be asked to participate in the program.
7. Directives and Rules. One purpose of the youth residential center is to assist the resident to adjust to its directives and rules so as to help him assume responsibilities for his behavior.

The directives of the home are those regulations established by the Program Director and staff and are concerned with the overall maintenance and functioning of the home, its staff and residents. These are general in character and their violation is subject to serious evaluation by the staff. To be effective, the directives should be clear and concise, few in number, and capable of being enforced.

Initially, they will include regulations regarding curfew, possession and use of drugs and alcohol, visitation rights, attendance at school, job training, or employment, attendance at meals, property rights within the home, and personal rights to privacy and protection. Others may be added as the need arises.

The rules of the home are established by the Program Director, staff and all residents at the House Meetings. They may be more specific in nature, dealing with such issues as household chores, activity procedures, meal times, etc. Violation of home rules will be subject to evaluation by all members of the home, staff and residents.

In addition to the directives and rules of the home, each resident is expected to obey all federal, state, and local laws. Whenever a youth violates one of these laws, he must face the penalty imposed by the community, even if it should mean dismissal from the home.

8. Discipline. As stated above, residents of the youth residential center are responsible to the local, state, and federal laws that govern the land.

Violation of house directives will be subject to disciplinary action by the Program Director and staff. Violation of house rules will be subject to disciplinary action by all members of the home. Loss of privileges will be used to enforce both program directives and house rules.

There will be no use of corporal punishment within the youth residential center.

9. Criteria for Dismissal. A resident will be subject to dismissal if over a reasonable period of time he is unable to function adequately within the home and is disruptive and/or dangerous to himself or the other members in the home.

Any dismissal action must be recommended by the Program Director and staff to the Juvenile Court Judge.
10. Release Methods. Each resident will be released subject to Court approval. This release will be made after careful deliberation with the staff.

11. There will be a routine reporting of youth residents, admission date and approximate release date twice each month. A specific report may be requested to be answered in writing to the Knox County Juvenile Judge or his designee within 24 hours.

Evaluation

The youth residential center will have an effect on both the quantitative aspect of those youth who would otherwise go unserved or would be placed in inappropriate placements and a qualitative effect on the youths who receive direct service through the project.

I. Quantitative Evaluation
   A. Approximately 45 youths under the age of 18 will be served in residence by the project, during the year.
   B. A proportional decrease in the number of youth from the Knox County area who would otherwise be committed to correctional facilities.
   C. One goal of the project will be that the rate of recidivism among residents of the youth residential center will be 65% lower than a comparative number of youth not served by the project, but charged with similar offenses.
   D. The involvement of the community will include:
      1. direct financial support through provision of local matching funds.
      2. policy level involvement through a 12 member Board of Directors.
      3. general program support through volunteer involvement demonstrated through service and contributions.

II. Qualitative Evaluation
   A. A complete narrative case history will include information concerning the pre-admission status of youth, treatment, or residential status and follow-up information. This comparative data will include questionnaires to be compiled by parents, teachers, employers, and other significant adults in the youth's environment.
   B. A two year follow-up will be carried out on youth served in the youth residential center in conjunction with a Caseworker from the Knox County Juvenile Court. A comparison will be made between those youth receiving service and a control group (random sample) of youth not served in the program. Areas of comparison will include:
      1. rate of recidivism
      2. job performance
      3. school attendance and performance
      4. social adjustment within the community.
CONCLUSION

The actual operation of the house began March 1, 1974, after one lawsuit enjoining the home, and relocation to another house six blocks away. The boys have come from varied family backgrounds and have been adjudicated for many different types of offenses, ranging from assault and battery to truancy. Many of the boys are not "top" candidates for a group home, but due to the fact that the grant would have been rescinded they were taken into the home. Need I say more!!

Now that the gears are getting unclogged, cooperation between Juvenile Court, Corrections, and Mental Health is improving. More appropriate boys are now being referred to the home and a solidified in-group (of boys) is beginning to appear. This should make the home run much more smoothly and reduce the number of inappropriate behaviors which the boys are engaging in.

Community based programs for juvenile offenders are a necessary part of the total correctional program, but they are subject to flack from many directions. Hopefully, the funding source will be diminished as a source of this flack and the home or any other service provider will be able to get down to the task of dealing with human needs and social welfare.
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The "outside-change agent" is dangerous, something to be feared (based on past experiences, long since blurred by boredom and powerlessness) and not taken into the community. The outsider offers few, if any, tangible immediately usable resources -- only promises and fancy talk. Limited experience has taught the Appalachian that promises fade into misery and fancy talk to poverty. The self-fulfilling prophecy of inhospitality and disbelief in oneself, turn the Appalachian against the change agent and challenge the agent to leave the area out of self-felt persistent futility.

THE APPALACHIAN, SOCIALIZATION, AND ALTERNATIVE INSTITUTIONS

Towards setting the stage for our discussion of how outside agents can help to establish community participation in decision-making, we ask you to ponder history for a moment.

West Virginia's unique history indicates that its land and peoples have served as a "colony" and "colonials," exporting its vast wealth in human and natural resources. Concomitant with this imperialistic approach to the development of the material wealth of Appalachia came the exploitation of the human resources of the people in the same area.

The basic isolated and independent life style of the native Appalachian fits well with the schemes of the exploiters willing to treat the natives as "peasants (in) their own land." (Branscome, 1971:8) Appleby most graphically describes this phenomenon when she wrote that the Appalachian

has been taken advantage of by the clever, urbane entrepreneur who has been able to deceive him into accepting a token offering for the sale of his once productive lands. (Appleby, 1970:34-35)

This process subsequently fostered the almost total social and economic dependency on those outside exploitative interests, limited to a few large corporations maintaining power and rarely challenged.
The conditions of isolation, monopoly and self-containment lead to a considerable amount of provincialism, as experience repertoires and communications are limited. The terrain and lack of road networks in the area help to magnify the effects of the isolation. Social relationships tend to depend heavily on intra-family connections, and religious institutions. Social life is severely limited, with recreation facilities lacking and boredom pervading.

This background is noted for the explanatory purpose of making the point that there has been historically in this area, a lack of institutional and organizational structures and a lack of opportunities that build social participation and encourage community participation in decision-making. Historically, colonialism has provided the industrial corporation as the major and only institution for the socialization of the Appalachian and this institution has shown no obvious concern for individual growth, nor respect of the individual as a person or for their quality of life. The person then becomes an object of use for production and profit. (Branscome, 1972:4)

In this context of isolation and limited development of institutions other than economic ones, controls on community life and community development are vulnerable to simple pre-emptions by the economic interests who desire to maintain their position and undermine the populace. (Rossi, 1959:115)

The political, economic, social and communication patterns are under the strong dominance of a few powerful corporate interests, managed indirectly to achieve a power vacuum and block the development of institutional alternatives, as well as the development of a community which could participate in community decision-making.

With a lack of indigenous institutions of socialization (organizations for participation and governance) particular social behavior is fostered and developed. These behaviors could (but not exhaustively) be related to isolation, non-communication, stagnation, alienation, anomie and apathy. These behaviors are expressed as fear of change and steadfastness to tradition, low-expectations, non-participation, non-expressiveness, blandness or lack of enthusiasm.

The Appalachian's limited concept of change, limited trust, and their family-centered ethos, prevents action in concert with their neighbors or for the common good. Much like Banfield's description of his work in Italy (1958:163), with corporations acting as the Padrones, the Appalachian has become provincial to protect himself and his family. Outsiders are dangerous intrusions that must be dealt with so as not to upset the zero-sum game that limited resources are perceived (by the Appalachian) to demand. "The possibility of planned change (which must start from a foundation of common recognition and participation in problem solutions)... can only be accomplished through the presence of an 'outside(r)'... with the desire and ability to (bring about change)." (Banfield, 1958:164) The Appalachian fears change for he feels incapable of dealing with unknowns and is suspicious of would-be cooperating neighbors led by outsiders.

Having come into the region to exploit, the Corporations stay and control by...
blocking the formation of alternative institutions. They use power by fiat and for their own selfish reasons, and designate the "new change-agent outsider" as a scapegoat, a "Carpetbagger," which elicits the desired response from the exploited. Thus, this clever "reverse distortion" is used as a tactic to pre-empt efforts of the organizer to build a base for community participation in decision-making. The distortion achieves for the influentials a short-term strategic edge as the organizer attempts to achieve a "community" of interests to work from, among the suspicious, distrusting, exploited Appalachian.

For those living under such dominance and exploitation where powerlessness and isolation are at a maximum, and the experiential opportunities of self-determination and active participation in life are at a minimum, it seems appropriate to recall Plato's "Allegory of the Cave" (1942:398). Without the experience and knowledge of the world outside, and without the benefit of the conceptual understanding of alternatives, one can only see the reflection of himself on the wall -- yet once the outside is experienced, one can never come back to the same limited world. By way of transition therefore, this allegory brings us to the need for the outside change-agent who can introduce some conceptual and "process" fresh air and new experiences -- as community participation in decision-making is instituted through organization, and the building of viable alternative social patterns and institutions.

COMMUNITY AND THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

The maintenance and development of a community is enabled through the decision-making process that utilizes the autonomous strengths and resources of its people to confront their problems and create resolves for a better way of life. To have a more precise understanding of the decision-making process at the community level, it is most important to have some image or perspective of the definition of community for a frame of reference. Our point here is neither to attempt to expand definitions of community nor to challenge concepts and formulations of community definitions. Too often, when the term "rural community" is used, an image of pastoral life is brought forth. Alternatively when the community-decision perspective is viewed, we conjure up a New England Town Hall meeting where all neighbors are acquainted and decisions are made from the needs of the individuals.

One recent popular characterization of the rural community is specified by Vidich and Bensman (1960:81-100). "Perhaps most important are the mass decisions of business and government . . . ., and they comprise the invisible social chain reactions that are made in centers of power in government, business and industry. The invisible social chain reactions emanating from the outside no doubt alter the life of the community more seriously than the action of visible agents such as the (change-agent)".

While the rural Appalachian non-farm community may seem similar to the description above, we draw your attention to the lack of acting change agents or institutional structures that might support the developmental work of social institutions.
The Vidich-Bensman model presupposes a vertical-horizontal affectation in community decision-making (Warren, 1963:237-302). In the absence of a community decision-making process at the local level, the communities we refer to in this paper must be understood to reflect the lack of social institutions in the form in which they are traditionally characterized, and the lack of change agents. (Warren, 1963:9-20).

The impact of a single extractive industry (coal mining) in a rural nonfarm social setting has a direct relationship to the Gerhard Lenski (1966) idea that the type and level of technology shape a society's institutional structure.

An extractive industry does not shape, or contribute to social institutional development in the same fashion as do manufacturing or processing industries. It would appear that developed social institutions do not serve the purposes of extractive industries. The concept of "non-community" and the lack of alternative social institutions serve them more efficiently.

The lack of social institutions readily manifests social behavior limiting participation in community decision-making or facilitating participation. The emergent pattern of behavior combining powerlessness, fatalism and subordination is illustrated by Aquizap and Vargas (1970:137).

In rural Appalachia there are coal mining communities with relatively monolithic power structures that are maintained by a combination of punishment contingencies in a very limited physical and social environment. The strict suppression of any type of adaptive behavior on the part of the member of the poverty class is almost guaranteed. In such a society the reinforcement system sufficiently rewards dependent and unaggressive behavior in the subordinate class member. By definition, the controlling class manipulates the conditions for both reward and punishment as related to the behavior of the subordinate class members.

THE CHANGE-AGENT'S CONTRIBUTION

"The mind can . . . be thought of as a 'theory bin' housing an assortment of attitudes toward the self and others, a set of values, impressions, expectations, notions of many sorts." (Ferguson, 1969:408) This assortment is learned from a variety of sources including "significant others" and those in one's limited environment. These multiple perspectives on directions of thought and development of one's self-concept lead to choices and decisions made on the basis of learned behav-
for patterns. Behavior is significantly directed by the constraints and structural limitations within which one lives.

The previous discussion has illustrated some of the constraints and limitations on social participation and growth of alternative institutions within which the Appalachian lives. Conceptually, alternatives do not lie within the Appalachian's reality until some outside event or person introduces them into the spectrum of reality. This, then, is one of the leading roles of the outside change-agent. By introducing, directing and training a community through maximizing their ability to best utilize resources, the change-agent "enables" the community to participate in a decision-making process which will have direct bearing on the general community's well-being.

Arnstein states that community participation . . .

is a categorical term for citizen power. It is the redistribution of power that enables the have-not citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic process, to be deliberately included in the future. It is the strategy by which the have-nots join in determining how information is shared, goals and policies are set, tax resources are allocated, programs are operated, and benefits like contracts and patronage are parceled out. In short, it is the means by which they can induce significant social reform which enables them to share in the benefits of the affluent society.

It is important for an agent to be able "to assist in the illumination of alternatives, or formulation of options, and to help the (group or community to) make responsible choices among them." (Ferguson, 1961:409) By the distortion achieved through the scapegoating of change-agents with the brand "Carpetbagger," this illumination is immediately under suspicion, and the change agent's dependence on the foundations of community are tenuous at best.

A list of roles a change-agent plays, represents not only the roles of the change-agent but, importantly, the kinds of skills and roles the agent must pass on to and instill in the community in which he works. As long as these roles remain the specialty of the change-agent, and not the capability of those the change-agent is working with, or within their spectrum of activity, then all gains are severely limited to short run. Dependent on a community foundation in which individuals act together for their own development and understanding of the utilization of these skills, the community's access and participation in decision-making groups will be achieved and goals will be within the reach of the community to the extent that the change-agent's skills can be assimilated. This is the real role of the change-agent.
agent, to direct the group or community with which he/she works, through the process of learning how to gain access to power and participation in decision-making apparatuses.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is important to draw attention to the uniqueness of the communities of rural Appalachia. In viewing these communities, extra care must be taken in noting the characteristics of their decision-making process. It appears that extractive industries add a new dimension, not previously emphasized, to the consideration and development of social institutions and citizen ability to participate in community governance.

Furthermore, traditional characterizations of the development of social institutions in communities, do not seem to apply to rural Appalachia. Depending on historical developments, type of corporate controls and commerce in the area, and the quality and quantity of social participation at the community level, one must readjust their conceptions of rural communities to correspond to the multiple models in existence — from the company town as it develops into a more urbanized area, to the areas in which extracting corporations rule supreme. These are just two among many non-farm rural models.

Areas in which extractive corporations control large amounts of resources, are characterized by an absence of the development of social institutions and alternative organizations in which the populace can participate to practice the democratic skills of governance. Capitalizing on the fears and limited experiences of the isolated Appalachian, "Carpetbagger" is a phrase illustrative of the subtlety by which deception and social control is practiced by the exploiters. A strategic edge over the change-agent is achieved, through which penetrations based on building a sense of community, are blocked by enhancing distrust, suspicion and recalling distortions of past experiences with outsiders.

The outside change-agent brings with him/her, the tools with which to build a sense of community and need to act in concert. To the extent that these skills can be utilized and passed on to the local citizens, their efforts to form meaningful coalitions and achieve cooperation will lead to development of social, organizational, and institutional alternatives. With these established, and leadership and organizational skills internalized, access and participation in decision-making processes will be insured.

The importance of the change-agent's input in the improvement of the decision-making process, is heightened by a United States sensitivity toward the valued belief and necessity of "participatory democracy."

In a political era of decentralization, with its "new" practice of revenue sharing, participatory democracy is especially vital for those who have the least and need the most.
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The role of the change-agent is to direct the populace in their acquisition of perspective and broadening of their role repertoire, which in turn will enable local participation in decision-making processes, and the ability to influence outcomes by their marshalling of resources.

The institution which is unresponsive to the changing needs of its recipients is not likely to be responsive to its critics who operate on a lesser level of power.

Work for change within the system may be an essential pressure upon the system but without external pressure there is little likelihood meaningful change will occur -- since, after all, meaningful change is contingent upon acceptance of a different value construct, an acceptance which is not likely to occur lightly. (Kagen, 1972) (Emphasis added)

FOOTNOTES

1 This paper was originally presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association Joint Session with the Rural Sociological Society, August 1973. It also appeared in the West Virginia University School of Social Work publication Social Welfare, Vol. 6, 1974/75.

2 The peculiar term "carpetbagger" which was once applied to the Northerners rushing to exploit the situation of the defeated South, has now come full circle to refer to any "outsider" coming to work on reform in a corporate-dominated area. The fact that the Corporates are the "exploiters" has long been forgotten as they assumed dominance, control, and longevity. Through subtle manipulation the normal citizen is only aware of the disruptive effect of the "new outsider" who will bring the wrath of the Robber Barons against the already defeated and passive routine of life "enjoyed" by the Appalachian public.

3 It is reported that General Imboden, in the late nineteenth century, went before the state legislature to argue that "... within the imperial domain of Virginia, lie, almost unknown to the outside world and not fully appreciated by their owners, vaster fields of coal and iron than in all England, maybe than all Europe." (Branscome, 1972:3)

4 The small churches are analogous to the Black experience. "The Negro Church ... has been and continues to be the outstanding social institution in the Negro genius. It is the only institution ... that the Negro controls. It is more than a religious organization; it is also a social order and an education and welfare agency. Denied the opportunity ... in civic and political affairs, in business
enterprises, and in recreational and intellectual activities the Negro has turned to the church for self-expression, recognition, and leadership. (Davie, 1959:191; also Gerrard, 1970; Coles, 1972)

Illustrative of this lack of alternative institutions is the situation of education; "When he was in the ninth grade, young Willie was called aside by his father one August evening, 'Willie, I don't believe I can send you to school this year. I can't send you and the little ones, too, and they just have to go.' The son replied, 'Daddy, I'll step out and maybe something will happen and I can go back later on.'" (Bagdikian, 1971:102) Willie never returned to school. Alternatives didn't exist.

This point merits more research to empirically substantiate the claim.

As structured into such programs as OEO, Model Cities, and other Federal Projects.
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EVALUATING EXPLORATIONS AND DEMONSTRATIONS
FOR PLANNING IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Leonard Rutman
School of Social Work
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario.

In the past several years there has been an accelerating demand for the formal evaluation of human service programs. This interest is most dramatically reflected in the amount of funds, especially from the Federal Government which have been allocated for the evaluation of sponsored programs. For example, Buchanan and Wholey have recently noted that in the three Federal Departments of Health, Education and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and Labor there was a thirty percent increase in the amount of evaluation research funds that were allocated between fiscal years 1971 and 1973 (1972:17). Much of the impetus for evaluative research came from the program managers concern to enhance program efficiency. Also, because of the relative scarcity of funds available for human service programs, funding bodies have increasingly demanded that objective data pertaining to program effectiveness be collected. This is a significant departure from the traditional reliance on testimonials provided by program personnel or selected clients. Additionally, the increased demand for the evaluation of human services has been spurred by the appearance of numerous research reports, across a variety of programs, which fail to demonstrate marked positive effects for the clients being served (Bailey, 1966; Eysenck, 1961; Fischer, 1973).

The increased emphasis on evaluation research is not totally a response to such external pressures. Human service professionals have become more interested and involved in conducting evaluative research for the purpose of testing theory and, ultimately, improving practice. Similarly, evaluation research is becoming increasingly accepted as an integral part of program development, program management and policy-making. It is in this context that the demonstration project has emerged as a popular planning strategy. In the field of corrections the Ford Foundation and the President's Committee sponsored juvenile delinquency projects during the 1960's. More recently, the Law Enforcement Assistance Act provides for the funding of "innovative" projects.

For planning purposes, it is generally expected that the lessons learned from demonstrations, through the rigors of scientific research, will result in large-scale adoption and major shifts in aims, styles, resources, and effectiveness of human service programs. Although the expressed purpose is to use demonstrations for social planning, there are other covert purposes for undertaking such projects - e.g., postponing needed action, placating particular constituencies or challenging existing programs without a major concern for supporting data. Under the rubric of demonstration projects are activities primarily aimed at the conceptualization and development of programs as well as activities which are designed to test their effectiveness. A project aimed at program conceptualization and development should be referred to as an "exploration" and the term "demonstration" more appropriately reserved for those programs in which the independent variable (i.e. the program) is clearly defined and amenable to manipulation. Such a distinction has not generally been drawn. Thus, in reference to the delinquency and poverty projects of the 1960's, Marris and Rein state:
"though they claimed to be experiments, their whole manner of operation seems more consistent with an exploration (Marris and Rein, 1969: 207)."

Failure to make this distinction can result in poorly conceived and inappropriately conducted evaluative research and, consequently a limitation on the use of explorations and demonstrations as instruments for social planning. The distinction between explorations and demonstrations will be emphasized in this paper in order to show the differences in the purposes and evaluative research strategies for both types of projects. Since the strategies of explorations and demonstrations represent stages of program development, the contribution that investigations of these projects make to the planning process constitutes the overall context for examining evaluative research. Illustrative material will be drawn from two research designs prepared by the author; an exploratory project, "The Training Center for Community Corrections" and a demonstration, "The Group Probation Project."

Evaluating Explorations - The Training Center

Alice Rivlin has aptly described the strategy for program development in the 1960's as "random innovation" in which new ideas, methods and models were not systematized through experimental methods (Rivlin, 1971). Her observation is not made disparagingly as she recognized that such a climate permits creative people to develop innovative programs. Examples of random innovations in the field of corrections are plentiful: the trend toward a variety of residential "community-based" programs; diversionary projects which aim at keeping persons out of the courts and correctional institutions; the use of ex-offenders in treatment programs; and the reliance on different therapeutic methods, including restitution as a rehabilitative approach. Although random innovation results in the implementation of new ideas and methods, at some point, however, systematic experimentation is needed to determine the effectiveness of these programs. This involves the use of scientific experiments, to the extent possible, to test programs in different places and under varying conditions.

Although information about the effectiveness of innovative projects may be desired, a host of factors besides the usually articulated ones of political, legal and ethical constraints impede the use of experimental methods to study these programs. Among numerous other circumstances, the use of rigorous experimental designs in testing the effects of innovative programs are greatly restricted by the characteristics of the program itself: 1) vaguely conceptualized and operationalized programs without a clear orientation and/or 2) vague, unarticulated and conflicting goals. Trow suggests that in such situations it is important that the research be in the service of the innovative enterprise and not sitting in judgment of it (1971). Research can contribute to innovative projects and their ultimate use for program planning by assisting program personnel in developing an impact model - including the identification and operationalization of goals, the description of the input or program variables, and an elaboration of a rationale that specifies the relationship between the input variables and the stated goals (Freeman and Sherwood, 1971). Explorations can be a useful strategy for developing such an impact model which could then be tested experimentally during a subsequent demonstration stage.
The research design used for the Training Center for Community Corrections in Minnesota, an LEAA funded project, will be used to illustrate the use of an exploration for developing a testable demonstration. The Training Center was funded on the premise that since there was a dramatic increase in the number of community based programs in Minnesota, they felt there must be a need for training personnel who worked in this field:

The rapid emergence of new ideas and new priorities in the field of corrections has created a serious need for new training methods to develop the skills and knowledge necessary to translate the new correctional thinking and rhetoric into action and to stimulate substantive reform in the correctional process.

Nevertheless, because of the newness of the field, there was no well-documented body of data that would clearly describe all the specific skills and knowledge necessary to implement community based programs for which training was needed. The task facing the Training Center was the development of an appropriate training program and identifying the goals which such training would presumably accomplish. The completion of this task would make possible the measurement of the effectiveness of the training provided in the subsequent stages of the Training Center's development (i.e., during the demonstration stage).

The initial task of the planning process was the determination of training needs. Staff representatives from sixteen operating residential programs in the "pilot training group" were invited to a "needs/resource analysis seminar". The seminar was designed to help the participants identify areas of concern, translate those concerns into performance objectives, determine the kind of training that could best accomplish the stated objectives and identify the available training resources among the representatives and their programs. This seminar, however, was only a beginning step toward the identification of training needs. Two additional strategies were developed - a program follow-up and personal training inventory. Two staff members from the Training Center met with the entire staff of each of the pilot programs to discuss the outcome of the needs/resource analysis seminar which had been attended by representatives of these programs. This meeting also focused on the particular concerns and training requirements of each individual program. To gather information on the perceived training needs of the personnel, each director and staff person was asked to complete a personal training inventory form. In addition, information was also collected to identify resource persons whose knowledge and skills could be shared with others, either in formal sessions or on a consulting basis.

On the basis of the data collected from the needs/resource analysis seminar, the program follow-up and the personal training inventory, the Training Center Staff identified topics for pilot training sessions. Several one-day training sessions were planned and conducted. For research purposes, these sessions would provide opportunities for learning about preferred content, teaching approaches, instructors, and other concerns related to the provision of training for workers in the field of community corrections. It was hoped that from the lessons learned in conducting these exploratory sessions it would be possible to develop a testable training package. These sessions would also assist the
Training Center in identifying goals which become apparent only through involvement in the training endeavor.

The research strategies for examining these pilot training sessions included: 1) monitoring the actual training sessions; 2) immediate follow-up interviews with participants and 3) a subsequent three month follow-up. Training Center staff who monitored each of the training sessions kept notes on the content covered, the teaching approaches used and the perceived reactions of the participants to the sessions. The aim was to learn, through observation, the participants' training needs and the preferred methods of instruction. To supplement the impressions of the staff who monitored the training sessions, telephone interviews were conducted with the participants within days of the actual training. These interviews yielded data on the participants' reaction to the training sessions as well as solicited their preferences for future training. This data was useful in the ongoing process of planning a demonstration project for training personnel in community corrections. In regard to specifying goals, the staff could have themselves determined the goals for the Training Center's program. However, to broaden the range of possible goals for consideration, information was solicited from the participants of the pilot training sessions regarding how they felt the training session affected their work, ways in which they continued to pursue content covered at the training sessions and how they viewed themselves using the Training Center on the basis of their involvement in its activities. As a result of this inquiry, unanticipated goals emerged. Finally, a rationale could be developed for linking a planned training program to specified objectives (e.g., persons participating in training sessions are more likely to use evaluative research procedures in their work and more highly rated as effective practitioners).

Evaluating Demonstrations - The Group Probation Project

Whereas the major purpose for doing research of explorations was to collect information for use in developing an impact model, the evaluation of a demonstration project aims to "test", through rigorous scientific methods, the effectiveness of a program in achieving its stated goals. There are two types of demonstration projects. Model demonstrations involve the evaluation of programs under ideal circumstances, with a controlled experiment being preferred. What are usually considered as demonstrations, however, are prototypes in which programs are tested in natural settings that presumably resemble the conditions in which such programs might be later introduced if proven successful. The model demonstration serves the purpose of testing the validity of a particular approach as a means toward the achievement of some desired objective while the prototype demonstration tests the ability to institute a workable program in the "real world" based on that approach (Suchman, 1971).

The Group Probation Project is a prototype demonstration which aimed to test and compare the effectiveness of group work and casework services with juveniles on probation. An impact model was an inherent feature of the grant application. The experimental input or independent variable was group work service. More specifically, initially two different group work approaches would be tested - positive peer culture and the mediating approach. The experimental variable could be clearly
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conceptualized and operationalized. For example, the use of positive peer culture could be recognized by the following traits: frequent meetings (at least 3 or 4 per week); focus of the meetings mainly on one individual; small number of group members (5 to 7); rigid seating arrangements; extensive use of confrontation; and so on. This method was clearly different from the mediating approach which focuses on the group as a whole and where mutual support and aid are the characteristic interaction patterns. Moreover, both group work approaches constituted a distinctly different treatment than the regular casework supervision. The outcome goals were also clearly stated: improving self-concept; improved school grades and attendance; reduction in delinquent behavior; etc. The rationale linking the experimental input to the stated goals was that the peer group is more likely to have a positive influence on the youth's behavior than the intervention by the professional probation officer. The preconditions did exist for developing an experimental design and compromises in this ideal design would be necessitated by professional, administrative and legal constraints, but not primarily because of the limitations imposed by the characteristics of the program. The fact that juveniles are assigned to workers according to their geographical location, posed limitations on the extent to which random assignment to experimental (i.e., group work) and control groups (casework supervision) could be made. Where random assignment was not possible, a comparative caseload was selected. "Before" measures on self-concept, school performance, family closeness, prior involvement with the court and other relevant data could be obtained prior to placement on probation. Information could be collected on the treatment process (e.g. the use of contact sheets completed by the workers to measure the quantity and type of contacts made with the juvenile or on behalf of him; group summary forms completed by the worker after each group meeting to note the focus of the meeting and the nature of participation by the members; video tape to rate the workers' performance in the groups; and a questionnaire which solicits information from the juveniles about their views of the group). Finally, follow-up information could be collected on the juveniles in both the experimental and control groups after six months on probation.

This experimental design could address itself the following purposes for an evaluative study: (a) effort - who received the services; who provided the service; how was the program implemented; what was the nature of the clients' participation; what was their view of the service received; needed resources to carry out such a program; (b) effect-inferring the extent to which the program produced changes in school performance, delinquencies committed and self concept; and (c) efficiency-comparative cost of providing group work and casework service relative to the success of these two approaches. In other words, such an evaluative study pursued two major goals (a) identifying the manner in which the program was carried out, particularly to determine whether it was actually implemented in the intended manner; (b) assessing and accounting for the impact of the program on the consumers of the service, including the economy of the program vis a vis accomplished results.
Comparative Analysis

Explorations and demonstrations have been presented as both strategies and stages of a rational planning process. To maximize their "payoff" for the planning enterprise, emphasis has been placed on the use of evaluative research designs and procedures which are appropriate to the purpose and stage of the program's development. The danger of emphasizing the differences in the purposes and research strategies for explorations and demonstrations is the possibility of creating artificial distinctions while negating important similarities. Although a comparative analysis focuses on differences, the activities of describing process, measuring outcomes and inferring causal explanations are aims of all projects. Nevertheless, there is a difference in the relative importance and nature of these activities according to the type of project.

The research conducted on explorations is clearly aimed at discovery and relies largely on an inductive approach. In undertaking an exploration, the pilot project affords a learning opportunity with research used as a tool for collecting data to assist in the conceptualization and operationalization of a program and the specification of its goals. This necessitates an emphasis on studying the program's unfolding process:

The whole process - the false starts, frustrations, adaptations, the successive recasting of intentions, the detours and conflicts - need to be comprehended. Only then can we understand what has been achieved and learn from experience (Marris and Rein, 1969: 207).

The Training Center's research was aimed primarily toward the development of a concrete and appropriate training program for people employed in the field of community corrections. Its initial investigation of needs for training assisted in the development of pilot training sessions which in turn were examined in order to learn more about the type and methods of training which should be included in a training package for the succeeding year.

Whereas the exploration primarily aims at discovery through an inductive approach, demonstrations more clearly attempt to verify through measurement of the relationship between the experimental variable (i.e., the program) and the dependent variables (i.e., specified outcomes or effects) through a deductive approach. Testing hypotheses is an appropriate approach to studying demonstrations. The focus on process is not restricted to learning how the program was carried out. In addition, efforts are made to determine whether the program was implemented in the intended or prescribed manner and to use program components or variables as possible causal explanations for the outcomes produced. For the Group Probation Project it was possible to test hypotheses related to the extent and nature of participation in groups with outcome on probation. The program was monitored to determine the manner in which it was implemented and to relate various aspects of the program to the success of the probation service in meeting its stated goals.

The extent to which there are strict controls on the program's operation and continual feedback of research findings occurs is largely dependent on the nature and purpose of the evaluative study. For explorations, feeding back information from the evaluation to the program in order to affect both its objectives and procedures is of paramount importance. The
Training Center relied on a constant feedback of information to plan the pilot project and then to use the lessons learned from the pilot project to develop a testable demonstration project for subsequent evaluation. Research and program development was a dynamic and reciprocal process. On the other hand, if information is needed on the ultimate worth of program ideas, then a controlled situation is more likely to be insisted upon. And there would only be deliberate manipulation on program variables which have been predetermined for their contribution to the overall experiment. Additional demonstrations could be undertaken, prior to the formulation of a permanent program, to pursue insights and test changes which emerged from the initial research. The Group Probation Project which sought information on the effectiveness of a particular approach relied upon a controlled situation. Subsequent alterations in the program (e.g., working with the juveniles' families) were only made after the initial phase of the research was completed.

There has been considerable controversy about whether it is preferable to use in-house or outside evaluators. Inevitably, the answer is that there are distinct advantages and disadvantages to both. Since the research in the exploratory phase is an integral part of the program development, the project's own staff can take major responsibility for planning and conducting the research without having to fear accusations about bias. If needed, an external researcher would merely serve as a consultant and his role would involve providing technical advice where needed.

Although initially hired as an outside evaluator for the Training Center, the researcher undertook regular staff responsibilities and except for his more specific involvement in developing the research instruments, determining data collection procedures and analyzing the data, his role was not distinctly different from other staff. On the other hand, in his involvement with the Group Probation Project, the researcher was clearly identified as an outside evaluator and he acted like a watchdog ready to oppose major alterations in program and procedures for fear that it might render the evaluation useless.

Since there are somewhat different purposes for undertaking explorations and demonstrations, the acceptability of "soft" versus "hard" data varies somewhat according to the type of project. In the attempt to discover the nature of the program and its goals, explorations must rely to a greater extent on soft data - e.g., attitudes, felt needs, subjective estimates and personal opinions. Much of the data collected by the Training Center was of this type. In testing demonstrations, however, where the outcome criteria are critically questioned, it is necessary to collect relatively objective data which can be assumed to have a known degree of reliability and validity. Although the Group Probation Project did include soft measures (e.g., attitudes toward the group), greater emphasis was placed on the collection of more objective data - demographic information, school grades and attendance, recidivism rates and standardized self-concept scales.

There are not only differences in the research design used and the type of data collected for explorations and demonstrations, but the procedures and instruments for the collection of data are also somewhat different. Although both included administered questionnaires, the exploration relied more heavily on observation, unstructured interviews and detailed notes.
Conclusion

This paper has emphasized the importance of evaluative research as an integral component for both explorations and demonstrations, particularly for its contribution to planning in criminal justice. In so doing, an attempt has been made to differentiate the purposes and, consequently, the appropriate research strategies for evaluating these projects. The research of explorations aimed to facilitate the process of conceptualizing and operationalizing "innovative" services into testable demonstrations. To increase the validity and generalizability of individual demonstration projects, replications in different places under varying conditions are needed. According to Wholey, however, many small studies have been carried out around the country which lack uniformity of design and objectives. Thus, results have been rarely comparable or responsive to the questions facing policy makers (Wholey, 1971: 15). To remedy this situation there would be some merit in following Rivlin's suggestion that funding organizations take the leadership in organizing, funding and evaluating systematic experiments with various ways of implementing programs (Rivlin, 1971: 15). Demonstration projects could then be planned in response to established priorities in the overall process of program development and/or policy-making while allowing for some random innovation.
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In social work circles client withdrawal from a treatment program commonly has been labeled as "discontinuance". Discontinuance rates have been inordinately high for both casework and group work endeavors, ranging in some instances to 59% of all clients following the first interview (Aronson and Overall, 1966; Empey and Erickson, 1972; Goldstein, Heller, and Sechrest, 1966; Levinger, 1960; Overall and Aronson, 1963). Dis­continuance represents an obvious and essential concern for social work for one overarching reason, to wit, treatment interventions cannot be implemented should the client(s) withdraw from the therapeutic relation­ship. Additionally, as some investigators have shown, discontinuance represents a focal concern for evaluative research since valid estimates of treatment success cannot be obtained unless early discontinuers are regarded as instances of treatment failure (cf. Lerman, 1968; Empey and Erickson, 1972).

A variety of reasons have been posited for the high rates of discontin­uance in social work and allied treatment professions. Among the fore­most are inaccurate or incongruent role expectations held by the two people most central to the therapeutic relationship, namely, the
therapist and the client (Frank, 1961; Freeman and Simmons, 1958, 1959; Garvin, 1969; Goldstein, 1966; Heine and Trosman, 1960; Kadushin and Wieringa, 1960; Lefton, et al., 1962; Mayer and Timms, 1970; Mechanic, 1961; Olsen and Olsen, 1967; Oxley, 1966; Shapiro, 1971). These and other factors have been posited to result in counter-therapeutic client uncertainties (Erikson, 1957), anxieties (Dibner, 1967), and misperceptions (Sapolsky, 1965; Thomas, et al., 1955) and, consequently, in discontinuance. Interestingly, the great majority of studies concerning discontinuance in social work have focused solely upon endogenous features of the therapeutic relationship per se, that is, upon social variables that emanate from the interaction between client(s) and therapist(s) and that determine their ongoing interaction. For the most part, however, exogenous determinants of that relationship have been ignored in the literature. This is especially unfortunate in the case of group work since the course of treatment may depend upon a variety of socio-cultural attributes and behaviors that the various members bring to the treatment group.

SOCIAL EXCHANGE AND CLIENT COSTS

Contrary to the prevailing trend in social work research (Freeman, 1972) social exchange theorists have posited that endogenous factors account for only a limited portion of the behavioral variance within any social relationship (cf., for instance, Thibaut and Kelley, 1959). A significant portion also is accounted for by exogenous factors, that is, attributes and behaviors that individuals, including both clients and practitioners, bring to a social relationship and that determine its future course, particularly during the early phases. Relevant examples include socio-demographic variables such as race, religion, age, and economic status, and virtually all background behavioral and attitudinal predispositions such as aggressiveness, isolativeness, candor, and so forth (cf. Briar and Piliavin, 1965; Edwards, 1969). The interplay between exogenous and endogenous variables determines the ultimate outcome of social interaction, including voluntary continuance in treatment (Thibaut and Kelley, 1959).

More specifically, the continuation of a voluntary social relationship depends upon whether or not the participants experience mutually satisfactory outcomes from it. For each participant to desire continuance he must experience positive outcomes from the relationship. Moreover, the outcomes must exceed those that the participants consider necessary and sufficient for the relationship to be deemed "satisfying". Should the outcomes be unsatisfactory for a given individual he will choose to leave the relationship so long as other more satisfying social relationships are available. If the latter are not available, however, the individual necessarily will be constrained to continue the unsatisfying relationship. In brief, then, if one assumes all other factors to be constant, a client is likely to discontinue from a treatment program when
the program results in (1) excessive costs, (2) a dearth of rewards, (3) outcomes that are lower than those previously expected and/or deemed satisfying, and (4) outcomes that are lower than those to be found in readily available alternative programs.

The "costs" that clients incur while engaging in therapy seldom have been the subject of systematic research. In contrast, therapeutic "rewards" have been the focus of much study although investigators usually have operationalized the construct solely in terms of "client change" or "client progress". Some reviewers have suggested that therapeutic programs tend to promote little in the way of client change (Empey and Erickson, 1972; Poser, 1966; Bergin and Garfield, 1971) and, in fact, may be counterproductive (Berleman, et al., 1972; Empey and Lubeck, 1971; Warren, 1970), thus contributing to client discontinuance. A host of other studies have clearly shown that clients withdraw from treatment programs when their early expectations and hopes regarding the relationship are not met (cf., for example, Levinger, 1960). In most such studies, however, client expectations have been examined as a discrete social referent apart from other factors that might integrally influence one's expectations for therapy. Finally, as has been shown in several additional studies, clients are likely to leave therapy when alternative treatment resources are available in their community and, conversely, to remain in treatment when viable treatment alternatives are not readily available (Mayer and Rosenblatt, 1964).

In contrast with the foregoing topics the social costs incurred by clients and therapists remain an essentially unexplored, but nonetheless critical, area of study for social work researchers. Therapeutic costs may include tangible factors such as fees charged for service, income foregone by receiving treatment during one's normal working hours, and transportation expenses to the agency. Less tangible costs also may influence the course of a therapeutic relationship. As posited by Lott and Lott (1965), for instance, social interaction with individuals of dissimilar races, religions, ages, or socio-economic backgrounds may be viewed with trepidation by some clients and, therefore, considered as social costs militating against continuance in small group treatment. In brief, then, the present study will examine the relationship between client discontinuance and a variety of socio-demographic variables that may be construed as hypothetical deterrents to continuance.

DESIGN OF THE TREATMENT PROGRAM

Discontinuance was studied within the context of a unique community-based treatment program for anti-social males ranging in age from 8 to 16 years old (Feldman, et al., 1972). Among other things, the program attempted to provide and evaluate group work services for boys who were referred by a variety of agencies, including special public school systems, juvenile courts, and police youth bureaus. Referrals were drawn from 16
agencies in St. Louis County (Missouri), a geographic area embracing 490 square miles.

The group treatment program was offered at the Jewish Community Centers Association, St. Louis, Missouri. The program extended for a thirty week period from October 1971 through May 1972. Although a $30 service fee was assessed for the program, actual charges were scaled in accord with the financial status of the clients' families. Only 36 of the 145 clients paid the full fee; 30 paid a total fee of only one dollar or less. The average fee was $16.74. In order to facilitate the referral process the program staff held a series of meetings with guidance counselors from school districts within a 15 mile radius of the agency and with psychiatrists, social workers, deputy juvenile officers, and other staff members from referral agencies. In addition, a brief statement describing the purpose of the project and appropriate referral procedures was distributed to all referral agents.

Unlike virtually all treatment programs for anti-social youth the staff attempted to provide service for certain referred children by randomly integrating them into groups composed of pro-social children, as determined by behavioral checklists completed by the referred children, their parents, and the referral agents (Feldman, et al., in press). More specifically, as part of the research design three types of groups were formed and evaluated: (1) groups composed solely of children referred for anti-social behavior, (2) groups composed solely of pro-social children, and (3) groups composed solely of pro-social children plus one child referred for anti-social behavior. Respectively, these groups were denoted as anti-social, pro-social, and mixed (or integrated) groups. Additionally, the investigators endeavored to ascertain the differential effects of two types of group treatment methods (traditional social group work and group level behavior modification) in contrast with a non-interventive, or control group, treatment. Finally, the program also attempted to evaluate the differential treatment effectiveness of trained social work students and less trained college undergraduates.

The great majority of clientele served by the agency were of the Jewish faith and from middle and upper-middle socio-economic strata. However, approximately one-fifth of the agency's membership was non-Jewish and from relatively diverse socio-economic backgrounds. About 90% of the children referred to the program were non-Jewish. Nearly 38% were Black. Approximately one-fourth of the referred children were from families with annual incomes of less than $6,000. Among the demographic variables considered relevant for examination were the following: subjects' age, race, religion, family income, type of referral agency, availability of transportation to the agency, and weekly frequency of anti-social behavior as indicated by behavioral checklists completed by the subjects, their parents, and referral agents.
DISCONTINUANCE AND CLIENT COSTS

It was considered essential to distinguish between two important categories of subjects in the present study: (1) those who were referred to the program but declined to join it following the intake interview, and (2) those who were referred to the program and enrolled during the intake interview, but who withdrew during its first six weeks. The former subjects were classified as non-joiners and the latter as discontinuers. Of 169 referred children, only 25 did not enroll following the intake interview. These subjects, representing 15% of those referred, did not participate in the program for a variety of reasons. In some instances their parents considered them inappropriately labeled by the referral agent (that is, as more pro-social than considered by the referral person) or as behaviorally withdrawn or isolative (rather than anti-social or hyper-aggressive). In other cases transportation or scheduling difficulties precluded enrollment in the program. Of the 145 subjects who agreed to participate only 23 (or 16%) withdrew during the first six weeks. This period represented a baseline period for the program and, therefore, was utilized solely for diagnostic purposes. The application of treatment methods by group leaders took place only after conclusion of the six-week baseline period.

At this juncture it is relevant to emphasize that several key variables essentially were eliminated or held constant in the present study. Fees averaged less than one dollar per week per client since they were assumed in large part by the agency and governmental funding sources. Similarly, since the clients were children virtually none had to forego work-related income in order to attend the treatment program. Finally, since discontinuance rates were examined only during the baseline period the social benefits associated with therapeutic progress may be considered relatively constant and negligible in this study. Consequently, conclusions to be derived from the data are not likely to be significantly obfuscated by factors such as fees assessed, income foregone, or extent of client progress due to actual treatment interventions.

Group Composition

In accord with some theories of delinquent behavior one might expect substantial numbers of referred children to experience extreme difficulty in adjusting to groups of pro-social children and/or to a pro-social agency. Relevant formulations include the reaction formation theories of Cohen (1965), the delinquent sub-culture theories of Ohlin and Cloward (1960), and the social class theories of Miller (1958). On the other hand, as suggested elsewhere by the present authors, the anti-social reinforcement patterns, deviant role models, and debilitating stigmatization associated with treatment groups composed solely of anti-social children may foster inordinately high rates of withdrawal (Feldman, et al., 1972). Review of the data pertaining to composition of the treatment groups shows that the
referred children integrated into pro-social groups withdrew from the program at a slightly lower rate (15%) than those who were treated solely with other anti-social children (19%). Although suggestive of a trend the mean differences between the two client categories were not statistically significant, thus suggesting that discontinuance was not unduly influenced by variations in treatment group composition. In any event, it is apparent that discontinuance rates for both types of treatment groups are much lower than those reported for most similar programs in social work. Pending the review of additional variables to be cited below this datum might point to the efficacy of a pro-social agency milieu as a locus for community-based treatment.

Referral Agencies

Approximately twenty agencies were asked to refer children to the program. Four agencies referred none. In some instances the dearth of referrals was attributed to the referral agency's stereotyped conception of the community center as a recreational-religious (or non-treatment) agency, to organizational problems internal to the referral agency itself, or to inadequate liaison between the referral agency and the project staff. Referrals from closed treatment institutions and correctional agencies were characterized by virtually no discontinuance. For example, the boys referred by one agency vested with the right to exercise legal guardianship over its clients remained with the program for the entire year. Obviously the referral agency itself can exert constraints upon its clients which, in turn, result in low rates of discontinuance. However, whether or not the clients' commitments to the program are, in fact, of a therapeutic nature remains in question. Referrals from some other agencies, primarily small public school systems, were characterized by extremely high rates of non-joining and discontinuance. Data presented below will suggest that this finding cannot be attributed to certain distinctive characteristics of the referred children themselves, such as race. Therefore, it appears that features of the referral agency itself may serve in part to determine whether or not referred children will remain in an allied program.

Interestingly, incidences of non-joining and discontinuance were extremely high for clients from agencies that referred only three or fewer children to the program. Of nine subjects referred by such agencies four chose not to join and two withdrew during the baseline period. These observations point to the critical importance of supportive social agents within referral organizations. These may include interested staff and peers or acquaintances likewise referred to the program. Similarly, it is relevant to note that referrals from persons who were relatively unsure of their assessments about a client's anti-social behavior were characterized by relatively high incidences of non-joining. For example, when referred persons indicated, through their responses to a checklist question, that they were "absolutely sure" of their assessment
the non-joining rate was only 11%. When they were only "very sure" the non-joining rate was 15%. When referral agents were only "moderately sure" the rate rose to 27%. No referral personnel indicated that they were "not very sure" or "not at all sure" of their assessments. Hence it appears that a referral agent's own uncertainty about his evaluation of a client may determine the likelihood of therapeutic continuance by clients referred by him. Once having joined the program, however, it is relevant to note that referral agents' uncertainty tends to be unrelated to clients' further continuance.

Inadequate explication of the program to referral personnel and/or their incorrect perceptions regarding its objectives also may contribute to inordinately high discontinuance rates. Indeed, a review of behavioral profiles for the referred children suggests that at least in some instances children were referred who were not anti-social in their behavior but who demonstrated other problematic behaviors such as withdrawal or isolativeness. Hence some referral agents may have misconstrued the objectives of the treatment program or may have chosen to refer children for whom the program was not geared but, nonetheless, who may have been problematic for the referral agency's own operations. Clearly, then, factors other than the therapeutic relationship per se influence the course and ultimate success of a treatment program that depends upon referrals from collaborative agencies.

Travel Distance

A treatment agency's location relative to its pool of available clients also may represent a key variable associated with client discontinuance. Put differently, financial and time costs incurred by clients for travel to and from a treatment program may represent a critical variable. In the present study per capita client transportation costs exceeded the per capita fees assessed for service by a ratio of nearly 2:1. In order to analyze the effects of this variable more exactly clients were classified into one of three categories based upon the total one-way travel distance to the agency. Nearly 20% of those who lived 0-3 miles from the agency chose not to join the program; 23% of those who lived 4-6 miles from the agency did not join, and; 13% of those who lived 7-10 miles from the agency did not join. The lower incidence for the latter category of subjects probably was influenced by the introduction of an important variable, namely, the provision of free taxicab service for subjects who found it difficult to participate in the program due to transportation difficulties. Although an initial approximation would suggest a direct correlation between transportation distance and non-joining it seems that this association can be attenuated through the provision of free transportation.

Once enrolled, however, a direct correlation between distance traveled and discontinuance emerged, although at non-significant levels. During
the first six weeks of the program approximately 12% of those traveling 0-3 miles withdrew from the program, 15% of those traveling 4-6 miles withdrew from the program, and 18% of those traveling 7-10 miles withdrew. The data suggest, then, that the costs of traveling to and from a treatment program may bear an inverse relationship to continuation. At another level, this observation would point to the efficacy of locating large numbers of decentralized service programs within clients' own communities rather than toward the centralization of service in one or a few treatment agencies or sites.

**Travel Costs**

In order to shed further light upon the relationship between travel costs and discontinuance it is germane to examine the mitigating effects of another program variable, viz., the provision of free transportation services for clients. Federal funding permitted the agency to provide free taxi-cab transportation throughout the year for 56 of the referred children. Of these children only one, or less than 2%, discontinued from the program ($p < .001$, chi square test, two-tailed). In contrast, 25% of the referred children who were not provided with free transportation discontinued during the baseline period. Hence it is obvious that aside from direct therapeutic benefits, transportation costs and difficulties represent a crucial variable influencing a client's decision to continue in treatment. In fact, of all the variables studied here transportation cost appears to be the factor most clearly associated with discontinuance. Although trends are found for the relationship between discontinuance and certain other social variables this is the only factor that attains unequivocal statistical significance. Should treatment agencies be unable to locate themselves in close proximity to client populations it appears advisable, then, to facilitate client continuance through the provision of low-cost transportation. As with the present program, the expenses incurred by a community-based treatment program staffed largely with sub-professionals may be sufficiently low to counter-vail the expenses required for client transportation. In total, such programs may be far less expensive than comparable programs with higher rates of discontinuance.

**Family Income**

In further support of the foregoing observations the data also reveal a slight tendency for non-joining to vary in accord with family income. Although the trend does not attain usually accepted levels of statistical significance it is noteworthy that none of the 31 children referred from families with a yearly income of less than $6,000 chose to decline participation in the program. Following enrollment, none of those from families with an income ranging from $3,000-$6,000 withdrew at a rate (16%) equivalent to that for all other
income categories. The data suggest, then, that there is little support for the view that certain socio-cultural deficiencies necessarily militate against the efficacy of providing social services for lower class clients within middle class social environments (cf., Cohen, 1965; Davis, 1938). To the contrary, once financial barriers are vitiated it appears that lower class clients are more likely than others to sustain active engagement in such programs, possibly due to a paucity of high quality recreational resources in their neighborhood environments. However, as noted in a recent essay by Kelman (1972), it also may be possible that lower-class clients consider themselves to be relatively powerless vis-a-vis therapists and, therefore, obliged to continue in therapeutic and experimental programs even when they are relatively unsatisfactory.

Race

As noted earlier, substantial numbers of black subjects were referred to the program. Since virtually all of the agency's regularly enrolled clientele were white there was initial concern lest undue problems arise regarding the capacity of the former children to adapt to the program or to be received with equanimity by the regular clientele. Likewise, there was concern that black parents would be reluctant to enroll their children in a treatment program conducted within a predominantly white social environment. Nonetheless, 19% of the non-joiners were white and only 17% were black. Similarly, the rates of discontinuance following enrollment were the same for both categories of subjects (15%). Although it is probable that race interacted with family income the data suggest that economic factors are more important than racial ones when discontinuance is the prime variable under consideration. More specifically, it seems that low economic status serves to enhance the likelihood of clients remaining in a treatment program so long as fees are minimal and transportation is not unduly problematic. Again, the findings clearly refute the notion that socio-cultural deficits, rather than financial and travel barriers, militate against treatment continuance by minority group clients and clients from lower socio-economic strata.

Religion

As with the variable of race, the investigators and agency staff expressed some initial concern regarding the anticipated difficulties of helping non-Jewish children to adapt to the agency and its clientele. Twenty-three percent of the Catholic and Jewish children referred to the agency did not enroll in the program. Although the incidence of non-joining was 17% for Protestant children and only 11% for those who claimed to be areligious the differences between categories do not attain usually accepted levels of statistical significance. Jewish children withdrew from the program at a higher rate (23%) than Protestant (19%), Catholic (15%), or areligious subjects (0%). Interestingly, it appears that subjects with no distinct religious affiliation found it easiest to
adapt to the program. Only one of nine such children referred to the program declined to enroll. The remainder stayed with the program until its termination. It is important to note that the highly secular nature of activity programs engaged in by the treatment groups seemed to de-emphasize the religious orientation of the agency. Within the context of the leaders' treatment objectives, groups participated in activities such as swimming, basketball, arts and crafts, hikes, fund-raising activities, discussions, and so forth. To the extent that programming focused upon such activities differential religious backgrounds of the clients probably were of low visibility and little import for continuance.

Age

Among other things, it was anticipated that young children might have great difficulty in adapting to a community-based treatment program, especially one in which transportation was a major consideration. Apparently this concern was shared to some extent by the children's parents. Twenty percent of the interviewed children ranging in age from 8-9 years old did not join the program. This percentage decreased to 16% for 10-12 year old children and 14% for 13-16 year old children. Once enrolled for the program, however, a client's age appeared to be of minimal significance for continuance. Review of the data show no systematic relationship between discontinuance and clients' ages. Although provision of free transportation may have reduced the importance of this variable, especially with reference to younger children, it seems apparent that attendance requirements were not unduly problematic for children ranging in age from 8-16 years.

Clients' Presenting Behaviors

In order to facilitate referrals collaborative personnel were asked to complete a behavioral checklist for each client. Completion of the checklist entailed that respondents estimate the total number of behaviors exhibited by the client during a one-week period prior to the referral. Behaviors were classified according to one of five categories: (1) interpersonal aggression (such as fighting, kicking others, and so forth), (2) object aggression (such as breaking windows and destroying furniture), (3) verbal aggression (such as threatening to maim or kill someone), (4) disruptive behavior toward peers (such as interrupting conversations, distracting others by whistling, and so forth), and (5) disruptive behavior toward adults (such as refusing to obey reasonable requests, not attending to teachers' instructions, skipping school, and similar behaviors). During the intake interview the clients' parents also were requested to complete an identical checklist.

Review of the checklists obtained from referral agents showed that nearly 8% of the clients obtained total scores ranging only from 1-5 on the checklist. That is, fewer than 6 anti-social behaviors were estimated
for the client during the preceding one-week period. If the estimates were reliable such clients were inappropriately referred to the program since their frequencies of anti-social behavior for a one-week period were within relatively normal limits. Seventeen percent of the clients obtained scores ranging from 6-15 anti-social behaviors per week. The overwhelming majority (76%) obtained scores varying from 16 to several hundred such behaviors per week. The greatest proportion of non-joiners (23%) were boys with extremely low anti-social scores on the behavioral checklist, that is, scores ranging from 1-5. Likewise, rates of discontinuance for clients from this category were exceptionally high (40%). Therefore, the data indicate that children who were inappropriately referred to the program tended to voluntarily withdraw either at the point of intake or early in the program's inception. Discontinuance rates tended to decrease in inverse proportion to the reported frequency of clients' anti-social behavior. Clients who were reported to display 6-20 such behaviors in a one-week period had a discontinuance rate of 18%; those with reported frequencies ranging from 21 to several hundred had a discontinuance rate of only 13%. Generally, then, it appears that clients with the greatest need for the program tended to continue. In contrast, those considered to exhibit infrequent anti-social behavior tended to withdraw during the early stages of the program.

Additionally, rates of non-joining and discontinuance were examined with reference to the particular types of anti-social behaviors exhibited by the clients, as indicated by parents' behavioral checklists. The reported frequency of clients' interpersonal aggression towards others, such as fighting, did not differentiate among those who did not enroll for the program and those who left it during the first six weeks. In contrast, clients with high frequencies of object aggression were less likely to join the program than those who displayed such aggression minimally, that is, five times or less per week. Twenty-five percent of the clients who exhibited such anti-social behavior from 6-20 times per week declined to join the program. Likewise, 50% of those exhibiting such behavior 21 or more times per week did not join. In both of the latter instances, however, the total number of clients was small, thus precluding generalization to larger populations. After enrollment, discontinuance rates for clients exhibiting 6 or more instances of object aggression per week were nil. Discontinuance was observed only for those clients displaying 5 or fewer such behaviors per week.

Likewise, non-joining was found to vary in accord with the reported frequency of clients' verbal aggression towards others. Again, however, after joining the program no clients with extremely high verbal aggression scores (21 or more times per week) discontinued. Discontinuance rates were highest (23%) for clients reputedly displaying verbal aggression 6-20 times per week. When considering clients' disruptive behavior toward peers, it was found that 33% of those with extremely high scores
(21 or more times per week) did not join. In contrast, those with esti-
mated frequencies varying from 0-5 or 6-20 times per week did not differ
in their predilection to decline enrollment; 14% of the clients from
each category did not enroll. Again, there were no discontinuances
among clients who enrolled in the program with extremely high reported
frequencies of such behavior (21 or more times per week). In fact, the
relationship between discontinuance and reported frequency of disruptive
behavior toward peers was an inverse one, ranging from 0% for clients
with 21 or more behaviors per week to 9% for those with 6-20 behaviors
and 18% for those with fewer than five such behaviors.

Finally, it is relevant to note that clients who exhibited extremely high
frequencies of disruptive behavior toward adults tended not to join and,
moreover, tended to withdraw readily from the program after having joined.

TABLE I: Summary of Relationships Between Selected
Socio-Demographic Variables and Client
Discontinuance

Direct Relationship

Free transportation*
Type of referral agency
Travel distance
Family income
Frequency of anti-social behavior, estimated by re-
ferral agents
Type of anti-social behavior, estimated by referral
agents: Disruptive behavior toward adults

Inverse Relationship

Type of anti-social behavior, estimated by referral
agents:
Object aggression
Verbal aggression
Disruptive behavior toward peers

No Relationship

Type of group composition
Race
Age
Type of anti-social behavior, estimated by
referral agents: Interpersonal aggression

*p < .001, chi-square test, two-tailed.
Whereas 37% of those exhibiting 21 or more such behaviors per week did not enroll, the respective rate was only 13% for clients displaying five or fewer such behaviors per week and 17% for those exhibiting 6-20 such behaviors per week. Likewise, whereas discontinuance rates were relatively similar for clients showing five or fewer such behaviors per week (13%) and 6-20 such behaviors per week (11%) the rate was significantly higher for those showing 21 or more such behaviors per week (20%).

Among other possibilities, it would appear that the clients' tendencies to contravene parental instructions frequently resulted in a decision not to permit them to join the program or, likewise, to discontinue during the first six weeks. This raises the distinct possibility that the program was used by some parents as a reward for conforming behavior or, even worse, that parents may have subtly encouraged children not to participate in the program in accord with their unique needs to maintain deviant behavior by their own children. Thus, for example, Bell and Vogel (1968) have posited that some parents tend to induce or sustain deviant behavior among their children in order to maintain their own tenuous relationship with one another. In general, however, it is encouraging to note that children with reportedly high frequencies of behaviors such as object aggression, verbal aggression, and disruptive behavior toward peers chose to continue treatment. Most probably their efforts toward continuance were supported by parents and relevant others in the community. In contrast, it appears that anti-social behavior specifically directed toward parents and other adults resulted in early termination from the program. The data suggest, then, that the particular types and targets of children's anti-social behavior tend to influence whether or not they will choose, or be permitted to choose, continuance in a treatment program directed toward the reduction of such behavior.

**DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY**

As illustrated in Table I the foregoing data show that clients' continuance in a treatment program is likely to be influenced by a number of social and economic desiderata other than those integrally associated with the therapeutic relationship itself. Whether or not a client enrolls and actively participates in a treatment program may depend on a variety of factors, including his relationships with parents and relevant others, the internal operations and needs of the referral agency and its staff, his family's socio-economic position, and the actual nature and targets of the maladaptive behavior that he exhibits. In general, our data indicate that clients from economically impoverished families tend to enroll in, and remain with, a low-cost community treatment program. This is especially apparent when transportation costs for the program are negligible or are assumed by the agency or other funding sources. In addition to minimizing the client's costs for participating in treatment the low-cost provision of regularized transportation probably serves to promote positive behavioral expectations that further enhance the likelihood of long-term continuance. Given the excessive charges and high
discontinuance rates of most other treatment programs (cf., Empey and Erickson, 1972; Warren, 1970) and the inordinate societal costs attributable to juvenile delinquency the payment of clients' transportation expenses to and from treatment programs may represent a negligible and worthwhile social investment. As with our program, such expenses may be readily countervailed by the relatively low costs entailed by a community-based treatment program utilizing primarily sub-professional personnel.

It is important to note that certain factors oftentimes viewed as deterrents to client continuance were not found to be particularly significant in the present study. Factors such as race, age, and the proportion of pro-social and anti-social children in each treatment group were unrelated to discontinuance, thus suggesting that the historical debate between the merits of homogeneous and heterogeneous treatment groups may be readily resolved in favor of the latter (Hoffman and Maier, 1961; Schutz, 1961; Shalinsky, 1969; Shaw, 1960; Spergel, 1965).

However, other socially relevant variables were found to be of marked importance. Thus, for example, given relatively low costs for transportation and for the treatment program itself clients from economically impoverished families were found to be more likely continuers than those from wealthier families. The data also suggest that clients who are thought to exhibit certain types of behavioral problems are more likely to join and to continue in a treatment program than others. It was found, for example, that children with high estimated frequencies of verbal aggression, disruptive behavior toward peers, and object aggression showed great resistance to joining the treatment program. Nonetheless, those who enrolled were more likely to remain with the program than less serious offenders. In contrast, clients with high estimated frequencies of disruptive behavior toward adults tended to discontinue relatively early in the program, perhaps as a result of undue constraints imposed by their parents or others in the community.

Finally, the data suggest that factors associated with the internal operations of referral agencies may be associated with their proclivity to refer clients to a treatment program and, even, with the long-term continuance of such clients. Obviously every agency must retain a certain number of paying clients in order to assure its own long-term viability. At the same time, the data point to the possibility that some agencies may readily refer clients who are unduly problematic for their own internal operations, even if the former do not fit the particular stipulations of the treatment program. These and similar considerations are the subject of further detailed research by the present investigators.

In summary, then, the above findings clearly suggest that enrollment and continuance in a treatment program depends upon many variables that may be regarded as distinct social or economic costs for clients. These
include factors that are relatively unrelated to the clients' actual behavior in the treatment group or to the client-therapist relationship. In large part, the provision of requisite ancillary services and economic assistance may greatly reduce the likelihood of premature discontinuance by clients. The creation of more effective collaborative relationships with referral personnel, the provision of transportation resources for clients, prior consultation with parents, and other desiderata can be readily influenced by the staff of a treatment program. Accordingly, with proper planning and a full recognition of the various benefits and costs entailed it may be possible to provide the requisite conditions for client continuance and, therefore, for the subsequent delivery of effective social services.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Within the social work community there exists an acknowledged need for evaluating the effectiveness of casework services. This need developed and was sustained over time because of pressure exerted by the profession for internal accountability: understanding practice to improve intervention and insure professional growth. But more recently, evaluation endeavors arose from pressure to demonstrate external accountability: the need to prove the validity of casework services. This shift was produced by the change in casework financing from private voluntary contributions to public tax dollars. Claims made in the early 1960's that expansion of casework services could reduce existing, and prevent future, social problems brought governmental funding of service delivery. But, at the same time, receipt of public tax dollars necessitated verification of those claims to justify the increased support. To this end, the number of casework evaluation studies undertaken since 1962 provides evidence of the field's commitment to answering the basic accountability question, "is casework effective?".

Despite the field's apparent commitment and increased use of evaluation research, there has been little impact on our understanding of casework effectiveness. Briar identifies four reasons to explain this phenomenon:

1) ...to ignore the research on effectiveness and try to preserve the faith and confidence that once prevailed
2) ...that the problem itself is not important
3) ...to recognize the research findings but then try to explain them away
4) ...cynicism and despair associated with a feeling that social workers are useless

In his analysis, Briar correctly describes the field's response to evaluation efforts. However, his analysis (as well as others') fails to identify those dilemmas which help create and maintain the profession's stance toward casework evaluation. To date, no systematic analysis of these dilemmas exists. This article is devoted to that task. While there are no guarantees that identification will lead to eliminating the barriers that prevent adequate evaluation, it seems a necessary first step toward this goal.
II. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

In developing an analytical framework we did not attempt a re-examination of the evaluative studies themselves. Instead, we concentrated on review, summaries and critiques of these studies which provide clearer delineation of the issues involved. From this review of the literature four basic dilemmas were identified:

A) Unity-the conceptual dilemma
B) Humanism-the value dilemma
C) Abstracted Empiricism-the methodological dilemma
D) Deparatism-the integration dilemma

These four areas are neither mutually exclusive nor exhaustive but provide a heuristic framework for understanding a highly complex and dynamic issue. To understand the framework it is crucial to realize that each dilemma represents both an important part of the problem and an element in its solution. Viewing each of the dilemmas as the main cause of the problem ignores their interactive dimension, establishing a part/whole dichotomy which forestalls a holistic solution.

A. Unity—the conceptual dilemma

The unity dilemma arose because theory has not been the guiding principle in evaluation research. Breedlove, among others, has pointed strongly to this fact as the main difficulty in evaluating casework. By not utilizing theory, researchers view casework as a totality, i.e., a black box, rather than an interactive process. This situation seems to be in conflict with the very essence of casework practice which stressed process both in the field and in academic training. Without theory to guide one's understanding of what actually occurs in the process, two shortcomings are evident in the evaluative literature. First, as Geismar has noted, casework services are delivered to diverse target groups with a multiplicity of problems. Thus, intervention is directed toward prevention of juvenile delinquency, elimination of mental illness, and reduction and prevention of dependence and poverty. The target groups served include people of all ages, races, ethnicities and socio-economic classes. The breadth of target populations and problems is reflected in research studies and indicates the vague limits and process of casework intervention. This diversity has also handicapped the basic intent of research to validate theory and advance knowledge because each study focused on different problem/target group combinations and neither cumulative information nor replication were attempted.

A second shortcoming is the tendency of the evaluative literature to standardize the process of interaction itself. Researchers tend to view social workers as a homogeneous group, failing to appreciate differences in style, knowledge, skill, motivation or experience and the way these variables interact with, and influence, outcome. A more appropriate assumption is that workers are heterogeneous. Researchers would be alerted to the nature of differences between workers and build this into
evaluation. The belief in homogeneity may account for many of the contradictory and confusing findings. Without controlling for worker heterogeneity, cancelling out effects within the internal operation of the study may occur. Thus, positive gains by some workers may be cancelled out by negative or no gains by others. This effect may also work within the caseload of a single worker depending on the nature of the interaction with the client.

It seems evident that both of these problems stem largely from the tendency to avoid testing and using theory in evaluations. Practice theory is directly related to the range of available interventive techniques and strategies. In addition, there exists insufficient knowledge by which to view the process dimension systematically. Consequently, researchers avoid the problem of theory by perceiving casework as a unitary process without considering whether a certain target group and problem area is appropriate or whether worker heterogeneity is an intervening variable in that process.

B. Humanism—the value dilemma

Social work's value foundation rests largely in the humanistic tradition; a belief system stressing the individual's fundamental goodness and ability for constructive growth and change.13 Within the field a continuum is discernible between the art and the science components of casework practice. Our humanist tradition tends to emphasize the art of practice; whereas research philosophy stresses the science component of the process.

This basic value conflict has led to a disparity between the perceptions of casework held by the researcher and the practitioner. Researchers stress the quantitative aspects of the casework process; the practitioner emphasized the qualitative. These differences cause the major focus of the evaluation effort to miss the interactive process through which much of casework treatment is conveyed. While attempting to quantify all relevant variables the researcher has difficulty accepting and utilizing many qualitative elements. These then go unnoticed and are not included within the evaluative framework.

The dilemma of conflicting values between research and practice is heightened when efforts to utilize an experimental or quasi-experimental design are implemented. Geismar points out that social work is generally engaged in a socially expected function, the exact utility of which can rarely be established because of the inability to produce comparisons in which no services were provided.14 His statement seems to preclude the use of a service/no service comparison, the basis of the experimental design. In its place, research has tended to substitute comparisons between a new service and a traditional service.15 This produces yet another problem, since the impact of the traditional service is unknown and therefore cannot be used to evaluate the impact of a new service. Both elements in the comparison contain unknown quantities. However, such a
situation reflects a basic belief held by practitioners: that any service is, in fact, better than no service. This assumption is based almost entirely on faith for, as Fischer has noted, the research evidence does not bear out this conclusion.\textsuperscript{16}

Researchers compare services about which they know very little, while practitioners believe their activities with clients made a difference no matter what the findings suggest. A powerful stimulus develops which encourages the practitioner to ignore findings and the researcher to push even harder to prove the practitioner wrong. Humanist values in this case operate as a defense against more adequate research instead of as the motivating force for more information. In order to help clients, practitioners need more knowledge and in order to obtain that knowledge researchers need more information and the cooperation of the practitioner. Value conflicts within humanist traditions and the art/science continuum clearly impede the development of adequate evaluation efforts.

C. Abstracted Empiricism—the methodological dilemma

C. Wright Mills wrote in 1957 that sociology had developed a dependence on methods at the expense of more substantive work. Mills termed this practice "abstracted empiricism" and indicted sociologists for trying to emulate the natural sciences in the application of the scientific method for the development of all sociological knowledge.\textsuperscript{17} This criticism seems to fit the current state in casework effectiveness thinking. The focus on methods as an end in and of itself, as opposed to a means toward understanding casework, presents a serious problem. The evidence of this problem can be seen in two related observations:

1) researchers take great pains to present their methods sections in detail in order to meet the requirements of the scientific method.

2) The major criticisms levelled at these studies are almost always on methodological and not substantive grounds.\textsuperscript{18}

Although abstracted empiricism gives highest priority to methods, there is a paradox operating within the evaluation of casework effectiveness. There appears to be a discrepancy between how the methods are employed in the research and their technical appropriateness.\textsuperscript{19} According to the writings of such authors as Edward Suchman there are three dimensions to the evaluative research process: input, output and design.\textsuperscript{20} It seems that primary concentration is on the design with little, if any, attention directed to either input or output. Despite the fact that a research design is only the mechanism for systematizing data gathering and analysis it seems to be a substitute for a real understanding of what occurs in the casework process. In and of itself the quasi-experimental design adds nothing to our basic knowledge. Its use is predicated on a sophisticated and extensive knowledge base.
which permits one to identify and control all irrelevant variables, to isolate cause and effect relationships. Without this knowledge the researcher will not ask the appropriate set of questions and must assume the existence of relationships. If this assumption is correct then use of an experimental or quasi-experimental design at this stage of development of casework effectiveness actually impedes knowledge building and research findings.

The misapplication of the input/output concept can be demonstrated more clearly by the tendency to mix priorities in assessing relevant variables on each side of the equation. Thus, quantitative measures of activity, i.e., hours of treatment, number of weeks in treatment, number of visits are used for the input side whereas qualitative aspects of behavioral change measure outcome. While this formulation is not necessarily incorrect it stresses the wrong variables on each side. Therefore, to understand input, i.e., casework, one must have an understanding of the qualitative aspects inherent in the process itself. Likewise, to understand output, i.e., expected goals, the quantitative aspects of behavioral change are critical if accurate measurement and reduction of value judgements is to occur. Unless priority is given to the appropriate orientation on each side of the equation, valuable information is lost which has a critical effect on research findings. This is not to say that quantitative aspects of input and the qualitative dimensions of output are not important, but they should play a secondary role in the process and be utilized to enhance the primary components in the analysis.

D. Separatism—the integration dilemma

Social work, as noted earlier, has not used effectively either the research process or its findings as a mechanism for understanding casework. Research usually remains outside the realm of practice and rarely has a direct impact on either practice or education. Despite this relationship researchers have not hesitated to accumulate evidence to answer the effectiveness question. Clearly, the need to summarize these studies exists although there are inherent pitfalls in this approach, as Fischer has discovered. In trying to unify studies that have different population targets, different treatment goals, different objectives and no compatible understanding of casework, one is left with the most superficial analysis and forced to accept the weakest evidence to support conclusions. Fischer's definition of casework, goals and analysis all fit this general pattern, yet, he concludes his analysis with a resounding defeat for casework intervention. This type of effort is evidence of the lack of congruity between the field and research. Approaching knowledge building from this standpoint prevents practitioners from either trusting researchers or utilizing their findings. It creates the integration dilemma.

We have already pointed to the value conflict between research and practice, but stemming from that is a fundamental goal conflict as well.
This situation derives in part from the political environment within which casework evaluation occurs. Most studies are undertaken by researchers employed from outside the organization they are investigating. The need for agencies to show positive impact is becoming an overriding concern within the organization because of the funding pattern of casework services. Conflicting concerns emerge—the researcher's main interest is to further the knowledge base of the field; the practitioner's main objective is to help the client and maintain his job; and the agency administrators' concerns involve organizational survival in the political environment. The disparity in objectives is one possible explanation why research findings are not met with enthusiasm by the practitioner. When findings are negative they can be used as a weapon to decrease financial support by foes of casework services. When findings are positive (rare at best) they are criticized on methodological grounds, effectively neutralizing their impact. It seems that evaluation studies can only hurt agency operation without providing any positive feedback.

The integration dilemma has one final dimension related to the absence of formal mechanisms for feedback of research findings into the field. Research tends to be presented in haphazard ways either in journals, at conferences or in small doses in the academic setting. There is no on-going system whereby research is disseminated to the field and comments and criticisms are entertained. Theory is not tested, so knowledge based on research findings is limited usually to the immediate organizational unit of the study itself. The nature of funding such research precludes its being used in a broad sense since it is usually the agencies who contract directly with the researcher. Research, in order to be utilized, must relate both to the wider needs of the field and to knowledge building and hypothesis testing. It has been an easy task for the social work community to avoid the effectiveness issue, as it avoids research in general, but the field can no longer take this stance. Action is imperative!

III. IMPLICATIONS FOR ACTION

The analytical framework developed in the preceding section demonstrates the weaknesses in casework evaluation. At the same time the framework demonstrates the interrelationship between all four dilemmas. The extent of this relationship necessitates action for change that will enhance the operation of each part of the evaluation process. By taking such a stance, the combination of factors will maximize the potential utility of research findings. The following discussion attempts to develop a three-faceted holistic approach to evaluation.

The first facet entails the recognition of practice theory as the guide for evaluation. Without a systematic testing of theories acknowledged as important in casework practice, e.g., problem solving, ego psychology, role, communications, and task oriented, the black box which surrounds casework cannot be opened. The main task of theory is to provide the basic knowledge necessary to understand what casework is and how it operates.
theory can furnish greater comprehension of casework's major effectiveness in terms of problem areas and target groups. The elements which comprise the process of casework and heterogeneity among workers become clear and flow naturally from utilizing theory as a guide. In their attempt to understand the place of casework both Kahn and Geismar have expressed considerable doubts about the ability of casework to stand as a single service. They view casework as a crucial component within a core of services which, taken together, can maximize desired outcome. But without adequate knowledge such views can neither be tested, nor, if correct, be implemented.

A better understanding of the relationship between theory and practice can occur only through an ongoing and systematic analysis of casework's operational characteristics. Identification of these dimensions provides the linkage between theory and practice and gives meaning to the input and output sides of the evaluation equation. Outcome can be determined only on the basis of what goes into the process, and this relationship is governed by theory and its implications for technique, problem area and desired objectives. The development of such a systematic testing of practice theory can be facilitated through the use of grounded theory. Grounded theory is based on the observable as the basic unit from which theory is constructed. This approach can be used to validate predictions of outcome and process. Unlike formal theory construction and testing, grounded theory does not require rigid formulations before observations are made. Because social workers deal with observable reality this approach maximizes the need of the field in both theory development and testing as well as meeting human need.

Using practice theory as the guide for evaluation seems a logical first step, however agreement about this point is not universal. Some authors strongly believe that the development of better research technology, along with clarification of social work's goals, is both the necessary and sufficient course of action. The following general statements by Briar exemplify such an approach:

"It would entail a shift away from identification with particular theories and toward commitment to discovering and determining empirically what is effective practice, letting the theoretical chips fall where they may."

"...theory and other speculative materials would play an important supplementary and heuristic role but not a crucial one."

This approach, in essence, maintains the operation of the abstracted empiricist dilemma choosing to avoid the use of theory as a little more than supplementary to the research process. As was pointed out earlier,
better research technology cannot answer the underlying question about what casework is and what outcomes should be expected when it is applied.

Following from an understanding of practice theory, the second facet requires the improvement of research technology. In developing such technology the use of more qualitative methods on the input side and quantitative methods on the output side is essential. The work of David Fanshel is illustrative of such efforts. In examining marriage counseling, he videotaped the interactions and used this material as the basis for understanding the process observed. By asking questions at the same time, client participation provided the reactive element to the worker's understanding of what had transpired.

The work of Fanshel is evidence that improved technology can provide useful information in research. His design demonstrates that input and output data can be used to generate and test appropriate practice theory. This exemplifies one solution to the abstracted empiricist dilemma.

However, testing theory and using appropriate methods do not speak directly to the problems of value and goal conflicts inherent in the humanism and separatism dilemmas.

The third facet entails resolving the separatism dilemma by maximizing the field's humanist tradition to achieve a closer link between practitioner and researcher. Integration of research, worker and administrative concerns through a re-orientation of priorities within the political environment can facilitate the gathering and analyzing of research findings. This re-orientation can be accomplished by stressing the mutual benefits of effective evaluation instead of their negative consequences. A coordinated series of activities could advance social work's primary concerns about casework effectiveness. With improved knowledge and information provided by researchers, practitioners could be more effective in meeting client need; enhanced client functioning could facilitate organizational survival by increased financial support. But, if the results are not always positive, there is at least the awareness that efforts for change and improvement are on-going within an organization. This openness serves as a weapon against criticism since it indicates the desire, if not the attainment, of the maximum impact possible.

The emphasis in the above discussion rests on accentuating the positive, rather than the negative. Too often, stressing differences (so characteristic of the literature in casework effectiveness) hinders or prevents constructive action. If the field is to respond to pressures for both internal and external accountability then a coherent framework for evaluating casework is essential. If we are to know whether casework is effective the questions must be formulated based on theory, using appropriate research technology within an integrated and unified environment.
IV. CONCLUSIONS

An attempt was made in this analysis to identify the barriers inhibiting the development of a comprehensive and holistic approach to the evaluation of casework effectiveness. The four dilemmas, unity, humanism, abstracted empiricism and separatism, provide a general framework from which concerted action for change can be directed. Systematic development and testing of theory through the use of grounded methods to adequately define input and output will provide the guidelines for appropriate qualitative and quantitative methods. The recognition of the humanistic tradition with its emphasis on values to help people can break down some of the barriers that currently separate participants of the process. The realities of the political environment must be recognized for what they are and turned around to benefit the field and those it serves. Action at this stage in the history of social work is critical but there must be general agreement about how action should proceed in order to achieve understanding as well as improve casework services. This is the only way to respond to the pressure for accountability.
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This paper builds upon a helpful typology of free clinics that divides them into four major kinds - the street, neighborhood, youth, and sponsored. While the typology tends to weave among characteristics of clientele, locale, and source of support in setting up its units, it nonetheless has the advantage of being based on an empirical assessment of the major forms of clinic operations through the country. Youth clinics - the type that particularly concerns us here - are defined as "generally organized by adults, service clubs, or official boards... because of their concern about drug use among high school students." Such clinics are distinctive from the other types in that "they generally offer drug care which is limited to education and counseling."2

Our examination of the youth clinic model attempts to determine its distinctive characteristics vis-a-vis the remaining types of programs. In this regard, we hope to move information and insights about free clinics beyond the head-counting, diagnosis-tabulating stage and the sometimes (and quite understandable) self-congratulatory observations that have surrounded the early, innovative period of the free clinic movement.

RATIONALE OF FREE CLINICS

Two major themes in regard to free clinics provide important ingredients in our comparison of the youth clinics with the other types. The first concerns the nonjudgmental ethics which is ubiquitous in the free clinic world, and the second concerns the absence of sophisticated research, which is equally characteristic. Combined, these two items have particular significance in pinpointing what we believe is a special vulnerability of the youth-type clinics which leads them to distort or, at least, to redefine common goals of free clinic work.

(1) Non-judgmental ethos. Certainly, the most pervasive operating stance of the free clinics has been their emphasis on the nonjudgmental character of the service they deliver. In contrast to establishment health care, clinics are marked by a self-imposed "simplicity and candor."3 A writer describing a Los Angeles clinic program notes that "volunteers are
screened carefully to make sure that they have a nonjudgmental attitude toward people."4 While another commentator observes: "We don't ask any questions and we don't make any judgments,"5 and still another says: "We are there to provide a service to people of the community, not to make them fit our concepts."6 The matter is summed up very well in the following quotation:

We also said that we wouldn't treat anything that somebody himself didn't define as wrong with him. If he came in looking for a job, that's what we helped him with. If he came in saying he was strung out on speed and wanted to get off, that's what we helped him with. We did not try to impose a set of artificial diagnoses on the individual and say, this is your problem and this is what I'm going to help you with.7

(2) Absence of research. There are a number of reasons why there are virtually no outcome reports regarding the work of the free clinics. For one thing, service requirements take precedence over what is seen as cold-blooded and impersonal analysis, work which is defined as self-serving for the researcher and useless for the client. For another, it is seen as important that clients retain their anonymity, so that they are reassured that dossiers are not being compiled on them which might come to the attention of law enforcement authorities or might be divulged to persons, such as their parents, from whom they want their contact with the clinic to be kept secret. For a third matter, free clinics, like most social services, are not readily susceptible to evaluative investigations because they will not randomize their intake, on the ground that to deprive anyone seeking assistance because of research priorities is both inhumane and unethical. The following remarks, which were preceded by the observation that minority community people do not want to become "guinea pigs" sums up a number of the issues:

The idea that research might be done at the clinic was also resented by several members of the board and was of real concern to them. Some feared invasion of privacy of medical records. Others had long standing grudges because of sociologic studies made...earlier that were considered to invade the privacy of people solely to reap rewards for the researchers. Almost all requests to review clinic utilization systematically met with such objections.8

YOUTH-TYPE CLINIC: OPERATING PRINCIPLES

The absence of research in free clinics necessitates reliance upon
anecdotal and intuitive indices of success in order to reinforce personnel in the necessary belief that they are accomplishing something worthwhile. This is a very easy matter when the intervention involves physical matters, such as treatment of venereal infections or the prescription of drugs for upper respiratory complaints. It is a much more difficult task when the service, as in youth clinics, is only of an educative and counseling nature. Similarly, the nonjudgmental ethic may be hard-pressed to survive when counseling processes are tied closely to matters such as the expectation of the funding agency that the clinic "rehabilitate" a "reasonable" number of persons in order to "prove" its value.

These conditions, among others, feed into the following items, which we derived from more than a year's participant-observation involvement with a Southern California youth-type free clinic. We will first state them as general principles, and then document them with excerpts from the "rap" sessions, which are the primary treatment vehicles at the clinic.

1) Faced with a highly intransigent problem - that of drug use - clinic personnel are inexorably pressed to redefine their client's problems judgmentally, that is, not as drug use but as personality and performance inadequacies of a subtle and generally nonmeasurable nature. This redefinition allows the question of intervention efficacy to be bypassed without undue intellectual embarrassment.

2) Lacking solid criteria of success (such as the elimination of "real" sickness), clinic personnel come to measure success not in terms of the number of clients who have completed treatment, but rather in terms of the number who continue to appear for therapy. Under such conditions, they tend to resist with more vehemence than that devoted to almost any other issue decisions by clients to stop participating in the clinic program.

3) Youth clinic staff members are apt to mimic establishment tactics and pretensions instead of using their own strengths and talents in a straightforward manner. This results from the difficulty of providing short-term nonjudgmental help which will readily resolve a client's drug problem, and from the necessity to retain a respectable roster of clients to reassure the funding agency that worthwhile services are being offered.

ILLUSTRATION OF GENERAL POINTS

Each of the preceding items is documented below by material recorded during our participant-observation work:

1) Redefinition of clients' problems. Objective presenting problems
are redefined by the youth clinic counselors as symptomatic of deeper
difficulties, enabling the counselors to lengthen the span of the clients'
attachment to the clinic. This procedure is vital to the survival of the
clinic, which serves about 100 persons a month, with perhaps four out of
five of these persons representing part of the previous month's workload.
Surface symptoms are translated into the necessity to discover where you
"really are at." A newcomer to our clinic, for instance, was quickly
informed by a group leader about what was expected of him:

Counselor: How are you feeling tonight, Bill?

Bill: I had a crappy week. My boss was on my tail
from Monday to Friday. We're expected to put in a
lot of overtime. This week I worked seventy-five
hours. I'm just really burned out.

Counselor: Yes, but how are you feeling?

On another occasion, a 25 year old graduate student (the participant-
observer) recounted his efforts to get a job:

Counselor: How are you feeling tonight, Charlie?

Charlie: I'm feeling a little down. I've been trying
to find a job for the past ten weeks. Every place I
get I get the same line: "Don't call us; we'll call
you."

Susan: Why can't you find a job?

Charlie: Because there aren't too many openings for
an M.A. in sociology.

Susan: What do you need?

Charlie: A Ph.D. .

Counselor: But is there something in your own head
which is keeping you from getting a job?

Members who refuse to go along with this type of thinking, who insist
that they want practical help not abstract analysis, will be chastised for
their impatience and truculence. The following interchange took place, for
instance, when a group member brought with him a written report detailing
what had happened to him since the previous session:
Bob: First of all, I want to explain why I have this piece of paper. I recorded everything that happened last week. I did this because I wanted to get everything straight. (Reading.) On Monday, Dad and I got along fine. We went to a ballgame, the Dodgers versus the Phillies, and had a great time. On Tuesday, I was supposed to mow the lawn, but I forgot....

Counselor: Stop! Stop! I can't believe this. Bob, why are you doing this to us? All you're doing is storytelling. Why can't you get down to a feeling level. Stop giving us this bullshit! What's the worse thing that could happen if you told us what you really feel?

2) Response to client withdrawal. Counselors consume an enormous amount of time and ingenuity trying to keep members who want to leave the group from doing so. Problem solving is defined as a long-term, nonurgent process, a job that is never really completed. Dropping out seems to be regarded by the counselors as a personal affront to them:

1st Counselor: There's rumors that you might be quitting Group?

Ted: Yeah, I just might. I've been feeling awful comfortable.

1st Counselor: Let's sit on the floor and talk about it.

2nd Counselor: That's a good idea.

(The group forms a tight circle on the floor).

Ted: I feel I'm really comfortable. I'm happy with my job. Dad got so bad that I moved out. And last week I moved in with Betty (a former girl friend). Things have really been good between us. I'm no longer pressured to marry her (Betty had had an abortion). She has a job and can support me and....

1st Counselor: I disagree with your idea that everything is cool. I don't think it's really a positive thing to go from one dependency at your parents' house to another dependency at Betty's. I kind of question your motives.

2nd Counselor: I'm sorry, Ted. I don't mean to laugh,
but you're saying, "I really feel good, but I still have all these problems."

Ted: O.K. But when I was out of Group for ten weeks, while I missed the socializing, I didn't miss anything else.

2nd Counselor: Then there's nothing you get out of coming here?

Ted: Well, I enjoy coming and socializing, but....

Roberta: That's a fucked-up reason to come!

Ted: So what! What I need to do now is get more outside of here. I need to form new relationships.

2nd Counselor: It sounds like a cop-out to say you have to leave Group to build meaningful relations on the outside.

Ted: It's just that I don't think the pros of coming here every week offset the cons. It's a real sacrifice to come down here every week for three and a half hours. I have to walk; it's almost two miles; and it's cold at night.

2nd Counselor: I think that's bullshit. I want to know why you want to quit? If you had a deeper feeling about wanting to quit Group, what might that feeling be?

Ted: The fear of opening up, maybe?

2nd Counselor: Is there something to the fact that you might be on the edge of really relating to the group?

Ted: It could be. I have relaxed a lot.

2nd Counselor: I think you have an ambiguous attitude towards wanting to quit Group. I have an idea. Ted, you play me and I'll play you.

(The role playing lasted about ten minutes. During that time, Ted agreed that he was afraid to express his real feelings to his father and to the group.)

2nd Counselor: If you were really yourself, Ted, maybe it wouldn't matter what your Dad was doing.
You could change how you react to him.

Ted: And how do I do that? Just what should I do?

2nd Counselor: Well, for one thing, you don't quit Group. (The other members begin to laugh.) Have we convinced you, Ted, that you're still sick? But seriously, Ted, underneath that anger towards your father is a hell of a lot of hurt, and it's important to get at it.

1st Counselor: So will you be here next week, Ted?

Ted: Yeah, I'll probably come.

Roberta: Probably?

Ted: I'll be back.

3) Imitation of establishment psychiatrist role. The role of "junior psychiatrist", one requiring little training and no credentialing, is common among members of the counseling staff at the youth-type clinic. Since everyone is equally unqualified and the role itself is quite unassailable, once its basic plays have been mastered, its assumption is difficult to resist. Nurses, physicians treating burns, technicians doing lab tests - be they professional, paraprofessional, or amateur - will not be able to maintain their position for long without showing some sure signs of adequacy. Junior psychiatrists, however, need fear no such reckoning.

The youth clinic counselors' conceptions of themselves are illustrated by their book-lined offices with large sofas, the attache case they carry, and the signs on office doors: "In Session, Do Not Disturb." The following interplay indicates how both treators and those being worked upon fall into the role chosen by and for them:

Joe: I feel that I've been shit on by Kathy (his girl friend).

Counselor: How does that make you feel?

Joe: It makes me feel like the world is really a strange place. Honesty is really important to me.

Counselor: Has anybody who has been close to you, besides Kathy, like people in your family, been dishonest or used you?
Joe: No.

Counselor: O.K. So it's not like a transference thing you're putting on other people. Like you're not over-reacting to the dishonesty you see in other people?

Joe: No. I feel pretty submissive. It's an introspective thing with me.

CONCLUDING NOTES

This paper has attempted to illustrate a number of ideas which suggest that the structure of youth-type clinics forces them toward redefining parts of the fundamental philosophy of the free clinic movement. Most notably, youth-type clinics are apt to abandon a nonjudgmental approach, because they do not offer services whose value is readily demonstrable. They also are apt to redefine their clients' problems from immediate things to things more amorphous and less susceptible to apparent resolution. This is largely because they cannot quickly and cleanly deal with drug use (which usually is their mandate from the community), but nonetheless must convey the impression of making strenuous and satisfactory efforts in this direction.

This is not to say that the procedures of the youth-type clinic are without merit or that they are not of help to some people. The question is more basic: Are they as much help to as many people needing help as they might be with different structural arrangements and different program stresses?

Currently, we are involved in a followup study trying to assess the impact of one youth-type clinic on its clients. There is a need for many more such studies, and particularly for comparative studies, done with sensitivity and with respect for the rights of clients, which assess outcomes in terms of client characteristics and other important variables. Our bias, for the moment at least, is toward clinics which combine health treatment with counseling functions. It has been noted elsewhere that sometimes in such multi-service facilities "drug treatment wants to do 'its own thing', independent of the needs of other parts of the clinic."9 This tendency can be fought in the multi-service meeting, but when drug counseling becomes isolated, we believe that it is apt to succumb to the kinds of pressures and definitions that we have outlined in this paper.

We might note in conclusion that the term "para", as in "para-professional", means not only "besides" but also can be part of a combining form meaning "guard against." We think this double-edge definition is worth final stress. It is our belief that free clinic personnel, be they professionals or not, ought to guard against the absorption of unfiltered
establishment practices, adopting only those which meet the needs of their clients, persons who have so callously been overlooked by traditional services in the past. To these they ought to add new values, such as a stress on candor and the acceptance of people as they are. We have been suggesting that this blend of the decent old and the invigorating new might be best achieved in clinics whose structure is broader and whose mission is more encompassing than that of the youth-type free clinics.
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The conventional wisdom attributes moral dubiousness to those who sponsor or execute research on programs designed to help the disadvantaged. Albert Murray provides a definitive portrait of this genre. He describes a new social science specialist; the "white or somewhat white hunter" who is a, "Two-finger Pig-Latin Swahili Expert, an image technician who files survey-safari reports on GhettoLand, U.S.A." Armed with this picaresque image the researcher projects an aura of being on the last frontier of danger and adventure as he plumbs the depths of human misery. This stance has several advantages for the Ghetto-adventurer:

(1) He is consolidating his one-up status over those base-camp white people (who subsidize his reports because they are interested in reading about Negroes but are terrified at the mere notion of entering the Eight Ball) and also over other white reporters; (2) he is up-grading his credentials and bargaining power with white editors and publishers; and (3) he is making a public presentation of his black passport to such Eight Ball tribal chiefs as might figure in future safari assignments.¹

There is a darker and less romantic counterpart to the researcher as aggrandizer; that is the researcher as victim. Consider the following situation one of us experienced:

Several years ago I was working as a community organizer in a poverty program based in a large urban

Part of the job was to work with black youth in the inner city. I functioned as a liaison between the teenagers and the neighborhood community action agency. I enjoyed the job and had good formal and informal communication with those with whom I worked.

After a little more than six months on the job, the director of the neighborhood agency where I was based asked me if I would be interested in doing some research for the agency. He explained that the agency's citizens council was dissatisfied with the program for neighborhood youth. This agency had put most of its resources into a recreation program for children and teenagers. This program was not attracting the older teenagers and the citizens council wanted something done about it.

The agency director's response to this was to propose a research survey that would help determine what kind of fall and winter programs would be attractive to these youth. I said I would do some thinking about the feasibility of the study and make a rough estimate of a budget. He assured me that he would find the funds for the study and implied that the bigger I could make the study the more valuable it would be to him. (The city had just received a cut in its OEO program and the competition for available funds was very stiff.)

In thinking through the decision as to whether or not a study was necessary I was fortunate in that unlike many researchers I had intimate acquaintance with the program and its recipients. From this experience it was already apparent that whether or not the agency had a good or bad recreation program had nothing to do with whether or not it was used. The real interests of these teenagers were in something else, jobs. I remember one young man putting it quite succinctly, "Man we don't need no games, we need jobs."

The agency's policy guidelines stated that it had to work with youth, they did not specify that recreation had to be the exclusive focus. The agency director's experience and interest was in recreation. He wanted to avoid developing the employment program his citizen council was pushing for. The promise
of a research study on the recreation program was a means of temporarily placating the citizens and avoiding action which he did not want to take.

My observations had convinced me that there was no need to study the recreation program but that there was a need to do a study on how to develop a youth employment program within the limitations of the current staff resources. I informed the administrator of my conclusions. He told me to forget about doing the study and to go back to community organization, since that was what I was hired to do anyway. He then secured permission from the director of research at the central office to use one of his research staff to design and conduct the recreation study. The pressure from the citizens council was relieved by hiring several of them, at $2 per hour, to do the interviewing. I went back to community organization.

What ties these illustrations together is that depending on the circumstances the same person could reflect either situation. What distinguishes between them is the source of research sponsorship. In general, the independent entrepreneur researcher receives his support from foundations or federal grants. No matter how practical the investigation it is usually identified as basic research. And, most important, the researcher expects to publish the results of his work. Public exposure is the saving grace of the independent researcher. It encourages debate on whether or not there is a culture of poverty, or the poor can delay gratification, or cultural deprivation leaves the poor children unprepared for school, or any number of similar issues. As long as free discussion continues there is always hope that over time some truths will be identified.

The researcher who works for the organization which is the subject of his examination seldom has the right to publish without permission. His work is seldom disseminated except in limited editions of mimeographed reports. While all details of conceptualization and design are the same as in basic research the goal is usually to initiate or justify programs. The hired hand must face the dilemma of knowing that the political justification of a program requires claims that no research can ever substantiate. For example, the number of theories about delinquency is equaled only by the number of programs designed to control this behavior. No theory is definitive and no program has ever been seen as an unqualified success.
Occasionally when the question of the continued value of a program becomes a matter of public debate in-house reports receive public exposure and social science is roasted for its presumptuous claims, poor methodology, and the lack of ethics by its practitioners. We question whether the problem is that simple. It is easy to be an after-the-fact moralist and philosophize about the responsible researcher's role. Who cannot be self-righteous about those who participate in empirical frauds or fail to prevent or expose any distortion of truth. We can admire the researcher who fails to cave in to inappropriate demands or sneer at those who capitulate for personal glory, profit, or sheer survival. That does not solve the problem of how to make the knowledge of social science or the skills of the researcher useful for alleviating human privation.

Social science research and the social science researcher have come to be considered key factors in the efficient functioning of many social welfare programs. Usually when the word "research" or "survey" is mentioned images of great objectivity, almost infallibility, are conjured up. All too often the researcher does little to dispel these false notions. The point here is one of honesty, not of value free objectivity. Objectivity in science means that one presents his work in such a way that another investigator can repeat it. It means, not that a person is value free, but that he identifies his value position explicitly. The world is too complex to be described totally. At any point one undertakes to describe a part of something he is making a value choice that the elements he chooses for his description are more important than those he is leaving out.

When the social survey was first used it was as an instrument for reform. Most of the early surveys were frankly arguing for a position and gave their results the widest possible circulation. In addition, the early surveys gave relatively limited attention to public opinion and devoted most of their effort to documenting social conditions which the sponsor and researcher felt needed to be changed. Today survey has come to mean something different. It is not usually conceived of as an instrument of reform but as a form of participatory democracy where opinions are solicited about likes and dislikes. Opinions became the basis for program planning, but the data on which the planning is based are seldom available.

We do not dispute the right or even the necessity of any administrator to present his agency or his program in the best possible light. There is, however, a vast difference between an administrator arguing for the program he wants and his saying "research," where he has stacked the deck, supports the need for the program. In the illustration we presented there would be little to say if the administrator had said, "I have certain program interests which I want implemented and I want you to help me do this." It doesn't even matter if he doesn't want to
look at alternatives. Any social scientist who is either a member of the agency staff or is hired to do such a job can certainly do so with a free conscience. What he should not do is present his work as a "scientific" research report. Merely using appropriate methodological tools does not make scientific research. Data does not speak for itself, even when it is collected under the most rigorous and perfect methodological circumstances. Science comes in when a basis is provided for interpreting the data and the negative as well as concurring evidence is examined.

Researchers tend to overestimate the influence of their work in policy decisions about program planning or continuation. This often deludes them as to their real function. For example, sponsors at the operating level often call in a researcher and present him with a problem that is unsolvable. If this happens, no matter what the quality of the research, the nature of the factual information gathered, or recommendations for solutions, the administrator can use the research to support the decision he had already made. More important, the complex range of information that goes into policy decisions about programs of necessity makes the data from research findings play a small role. We have not been able to identify any major program that was saved or eliminated on the basis of research findings.²

To meet the dilemmas the "applied" researcher faces it is necessary to consider research with action implications as a form of professional practice; this requires standards and review procedures. The National Academy of Sciences provides a model definition for the changing role of the researcher. They say:

The job of the social scientist is clear. He can keep track of what is happening, work at understanding the sources of conflict and resistance to change and try to determine both the intended and unintended consequences of problem solving actions. Through the analysis of specific instances, social scientists seek to illuminate the ways in which the society is working.³


In focusing on this issue we are concerned about the wider ethical issues connected with professional practice. Most of the current interest in the ethics of research has focused on protecting the rights of the client. This is only an element in the emergence of research as a form of social practice. One of the things which identifies a profession is its ability to set and maintain its own standards. Where research as social practice is concerned this effort is only in the beginning stages. Within sociology, for example, concern is expressed that the current code of ethics will restrict free inquiry. Others see it as a way of protecting professional status and position in the bureaucracy without really changing anyone's behavior. Meanwhile the movement to employ social researchers in direct service organizations grows. Foote sees this as necessary for a true social science. He says:

...the salvation of sociology lies in shifting its attention from colleagues to clients. That is not to become less professional, but at last to become professional. By concluding with a call to orient training to the intelligible, purposeful presentation of sociology to non-sociologists, we are not re-directing sociologists back to academic sociology...we are re-directing them at last to sociology.

Put in these terms one would have to ask how sociology would be distinguished from social work. Gilbert and Specht identify skill in applied research as the core of one of the two basic wings of social work.

This convergence between the interests of sociologists and social workers is highlighted by the fact that current codes of ethics do little to help the employed researcher who seeks truth while trying to meet the needs of his employer. Trela and O'Toole present both ends of the

---

4Footnotes, February, 1975, pp. 1, 16.
problem when they say the researcher, "must recognize and accept the service organization's goals and interests," and at the same time, "he must also retain his identity as a scientist and continue to subscribe fully to the norms of science." This neatly avoids the real fact that the goals of service organizations and science are usually necessary and legitimately antithetical. Our suggestion is a modest one and is based on the idea that continuing tension between organizational service goals is required if both are to be true to their aims. It is that codes of ethics should provide for independent review of the state of the art in applied research and arbitration mechanisms for specific conflicts.

Setting standards and conducting periodic reviews are not seen as a panacea. In any practice situation conditions are always changing. The job of keeping ethical standards in focus is continual. We do not want to set up review committees with dictatorial power; rather we envisage something like the procedures used by the American Association of University Professors. The AAUP is neither a militant nor a powerful organization. Its Committee on Academic Freedom probably handles only a small number of the abuses of academic freedom which occur. Being censured by the AAUP has never closed a school. Yet by its very existence it affords a measure of protection. Schools do not like to be censured by the AAUP; most of those that are eventually make some effort to get off of the list. But, because it exists many schools and many professors do alter their behavior to take its standards into account.

We believe the same advantages could accrue if a similar device existed within our professional organizations. The existence of an outside professional body to which a researcher can appeal and which makes, maintains, and disseminates standards should help reduce some of the reprehensible relationships which have grown up in operating agencies.

What is done with the information developed by any researcher involves ethical and political considerations out of his control. In administrative research the sponsor has been able to dictate all conditions. We believe that this has contributed to the crisis in confidence about whether or not developing knowledge makes a difference in solving the problems of this world. It is time for professional societies to take more responsibility for the behavior of their members and to provide them with more protection.
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