

SOCIAL WORK AND THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES: REFLECTIONS ON DEVELOPMENTS *

by HERMAN D. STEIN, D.S.W.

Dean, School of Applied Social Sciences, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio

The Growing Closeness of Social Work with Behavioral and Social Sciences

SINCE the late 1940's, social work practice and education have been in increasingly close communication with the behavioral and social sciences. The strongest impact of this renewed association has been on education and research, the net effect on practice being less even and less rapid. This is in the nature of things. It takes time for theory and research to find its way into implementation, and not all theory, however relevant, lends itself readily to practice interpretations.

There is no reversal of the trend, however, to be foreseen. While social work will never be totally applied science, drawing on philosophy and history as well, and sometimes on aesthetic and even intuitive components which are not likely ever to be pinned down, it is doubtful that we will revert to the pre-World War II situation where our field had only the vaguest connection with the behavioral and social sciences.

Nine years ago, Ernst Greenwood advanced the proposition that "the most effective method of guaranteeing maximum utilization of social sciences by social work is to undertake applied re-

search designed to convert social science laws into principles of practice and thereby to demonstrate to the social worker the utility of social science knowledge."¹ As a long range objective, I agree that research leading to the enhancement of practice principles and theory is the surest road to the integration of social science theory and social work practice. It is, however, a long road to a long-range goal. We have to travel it, and make our investments accordingly. But it is not the only direction we can take, and if we wait endlessly for research we will miss what we can use now.

The position I had taken at roughly the same time,² was that connections

¹ Ernest Greenwood, "Social Science and Social Work: A Theory", *Social Service Review*, March, 1955, p. 29.

² The author is unduly represented in this and following footnotes not because his writings are the most noteworthy, but because certain of his points of view in this paper are given fuller treatment in the cited references. The potential bibliography which the large subject under discussion could elicit would be too formidable, if tempting, to entertain. Herman D. Stein, "Social Science in Social Work Practice and Education" *Social Casework*, April, 1955. Reprinted in Howard Parad, ed. *Ego Psychology and Dynamic Casework*, FSAA, 1958. (It may be noted that of the 8 papers in *Expanding Theoretical Base of Casework* reprinted from *Social Casework*,

* Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, Los Angeles, May 31, 1964.

should and could be made immediately to existing social science materials, to concepts, theory, and research, that could impinge on practice. Whether they did or did not affect practice immediately, communication had to be built between the field of practice and the most relevant sectors of the social and behavioral sciences.

Progress in this relationship was uneven but rapid, and it was possible by 1960 to assess some of the major contributions³ and directions. At that time I tried to develop the theme that greater links to the social sciences were compelling social work to examine the meaning of "the social environment" in a much more penetrating and realistic way. The concept of the social environment in social work had been too restricted to what was accessible to immediate perception and to what was external to the individual, and was seen, in effect, in rather static terms. The interactional relationship of the individual and his social environment could be considered in various dimensions, from the point of view of what he selected and rejected in personality and consciousness from modal national values, class patterns, ethnic and cultural influences, organizational relationships, and family. Moreover, the interactions among these systems themselves were of considerable importance in attempting to understand both client and worker behavior in the various fields of practice, and one could be specific about some of the action implications.

The present discussion represents a continuation of this assessment.

The greatest continuing impact of

FSAA, 1962, six deal with behavioral and social science theory.

³ Herman D. Stein, "The Concept of the Social Environment in Social Work Practice", *Smith College Studies*, V. XXX, No. 3, 1960 Reprinted in Howard Parad, ed. *Ego-Oriented Casework*, FSAA, 1963.

the behavioral and social sciences has been on social work education. This is exemplified in the 1962 Curriculum Policy Statement⁴ of the Council on Social Work Education; the section on Human Behavior and the Social Environment, superseding the former Human Growth and Behavior, which had an over-riding psychiatric emphasis, compels attention to the social and cultural as well as the psychological and the biological, determinants of individual and group behavior. Some schools had already developed considerable emphasis on the relationship between the psychological, the socio-cultural, and the biological perspectives on individual and group behavior. The new formulation has prodded a number of other schools to try to re-cast their teaching to bring a broader point of view to their students, not only in the background courses but increasingly in the methods courses of casework, group work and community organization.

In addition, the programs of advanced education in schools of social work, aiming to enhance professional knowledge, have tended to provide a strong underpinning of relevant content from the social and behavioral sciences. Since a number of these sixteen programs of advanced education leading to doctoral degrees primarily prepare teachers and researchers, another source of emphasis on social and cultural dimensions has come into play within the field of social work education.

Comparative Relevance of Different Theory

At this point it becomes necessary to raise once more the question of what we mean by relevant content in the social and behavioral sciences. One of the difficulties of course, is that it is hard

⁴ *Curriculum Policy Statement*, 1962, Council on Social Work Education, N. Y.

to find anything that is *not* relevant. Consider for example the organization of the volume edited by Berelson and Steiner.⁵ We have, in addition to psychological material focussing on the individual the following: *sociology of*: the family; face to face relations in small groups; of organizations; of institutions including religious, economic, political, educational, military; strata (social characteristics in common) including stratification and ethnic relations; publics (focus of attention in common) including mass communications and opinions, attitudes and beliefs; the society—including social demography, social geography, social change, social conflict, social disorganization; and finally, culture.

There is virtually nothing in this listing that could not conceivably be within our range of interest, because as a total field our interest in what goes on in society is boundless. This is at one time a blessing and a disease. It is a blessing to the extent that our minds are kept open and alert, but a disease because interest too diffuse can lead to dilettantism; when one can make a case for everything, one has a case for nothing.

For social work education, the task remains picking and choosing content and keeping it tied hard to the question of what the practitioner can do with it, what possible difference such knowledge and understanding can make. Only if one is prepared to grapple with these questions is there a case for introducing such content in a professional curriculum. Moreover, as a rule nothing should be taught in a graduate curriculum that is already well taught in a good undergraduate curriculum. If a student does not already have the basic

understanding which a good undergraduate program can provide him, in for example the sociology of the family, in social stratification, and in culture, he should get it but not via the professional curriculum. The latter should build on previous learnings and bring the theoretical academic material to bear upon the problems of practice to the extent possible and the understanding of those social issues with which the profession is attempting to cope.

Naturally we have to recognize that there will be greater concern in certain practice fields with some concepts and theory than with others. All students, for example, should be able to grasp and use the essentials of stratification and culture theory. Those going on into individualized casework services may draw more heavily on learning theory; those in group services on small group theory; those in community organization on social change and power theory; those in administration on organization theory, and it need hardly be added these days that everyone will probably be exposed to role theory in relation to any subject.

A word to agencies receiving students either for field training or immediately after leaving their training in schools which have strong behavioral and social science teaching: such agencies would do well to give the novice social worker his opportunity to see what he can make of his learnings. There are times when his field instructor or new supervisor may not be fully abreast of some of the intellectual baggage with which the fledgling social worker comes into the agency. In such cases, may I suggest there is no reason for the experienced social worker to react by hitting the new worker gently over the head several times with the club of indifference in order to get him back into a traditional mold. If indeed the supervisor and other seasoned colleagues are not aware of

⁵ Bernard Berelson and Gary Steiner, eds. *An Inventory of Scientific Findings in Human Behavior*, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc. New York, 1964.

what the new worker brings to his work in these additional learnings, their option is to find out, or at least to provide an atmosphere of support and encouragement so that he can see what use he might make of his education within the framework of agency possibilities. Several schools have made it possible for interested field instructors and other personnel to learn in this area the same content that the student gets and to test it out from the vantage point of their more enriched practice experience, and there are many experienced social workers who are thoroughly aware of the behavioral and social science components for their school or self-education, or, in rare cases, agency or the service training.

For the caseworker the basic knowledge and experience in casework helping process will remain fundamental. No traditional learnings will have to be thrown out. If in a particular agency there is little interest in content in the social sciences, or in the application of such concepts in research or in practice, and if a new worker comes with the hope of doing something with his additional perspectives, one can frankly say, "we're not up on all this but let's see what you can make of it". It has not been unknown in the professions to have the experienced old timers learn a few things from their newly trained apprentices. They need not fear, the new ones will become old timers soon enough and have their own concerns to deal with when another crop of fresh looking young workers acquainted with recent content and vocabulary trots into the agency. This phenomenon is by no means confined to behavioral and social science material.

What are the major sources of knowledge in the behavioral social sciences of greatest relevance to social work practice and education today? They may be grouped within theories of: learning,

role, stratification, culture, deviance, organization, social change, and power. Since the literature and research in all of these areas is vast, none of these will be presented in any detail in this paper, the observations ranging from fleeting to brief, and it is only certain connections with social work that I will emphasize.

I will not, for example, deal with developments in learning theory other than to note that cognitive theory is superseding the stimulus-response school. In the latter there is more accent on "negative drives," that is, doing certain things in order to avoid discomfort or tension states. The cognitive theorists put more emphasis on positive goal-seeking drives such as exploration, curiosity, and achievement of competence. Learning theorists of this school are interested in clinical problems and see the therapeutic role with neurotics, for example, as providing experiences where the patient can unlearn and re-learn. There is no basic opposition to psycho-analytic theory but rather an effort from their point of view to make such theory more operational. It is a school of thought and research that will very likely be having more impact on clinical processes in the future than it has to-date.⁶

Role Theory

Role theory, by contrast, has hit social work writing and education hard these last four or five years. Some of this emphasis has been all to the good, some has been, I'm afraid, rather unenlightening. The major utility of role theory is that it compels questions about the interactional aspects of the client's behavior

⁶ I am indebted to Dr. James Bieri for his views on this subject, see f.n. (8). Cognitive learning theory is becoming more prominent in Culture and Personality Theory, as viz: "The New Culture and Personality," by Anthony F. C. Wallace, in *Anthropology and Human Behavior*, Anthropological Society of Washington, Washington, D. C. 1962.

so that one can better define the crucial interpersonal relationships in an individual's many roles and perceive role strains of which an individual may not be aware. The most important point to keep in mind is that the concept of social role refers to social interaction, to a role system with one or more partners. It is not an intrapsychic concept, nor is it a substitute for other ways of viewing reality or for psychodynamic theory. On the whole, role theory is still in the process of adaptation and assimilation to practice needs, particularly in casework and group work, and cannot be swallowed in bulk. We have, however, become increasingly sensitized to the nature and variety of role strains, such as role conflict, role incongruity, role inadequacy, and role discontinuity. Role conflict generally refers to a situation where the individual occupies two roles whose demands are incompatible and cannot be successfully achieved at the same time. In role incongruity the individual's perception of his role is different from that of others in the role system. In role inadequacy the individual simply does not know how to fulfill the role. The problem here may not be emotional but require cognitive learning. In role discontinuity the individual is prepared to fulfill his role along certain lines, but when he comes to the role itself he finds that the demands are quite different than what he had been prepared to fulfill. The work of a number of people, such as Dr. John Spiegel⁷ in the utilization and expansion of role theory in treatment situations has been of particular interest to casework practitioners.

It should be borne in mind, however, that an understanding of social role

⁷ John Spiegel, M.D., "The Reduction of Role Conflict Within the Family", in *A Modern Introduction to the Family*, edited by Norman W. Bell and Ezra F. Vogel, Free Press, 1960. Also, see f.n. (8).

concepts is not relevant to caseworkers alone. All social workers who deal not only in direct helping situations, but indirectly through other groups should be highly sensitized to role problems. This includes for example, the executive himself who needs an understanding not only of his own role and the strains on it, but also of others within the organization. As agencies become larger and more complex, problems of role clarity assume greater importance.

It should also be noted that deviant behavior is increasingly becoming seen as a social role, with an emphasis on the milieu that provides the learning environment for the role, as Prof. Richard A. Cloward has noted.⁸ Thus, one can in part explain why certain forms of delinquency are more prevalent in certain neighborhoods than in others. It is the milieu which provides the learning cues and support for the emergence and persistence of particular forms of deviant behavior. For example, the Jewish milieu does not generally support alcoholism, as the Irish does, but the Jewish milieu supports neurosis as a deviant adaptation. A socio-cultural view of deviance, seeing it in social role terms, does not provide total explanations, and certainly not in individual terms, but the perspective is essential both for clinical and community process objectives. The social sources of deviance will occupy more of our attention

⁸ *The Relation of Social Science Theory and Research to the Teaching of Social Work Practice*, Report of a Faculty Seminar 1959-1962 at the Columbia Univ. School of Social Work, chaired and ed. by Herman D. Stein (to be published). Certain substantive observations in this paper are drawn partly from Prof. Richard A. Cloward's contribution on deviance and on social stratification to the seminar. The volume includes an extensive discussion on learning theory by Prof. James Bierl, on role theory by H. D. Stein and Dr. John Spiegel, and comments in this paper reflect certain of the major themes in these and other sections.

as social work becomes more aggressively concerned with coping with the problems of deviant solutions to life problems on a broader community base, as well as through services to individuals.

Stratification

Stratification theory is of immense importance to our understanding not only of individual and group behavior, but also to the analysis of social problems and what to do about them. We have come to recognize some of the essential components of ranking systems in our society, and we are becoming more aware of the ways in which these systems are maintained, and the consequences. The dimensions of power, of status (that is honorific position) and social class (whether from the point of view of socio-economic position or life style and values) are generally accepted as being incorporated in a rank. One view of social class, the "objectivist" view, is receiving more emphasis than it has in the past, although the "subjectivist view" remains still dominant. The objectivist view holds that the way in which people live their lives, their values, the people they associate with, and so forth, depend on their social and economic position, on their occupation, income and housing for example. Therefore, the objectivists will group people into a rank according to such criteria as occupation, income and housing. The subjectivist view tends to see the life-style and values of people as paramount, irrespective of their socio-economic position and therefore will group together all those with a similar orientation to life. For the practitioner rather than for the researcher, both points of view are important. That is, he must ask himself the two types of questions: Where is this person, or these people, located in our social structure with respect to occupation, income and housing, and with what consequences on

their way of life; and secondly, what is the way of life—the values, the mobility aspirations, the associations that this person or these people share with others and what is the relationship of their behavior and life expectations to the realities of their social and economic position?⁹

The impact of stratification theory and research is still to be fully felt in our field, but there is no segment of the mental health field that has not been either directly or indirectly affected by the Hollingshead and Redlich study of *Social Class and Mental Illness*,¹⁰ which underscored the nature and the sources of discrimination to which the poor are subject in receiving psychiatric care. One such source was the policy that was discovered of screening out those individuals from therapeutic clinic service who were thought to be "less amenable" to therapy and most of these turned out to be from lower socio-economic positions. This very definition of amenability has been biased against the lower class patient. Factors such as verbal facility, educational level, motivation for treatment are used as clinicians select those patients who are expected to be "better patients". Such considerations regarding psychiatric service have led to a much more careful look at casework agencies themselves. Such a look has revealed, for example, that voluntary casework agencies apparently have been showing in the past two decades a steady attenuation of services to the poor and a rising proportion of services to middle-income groups.

Riessman¹¹ has pointed out that most

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Hollingshead, August and Redlich, *Social Class and Mental Illness*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1958.

¹¹ Richard A. Cloward and Irwin Epstein, "Private Social Welfare's Disengagement from the Poor: The Case of Family Adjustment Agencies" to be published by NIMH in a book edited by Frank Riessman.

of the clinician's diagnostic tools whether in the cognitive sphere, such as intelligence tests, or the emotional sphere, tend to be class-linked and class-biased. He points out that even identical Rorschach records have been interpreted quite differently with lower class patients consistently found more mal-adjusted than those of a higher class position despite similar personality profiles.

A number of recommendations regarding the intake and diagnosis in therapeutic settings of all kinds have emerged from the exploration to-date of the needs and the life style of lower income patients to the extent that one can generalize about such patients. For example the importance has been noted of telescoping initial interviews with low income blue collar or lower class patients, of making the intake process as rapid as possible and starting therapeutic procedures as quickly as possible, rather than engaging in extensive exploration or gathering of life history data. Diagnostically the caution has been advanced against characterizing such patients too quickly as showing conflict, acting-out, showing lack of values, lack of guilt, or lack of verbal facility. Such judgments when directed at lower-class patients should be arrived at with great care because they can be too easily utilized from a perspective of middle-class standards and categories.

Furthermore, the role of the therapist vis-à-vis the lower-class patient needs to become considerably more flexible. It is important to overcome the impersonality in the therapist's or the caseworker's role, of being willing to give not only immediate service but specific advice whenever this is possible. Riessman and others have pointed out that when combined with informal friendliness a helping role that includes directive authority can readily be acceptable to lower income clientele. He notes the

ease with which such clientele can take advantage of role playing and the importance of giving consideration to all types of auxiliary physical treatment.¹²

Moreover, despite the fact that to begin with a lower-class patient may not be very happy to consider therapy that leads to insight, should this become really necessary he can be prepared for the traditional patient role, and this preparation itself needs rather careful consideration.

The low-income or lower-class individual tends to be suspicious of the psychotherapist. Unlike the traditional doctor or the minister, the psychiatrist or the caseworker has to validate himself before he is completely accepted. What is most important is to realize that "in contrast to the goals of insight and self-development in middle-class psychotherapy, the low-income patient hopes for visible, complete, specific behavioral change and symptom reduction."¹³ His concept of health is freedom from symptoms, not a generalized happiness, productivity on his job or overall "self-fulfillment".

If increased awareness of stratification is leading us to new kinds of approaches with lower-class people in traditional casework settings, it is leading us as well to much greater awareness of our responsibilities in other areas. For one thing, it has become imperative that we recognize our responsibilities to lower-income people not only because there is now a new wave of interest in poverty, but because for some years now it has been repeatedly noted that the people who really need the service most rarely

¹² Frank Riessman, unpublished manuscript on psychotherapeutic treatment models for low-income patients.

¹³ *New Approaches to Mental Health Treatment for Labor and Low Income Groups*. Report No. 1, National Institute of Labor Education, Mental Health Program, 1964. Also, Berta, Fantl, "Casework in Lower Class Districts", *Mental Hygiene*, July, 1961.

see the inside of a traditional casework setting in which there are professionally trained workers. They not only have emotional problems—they are poor as well, as the Midtown Manhattan study of mental illness has pointed out. They don't tend to come, they don't want to come, and if they wind up in public agencies the likelihood of their receiving any intensive casework service, even if they need it, is very dim. New helping roles, including going out to the community, offering help on their terms and not on ours is necessary. This may mean locating referral and emergency service units within slum areas, not holding to traditional agency hours, getting to know the neighborhood by being on the street, visiting dwellings and interacting in a much less formal way. Traditional safeguards to professional discipline in the maintenance of professional distance between worker and client require re-examination, as we truly begin to comprehend the differences in life style and values, and the suspicion that is very natural to people in these walks of life to anybody who represents formal authority. It may be far more professional to be a little less "professional"; to know what one is doing and to retain one's identity, but not to fear the physical nudging and pat on the back, the walk down the street rather than the caseworker's office as a setting for contact, the "sitting around" someone's home without having to use every minute in official therapeutic process. There is a great deal to be done here that is exciting and of great consequence as we begin anew really to know the life of the poor.

If I may return to the social work educational situation for a moment, it is too often possible for a student social worker to come from a middle-class background into a school of social work, see no one but middle-class clientele in high standard agencies, and then go to

work in another high quality agency with predominant emphasis on middle-income clients or low-income clients with middle-class orientations. I'm afraid that for many of our social workers the community definition of our being protectors of the poor and knowing the poor gives us too much credit.

As we move into assumption of responsibility in federal poverty programs, we are going to be having to ask ourselves pointedly, whether as a profession we really can speak for the poor, whether it is the most or the least professionally trained among us who have the most contact with the poor, whether indeed we are assuming a wisdom that is not ours.

Stratification theory is of course of immense importance to those in group services and in community organization and community work generally. The very way in which an agency structures its services can determine what kind of person will want to utilize its resources, and if a community center is set up to serve the most acceptable values of decorum, high intellectual ambitions, high mobility aspirations, and the most refined ways of life, it will attract those who want to take advantage of such facilities. It will also screen out those who would feel it is not for them, and the community center and its staff may never even know who it is they are not serving. There remains, of course, the problem in those community centers or settlement houses where the professional staff do not come from the same class position as many of their clientele, and where value positions may be assumed by the professional staff without their being aware of it, that is the assumption that their own values about success and what is important in life are better or more related to the interests and needs of clientele than their own. It is not that the reverse is true, but that where there is a genuine difference in value orienta-

tions the decision for the group work staff of where to move should be made rationally and not taken for granted. Some of these decisions moreover, could very well be in the direction of helping lower-class clientele live up to their own patterns. They may not want to behave as "a good group". Their own definition of leadership may be quite important, there is not only one kind of leadership; their recreational interests may not be that which is deemed best for them by the group worker. The goals of providing opportunity to be exposed to stimuli that will provide growth remain important goals, but the ways of achieving them may be different in terms of social class.

In community work we have become more sophisticated in our understanding of different patterns of participation that we might expect based on class position. Naturally, these are generalizations. It does not necessarily hold, for example, that no lower-class individual prefers to take any formal leadership position in a community group. There has been enough study, however, to indicate that the way in which one approaches organization in lower-income and lower-class areas of our population is not the same as the approach used with middle- and upper-class populations. The incentives are different, the modes of interaction are different, the patterns of organization are different.

Culture

The importance of an understanding of culture in ethnic, racial, religious or other minority group terms, hardly requires additional emphasis in today's world. The fact is, however, that we are still not making the use that we should, of the relevant and available knowledge that has been accumulating about such groupings or communities in the United States. The time is long since past when

any agency, in any field of work, should as an agency be unaware of the best knowledge that is available about the groups and the population which it serves. It is an anachronism today to have a substantial investment in in-service training in clinical process in diagnosis and in therapy, in both casework and group work agencies, without a comparable investment in understanding of the social and cultural dimensions of the population being served. Somehow, in this part of the social and cultural field, we are under the curious illusion that everybody is an expert.

We are not experts, often not even experts in the very population groups from which we ourselves come, because we cannot see ourselves objectively or we may be seeing the ethnic dimension broadly, but without reference to sub-groupings, for example in relation to class. It is not only in order to be able to understand client attitudes as these affect the perception of the agency, to understand the perception of the worker, the way in which the problem itself is introduced in casework agencies, modes of participation that might be expected in group-serving agencies, and patterns of power and interaction that may be indigenous in community organization. It is not only for those reasons, but also in order better to comprehend the assumptions, the stereotypes if you will, which we ourselves as social workers may have, that knowledge of the group culture is important.

It requires as much self-discipline in cultural terms as it does in psychological terms to be a social worker, so as not to becloud the service we are giving or the objectives of our service by hidden value assumptions which we have. None of us perhaps can be rightly accused of rank prejudice, but we have learned that stereotypy is endemic, and may, when turned into attitudes leading to behav-

ior, result unwittingly in prejudice. Not only in the course of our social work education but also in the course of agency practice and development, a recognition of one's own value preconceptions in relation to those that may be expected to be held by our many client groups should be emphasized and re-emphasized. We need understanding in cultural terms of family structure, of the way in which mobility drives are expressed, of the kinds of people who are significant in the lives of the people we serve, other than ourselves, of the image of success and of the kinds of emphasis in child-rearing and so forth. It is not a new cultural relativism that we are after, but when there is a conflict in values between ourselves and our clients, and if we try to influence clientele to adopt our own, we should be making this kind of decision consciously and judiciously, so it becomes a rational judgment and not a non-rational automatic assumption. Moreover, we may find that it is not at all advisable to make this decision, that it may be very much to the advantage of our own helping efforts not to interfere with the underlying values of clientele in given situations even if these values differ from our own.

Organizational Theory

The larger social agencies, both public and voluntary, have followed the major traditions in public administration in organization and management orientation. Attention has therefore been focussed on such basic elements as tables of organization, span of control and definition of job roles, and to efficiency criteria for productivity (which has more recently come into play in voluntary service agencies).

During the past decade interest has been intensified in the study of administration from the vantage point of or-

ganizational behavior theory. The major emphases have included a stress on the non-rational (not irrational) aspects of organization and administration, with those elements not quite as visible to the naked eye as those normally included within the public administration context. Thus, there is concern with informal organization as well as formal, and the relationship between the two—formal organization consisting of everything official in the organization, from job description to policy manuals and informal organization consisting of everything else, including the way people feel about one another. The understandings of informal organization have led to increased awareness of factors bearing on morale, on productivity, and on behavior in organization generally.¹⁴

We have in addition become more sensitized to the nature of complex organization or bureaucratic theory, particularly the inherent tendencies to strains in the form of ritualism, over-conformity, de-personalization of both consumer and employee, resistance to change, and undue organizational self-protectiveness. By the same token, interest has been aroused in reducing or preventing these strains, and seeing how the inherent advantages consistent with bureaucratic structure can be maintained—e.g., efficiency, stability, and objectivity of policy and procedures. The approach of organizational behavior analysis, when wedded to more traditional management science, and applied to the problems of social work agencies, large and small, hold considerable promise for the develop-

¹⁴ Herman D. Stein, "Organization Theory and Implication for Administration Research" in Kogan, Leonard, ed., *Social Science Theory and Social Work Research*, NASW, 1960. Peter M. Blau, *Bureaucracy in Modern Society*, Random House, N. Y., 1956. Herman D. Stein, "Administrative Implications of Bureaucratic Theory" *Social Work*, Vol. 6, No. 3, July, 1961.

ment of greater knowledge and competence in administrative practice itself, aside from its merits for the scientific study of organizations.

We are, moreover, beginning to learn more about the need for, as well as the processes of organizational change, looking primarily to the interests of the clientele to be served and examining whether the organizational arrangements are best suited to make this possible. The definition of organizational ends in social welfare has itself become a problem meriting greater scrutiny. A good deal has been taken for granted in this connection, for we have tended to define organizational ends in large public relations terms, e.g. "serving families in trouble." Such formulations have their merit for certain public information purposes but cannot be used for any hard-headed evaluation of the extent to which an agency is meeting its goals. For the most part, it is very difficult to say that any agency is not "doing good," which is another way of saying that it is impossible to say that it is "not doing well." Organizational objectives require definition in more operational terms if goal effectiveness is to be evaluated with any meaning. When the population to be served by an agency is pinned down, for example, by demographic criteria, when the range of need which the agency is designed to meet is specified and the proportion of the population potentially in need of agency service estimated, when client population targets are set for a given number of years and the kind and quality of service to be rendered better identified in ways that are measurable, it will become more possible to tell "how we are doing". That there are severe problems in arriving at such formulations and making them official goes without saying, but they should be worked on.

In this connection, one may note the

distinctions presented by Etzioni¹⁵ in the research models of studying organizational effectiveness, that between goal analysis and systems analysis. In goal analysis, one tries to determine whether the official goals of the organization are being achieved; the answers are often strongly tinged with skepticism and reservations. In systems analysis, the research effort is directed to very limited goals, and attention is given to whether these limited ends are effectively and efficiently reached, without concern about global organizational ends. For example, it is one problem to study whether a prison achieves "rehabilitation," a global end; another to study whether there is human management of inmates, a more limited objective, but in Etzioni's view, the kind of analysis worth pursuing. I have tried to make the point elsewhere that in social welfare organizations, while systems analysis is most valuable, we still need goal analysis, since we have not yet reached the point even of experiencing its limitations.¹⁶

An understanding of developing organizational and administrative theory suggests not only sources of principle and practice but research needs such as the following: (a) to develop means for gauging the effectiveness of agency service, which in turn requires, as noted, definitions of agency objectives, in terms which can be objectively assessed; (b) to develop means for determining acceptable standards of quality of service in relation to productivity for those agencies which render direct service; (c) to develop comparative

¹⁵ Amitai Etzioni, "Two Approaches to Organizational Analysis," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Sept. 1960.

¹⁶ Herman D. Stein, "The Study of Organizational Effectiveness" in *Research in Social Welfare Administration* ed. by David Fanshel, NASW, 1962, (Observations on Etzioni's Approach).

studies of agency organization in order to evaluate the consequences of different structures and administrative patterns.

Power

The term "power structure" has come into the popular vocabulary, along with "serendipity". As usually employed in popular context, it refers to the top of a presumed power pyramid. That the structure of power in a community can be seen in pyramidal terms has been cogently presented in Floyd Hunter's study on *Community Power Structure*,¹⁷ which also emphasized that all policy-makers are men of power, but not all men of power are policy-makers. There are, however, several pyramids even in Hunter's view, and both the distribution and use of power are somewhat more complex than we had tended to perceive them. Not all men of power, for example, "play the game" (in game theory language) with respect to all issues, so that identifying "high power" or "high prestige" people does not necessarily identify those who can or would use power with respect to given areas of decision.

For our present purposes, perhaps the most significant development in recent years has been the recognition of latent power, becoming increasingly manifest, in lower-class groups. We have become aware of the importance in community decision-making of genuine participation by low-income groups, and not necessarily relying on spokesmen from even labor organizations to represent such groups in every case. There is a possible lesson here for the chest and council organizations, both non-sectarian and sectarian, in re-examining their long preoccupation with better coordination of what exists, and operating al-

most exclusively via representation from formal organizations.

The importance for community work of lower-income groups who are not accustomed to participating in formal organizations is becoming increasingly clear. Both the theory and the practice of developments such as Mobilization for Youth in New York and Community Progress, Inc. in New Haven and similar programs in other cities have provided evidence not only that there are actual and potential power groupings within lower-class strata of society, but that our means for locating leadership and potential power centers should not be confined to a search via formal structures. It is the informal organizational structure within lower-class society, and not only the formal, which requires study to locate valid representation. Existing organizations looking for true communication to and from lower-income population groups may have to engage in a different kind of search, and community organization efforts with such groups may increasingly be directed to making latent leadership more visible and active. Indeed, the implications for community organization have become sharpened. The issue is becoming increasingly acute of the posture to be maintained, or the balance to be struck, in the community worker's role in such fields, between the extremes of exercising active autonomous authority in stimulating greater assumption of power in such groups and of being a technical resource of the more passive "enabling" variety. We are, of course, dealing here not only with community decision-making processes¹⁸

¹⁷ Floyd Hunter, *Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers*, Univ. of No. Carolina Press, 1953.

¹⁸ A number of relevant readings are included in: Bennis, Warren G.; Benne, Kenneth D.; Chin, Robert, eds. *The Planning of Change*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961. Also: Rossi, Peter H. "Community Decision-Making," in *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 4, March, 1957. Also: Herman D. Stein, "Im-

