

the first year is the real governing board. The full board must meet no less than three times a year. Each previous board continues to operate as a so-called functional committee, one on family welfare and relief, one on child care and adoption, one on problems of boys, one on girls, and the fifth on the problems of the foreign born. This also was a compromise for the first year. Changes are definitely planned in the direction of a redistribution of these memberships in order to broaden the knowledge of each to include an awareness of the problems of the others. As it is, it has already been possible by the present arrangement to educate these committees by the presentation of material illustrative of the fact that problems are common to all. Matters of policy and legislation falling within each sphere are first brought to the appropriate committee for discussion and recommendation, and to the executive committee for final action. While it presents the aspect of a seven-ring circus it does present an unusual opportunity for keeping a large number acquainted with what is going on. Other means, such as a bulletin gotten out by a staff committee, also are employed.

An analysis of the problems affecting the members of all families in the case load was used to show each committee how its responsibilities, instead of being narrowed by the merger, have in effect been considerably broadened. For example, on December 31, 1936, when the existence of the boys' agency and the girls' agency as separate units terminated, each had between fifty and sixty cases open. The analysis of the combined case load, however, showed that there were nearly 200 cases in which there were problems of boys and a similar number of cases of girls calling for service. In other words, as we all know, and which fact

was used in arguing the validity of the merger, the family agency was dealing with more children's problems than the children's agencies themselves.

By keeping the case load down it is expected that attention to the problem of the child will not be diluted but rather intensified on account of the merger. If the family agency may be accused of inattention to the problems of the child, so may the children's agencies be equally deficient in their concentration on the adult. A one-sided approach on either count is not to be defended, and it is a prime purpose of the consolidation to afford a well-balanced and well-rounded program of attention to all factors in the family situation, no one of which can be focused upon without neglecting the other and without a biased, lopsided and inadequate result. Whatever may be the client's needs, he has, above all, the need of being regarded as a whole man, the product of a complex of concurrently interacting forces of heredity and environment. A myopic approach to a seeming special need, which tends to disregard his general situation and his position as a member of a family and general community group, may be both unrealistic and unscientific.

The general problems involved in such a merger are always complicated by others unique to the particular community in which it is being worked out, and that is certainly true in Pittsburgh. However, it is an interesting and stimulating job—one, if successfully managed, that should certainly point the way to others who are thinking of doing the same thing. If specialized agencies have any professional validity at all in the case work field, it is because they are consciously experimenting with different groups and methods, with a view to making the results of their experiments available to us all.

THE ROLE OF THE FAMILY AGENCY IN A COORDINATED CASE WORK PROGRAM

By FRIEDA ROMALIS

Jewish Social Service Bureau, St. Louis, Mo.

ANY discussion of the merging of case work services must consider the reiteration of the generic nature of case work. It should be emphasized again, what has so often been said before, that the techniques, and the methods and the group served by the family agency are no different than those of any other case work agency. What is perhaps different is their program—their function. A rather cursory survey of the available literature, and a personal view of several years of family agency experience, make me doubt seriously whether that function is changing sufficiently to warrant this paper.

Several reports that have been made, both of Jewish and non-sectarian agencies, have brought out very strikingly that the private family agency has the same program now that was articulated as long as fifty or sixty years ago. The Smith College Study published in December 1935, which is concerned with eight agencies, amongst them at least two which have been extremely articulate on their "new" emphasis, summarizes its findings in part as follows:

"In general, it seemed likely that the family agencies in 1934 had as clients people from much the same social level as before the depression (although most of them were poorer now), that they were sought for much the same sorts of service, and that the assistance they gave touched much the same problem areas . . . Except for the relief aspect of the work, it could almost be said that the family agencies were carrying on their accustomed function. The popular con-

ception of the family agency's function is not wholly wrong, then. What is more nearly new in family case work and what the public probably does not clearly understand is the case worker's attitude and method of approach to family problems and her recognition that often more than money is needed to effect an adjustment."

What, then, is this traditional function which has continued with so little change? According to the statement accepted by the Jewish family agencies at the Philadelphia Assembly, "The main body of their work was and is with the rehabilitation of families and individuals. Their method was and is case work. At the same time, their participation in the general community program, as it relates to the public welfare, has been traditional. They have recognized their responsibility to bear witness out of their experience on proposals for social legislation and other public welfare action. When the depression created a need immeasurably beyond any they had met, they realized that nothing less than public, tax-supported measures could cope with this need in Jewish as in other families; and so they were active in the agitation for the creation of such public relief."

In this paragraph is indicated the most decided change in the Jewish family agency program, namely: the fact that it is no longer the source of relief for the whole Jewish group, and that in this respect it has assumed a supplementary relationship to the public relief program. It would seem unnecessary at this time to discuss this point any longer, but from

the perhaps prejudiced point of view of a staff member of a Jewish family agency, this fact unfortunately must be restated. Not the clientele, nor the supporting group as represented by the Federation, nor the community as a whole, have anything but an intellectual acceptance of the reality that the Jewish community (as represented by the family agency) cannot step in and take care of the clientele every time that the public relief program fails. Until the community accepts this fact emotionally as well as intellectually (you will pardon this excursion into jargon) the social work program of the Jewish Federation, whether in a generic case work agency or in differentiated ones, will suffer. As the Philadelphia statement says: "These agencies which have tried to meet such gaps have found that their own work has been jeopardized."

But whether their constituencies have accepted it or not, the family agencies have had to modify their intake policies to meet the situation. And, thus, in general, again quoting from the Philadelphia statement, this is "What the Agencies Do."

"By helping people in time, in the early stages of their troubles, by sustaining them through periods of stress; by helping them to understand their difficulties and ways in which these can be met; by providing access to resources—both financial and other—when help from the outside is needed; and by intensive treatment of behavior, the agencies work: to prevent the break-up of homes; to prevent mental and physical breakdown; to prevent delinquency; to prevent deterioration through chronic dependency; and to assist those who have sunk too deep in the morass of misfortunes to regain a firm footing in life."

And to carry out this program, the statement goes on to say, there must be "money to provide skilled service for all the families helped; money for relief to those families who need financial assistance in addition to other services."

This program, again, is not a new one. It assumes that the relief given is incidental to the other services which the agency renders; and that in order to render these services, a high order of skill is necessary; that, furthermore, the agency must have discretion to select those situations which would benefit by the available skills. These two emphases, specialized skills and selectivity, which are really parts of the same thing, are changing emphases in function. Looking back to a period when the family agency was just beginning to question whether a case might ever be closed because it was "chronic" or "untreatable"—or still again, to the period when the family agency had to accept every situation in which relief was necessary despite the fact that case work had failed to accomplish anything—it is refreshing to be in a position to refuse situations just as other case work agencies do.

I suppose nothing has been more discussed in current family welfare programs than their intake policies and criteria for treatability. Much has been said about the agency's accepting for service only such individuals as recognize their problems and want service. I have no wish to quarrel with those who say there has been a requirement that the client actually articulate his own problem. It may be so—I don't know. The agencies with which I have some acquaintance, and those that have either made self-studies or submitted to studies made by others, would seem to indicate that their intake depends on other factors

than the client's clear statement that he has a problem. Acceptance of a situation for study depends rather on these factors: Any family agency that makes any claims to being a really selective agency, now, has done some self-analysis, in terms of community and agency resources, and knows what it has to offer to its clientele. No longer does it accept any situation that comes to it—now it knows that its case workers have a certain amount of skill, which can be applied, in a greater or lesser degree, to only certain types of situations. And it decides, not on the basis of whether the problem is that of an unmarried mother or a domestic difficulty or a behavior problem, but rather on the basis of what our own or other agencies' past contact has been with the individuals involved, on what types of attitudes and reactions have been built up, etc. And again, the really selective family agency no longer depends entirely on what psychiatric facilities are available to which it may refer its problem clients, but also on what facilities are available for teaching and consultation of its staffs. And, of course, it establishes treatability in terms of how capable its own workers are of rendering treatment.

It is the application of these skills that makes for what the Smith College Study said was "more nearly new in family case work"—"the case worker's attitude and method of approach to family problems and her recognition that often more than money is needed to effect an adjustment."

Certainly, one of the important changes in case work as practiced by the family agency has been the discovery of the individual. Families are no longer units to us, but are groups of individuals with very different personalities and reactions and interactions. In the nature of things,

this discovery of the individual in the family agency has been more important than the same discovery in the children's or psychiatric agency, for instance.

Since money is still essential for what we call normal family life, a large area of the family agency activity touches very closely on the public welfare program of the community.

In some agencies, there seems to have been a tendency to overemphasize the cooperative relationship of the private and the public agencies, to the extent that the private agency has no program other than the supplementary one for the relief clients of the public relief agency. While this is obviously bad planning, nevertheless, the relationship to the public relief agency or agencies is an important aspect of community planning. A direct relationship of either a supplementary service, or a supplementary relief nature, has been worked out in one form or another in most communities. So long as the Jewish community continues to regard the total Jewish problem as its responsibility, it is important that there should be some type of cooperative program. Even in our community, where the public agency has totally rejected a supplementary relief program and has been at least reluctant to accept supplementary service, we have had instances which show that the private agency can render a preventive service by being called into a situation early enough to prevent the complete break-up of a family, with the resultant calling-in of specialized services such as children's or old age agencies. The traditional primary responsibility of the Jewish family agency for basic needs of the group, and the historical influence of the Jewish family agency on the development of public relief programs, seems to indicate that a close working re-

lationship to the public relief agency will and probably should continue.

The role of the family agency as the community case working agency has been a difficult one to give up—and as much because of community pressures as because of vested interests. This has perhaps been particularly true of the Jewish family welfare society. As I have already indicated, the Jewish community has continued to feel actively responsible for the total Jewish dependency problem, with consequent interruptions of what the family agency was beginning to hope was a consistent service program. I suppose that so long as this attitude continues—and I am not at all certain that I would be willing to have it entirely discontinued—the Jewish family agency will continue to have interruptions. Shall I say, also, it will continue to be forced to face the realities of insecure, impermanent and insufficient public relief programs? It is largely in its relation to the public relief agency that the family agency has become conscious of a need for interpretation of its functions and has acquired a certain amount of articulateness. Again, this is not particularly a family agency function, but it is a comparatively new one for it, and it has become a sufficiently recognized activity to warrant inclusion in a catalog of family agency functions.

There are certain other ways in which the family agency continues to be the community case work agency:

In most communities the family agency covers a broader front than most other case work agencies in that it gives investigatory service to local agencies (such as group work, scholarship agencies, convalescent or institutional homes) and to national and international organizations. While this may be in part a throw-back to the days when everything that belonged

nowhere else was referred to the family organization, nevertheless these contacts have helped to make the family agency more widely known to the community, and may possibly have helped to coordinate or integrate Federation activity. And in a few communities, of course, the family agency has acted as a coordinating agent in such specialized fields as programs of community care for the aged. None of the foregoing is new, as I warned you, nor are the specialized services which are being developed by family agencies new. I need only name economic services (especially self-support projects, loan facilities, business advisory services), vocational guidance, visiting housekeeper services or home economics departments to prove they are not new. What is new, I must again repeat, is the case workers' understanding and approach to problems—and that is not peculiar to the family agency.

What, then, will be the place of the family agency in a merged case work service? As you know, an experiment is at present going on in St. Louis in an integrated case work service between the St. Louis Provident Association (the family agency) and the Children's Aid Society. A report of the first year of the experiment, just completed, was presented at a meeting of the Boards, staffs and invited guests of the two agencies, and speeches were made. I remember particularly one thing that the President of the Children's Aid Society said—that his Board has acquired "knowledge of the broad social welfare program of the community" through close contact with the family society program. And since this particular children's agency is one which through its entire twenty-seven years of existence has been particularly active in promoting good programs both in the private and

the public fields, this statement seems very significant. Maybe that is what the family agency can particularly contribute to the generic case work organization: a knowledge of the broad social welfare program of the community. The printed report emphasizes the generic nature of case work. It says: "We feel all social service embraces identical aims for the establishment of personal integrity and the preservation of the fullest functioning of family life." The first step in the integration of the service program was the establishment of a joint intake service by diverting all applications made to the Children's Aid Society, or the central office of the Provident Association, to the district offices of the latter agency. A next step was the taking over, as a joint function of the two agencies, the service to motherless families formerly maintained by the Children's Aid Society. The part of the report which evaluates the experiment is called "Qualitative Aspects," and reads as follows:

"Although our original purpose has not by any means been completely achieved, enough has been done to see the broad outlines of a new pattern for the organization of voluntary case work services. Without listing any of the advantages and disadvantages, and still viewing each agency as a separate enterprise, we see certain worthwhile developments.

"There has been enrichment of the point of view of the family agency's staff expressed in an increased awareness of issues involved in the foster care of children. Within the children's agency, we see an appreciation of the possibilities of work with families which have been previously regarded as hopeless. The experience of the year, by showing both groups examples of qualitative work with adults and children, has indicated the possibili-

ties of a more productive division of labor between workers with families and workers with children, which might not otherwise have been attained until many years later.

"Besides the improved service to both families and children, which the plan seems to be making possible, the other outstanding fact is the progressive enrichment and diversification of the services of the Provident Association district offices, which in part has grown out of the identification of the office with both family and children's services. Availability of diverse resources under single administrative direction permits uninterrupted, continuous planning and a greater degree of flexibility in choice of treatment resources and methods in accordance with the needs of the situation."

And under "What Next," the report first indicates certain contemplated administrative changes, and then says:

"The integration of services thus far achieved has shown us that, within the limitations of funds and capacities of the personnel, it is desirable for the districts to continue to provide as fully generalized a case work service as distinguished from more strictly defined specific services. The district office should more and more become identified as the voluntary social agency of the neighborhood, adapting its program to the social case work needs of the particular area, rather than merely being a branch office of a city-wide agency, taking its program from one fairly rigidly defined at Central Office."

In these "next steps" outlined for the districts of the St. Louis Provident Association, integrated with the Children's Aid Society, are indications of what may happen to the family agency as it becomes integrated into a community agency. With an ancient tradition of community respon-

sibility, which resulted frequently in the development of new agencies and services as the need for them became apparent, the family agency should be ready, and in many quarters is showing it is ready, to go into the community to study and experiment and meet needs. Added to that is the more recently acquired skill in self-analysis and evaluation which should prevent rigidity and make possible flexibility. And the end will probably be a generic social work agency, which will combine group work and case work skills, and which will evolve into a type of neighborhood unit. In a merged case work agency, there is no family agency.

CASE WORK ASPECTS OF REALIGNMENTS

By JOHN SLAWSON

Jewish Board of Guardians, New York, N. Y.

THE public agency, gradually at first, and rapidly in the recent past, has been taking over the quantitative and mass job. There have been many defects in the procedures adopted. There have been many upheavals, but unless a sudden change occurs, which is unlikely, the public agency will take over the entire mass social work job. Dynamic psychiatry, formerly restricted to the clinic and hospital, has become the newer and prevalent orientation of the social worker concerned with case work. These two trends, increased public agency responsibility and the rapid introduction of dynamic psychiatry into case work thinking, have had peculiar effects on the organizations operating in the case work field.

The rapid and huge reduction of the private family agency's responsibility for material relief has precipitated the tendency for the family agency to approximate the child guidance clinic and the psychiatric agency. The reduction of the problem of child dependency, largely due to this increased responsibility on the part of governmental agencies, coupled with increased sensitivity to psychiatric

values on the part of referring sources, has caused the child care institution to concern itself in a rapidly increasing measure with problems of personality and incipient delinquent behavior. To a certain extent, the foster home agency has also tended in this direction. The agency concerned with delinquents has attempted to do a preventive job, due partly to the psychiatric influence, by entering into the area of need during the early stages of personality maladjustment, and has increasingly become concerned with the younger group, not as yet declared officially delinquent, but exhibiting patterns of behavior indicative of future official delinquency.

There has been very little time to think through carefully the new emphases and to effect a workable orientation that can only be achieved through clear thinking, careful planning and constant experimentation. The need for change due to shift in responsibilities has become so compelling that new social work territory is appropriated frequently by agencies for justification of their own continuity and not through a process of integrating new procedures with established functions.

New functions, unrelated to the structure of the agency, are attempted. Agency rivalry, subdued but nevertheless present, ensues; bewildered staffs are forced to assimilate practically overnight new procedures and new skills.

In this confusion, the soil becomes fertile for the initiation of the undifferentiated agency, and mergers gain vogue. Many valid reasons are given in favor of mergers—economy, more efficient functioning, simplification of contacts, better assimilation of procedure and, finally, better service to clientele. In view of the fact that the community program is nearly always an unplanned program, due to the nature of the origin of philanthropic agencies, amalgamation appears to be the corrective for the sporadic creation of agencies in the past. Efficiency through the mechanism of merger will eliminate, it is thought, the errors produced by the sentimental origin of these organizations. Especially is the time ripe to do this, it is felt, when the responsibility on the part of the private agency for mass and quantitative social work is being so rapidly diminished. Mergers of all kinds—of orphan homes and foster home agencies, of foster home agencies and family agencies, of family agencies and child guidance agencies—appear to be the methods through which an increasing number of communities hope to establish order out of chaos and reduce friction that accompanies attempts to find new functions to replace those lost. In some of the smaller communities, it is felt desirable to merge all of the case work services, regardless of the standards of the agencies so amalgamated.

It might be well to pause to determine what it is that we are merging, what it is that we are combining, and it would be a mark of wisdom at least to prog-

nosticate the ultimate outcome of such amalgamations, especially when vogue and expediency, rather than accurate analysis, motivate the fusions. If we forget for a moment functions of agencies and concern ourselves with what is really fundamental in the case work situation, namely, the needs of people in trouble who come to agencies for assistance, we will find, generally speaking, the following: there are the reality needs, such as money; jobs, health, recreation, cultural and educational opportunity; and resources for others than themselves, such as problems related to family and children. We find, also, needs produced by psychological tensions which are also of a realistic nature, such as frustrations, disappointments, loss of love object, actual inferiorities and loss of security through the loss of job, status and health. And then we find needs flowing out of tensions produced by much more complicated states of an intrapsychic nature, such as unconscious mental conflicts and psychopathological conditions, expressing themselves in neuroses, abnormalities in behavior and psychoses.

When we consider the nature and variety of delinquent behavior alone, we become lost in the complexity that faces us. There is the delinquent whose difficulty lies solely in personality relationships; there is neurotic delinquency resulting in behavior expressed symbolically, of unconscious motivation; there is the psychopathological delinquent who, although not psychotic, is unable to relate himself to others, and who more frequently than not finds pleasurable and enjoyable his aggressive, overt, anti-social behavior. With the latter, very little, if any recorded progress in treatment has been made in this country.

Results of evaluation of case work treatment to date have not been very en-