own unsatisfactory relationships to each each other more in the present relaother were frozen.

Mr. B. Sr.'s feeling that "we can work this out among ourselves" became more possible as the whole family used the agency as a partial pivot point for change. Certainly it was painful for him at this stage of his life to come to terms with the fact that though he could be a small part of his children's lives. they would not permit him to become too involved. They faced this together. This experience, however, has helped to free Mr. B. Sr. from an anchor which had meaning and value to him in the past, but could not have the same meaning for him in the present, as she is no longer here—his wife. This experience in part gave him the courage to undertake a serious operation so that he might be less rather than more dependent on others in the future. The B.'s, Morton, Laura and Mr. B. Sr. are no longer denying each other as they were actually doing prior to coming to the agency. They fear each other less and recognize

tionship which they are evolving for themselves.

Too many Mr. B's, however, do not have the security of a separate income or infirmities that can be helped by operations. Too many Mr. B's and their children believe the family agency is not for them. For these people we need to continue to develop and to interpret our Older Parent-Adult Child Counseling

Such action on our part will mean little, unless our family agency services are backed up by the community and by the additional specialized resources which the older parent and his children need and must have today. I refer to more adequate Old Age Assistance Programs, hospitals, home services and specialized aged institutional facilities. Without these community services—both public and private, fear and frozen relationships between older parents and their adult children will continue to prevail with little chance for resolution.

The Jewish Social

STAFF PARTICIPATION IN A **COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM***

By HERMAN WEINHEIMER Jewish Community Service Society, Buffalo, N. Y.

THE increased efforts which casework agencies have made recently to build up their community relations programs are a telling testimony to our growing awareness of our ties with the community and of the existing weaknesses in our present relations to it. We have called upon public relations experts to help us revise and implement this program and their knowledge and skill has contributed to a beginning understanding of some of the misconceptions we have had about public relations.

A paper charged with the discussion of the staff's participation in community relations cannot disregard the fact that the profession of casework appears to be groping for a new understanding of its public relations responsibilities and that it seems to have arrived at the recognition that it needs different and specific skills to discharge these responsibilities effectively. Participation of the casework staff in such a program depends on the nature of the program and on the skill its operation requires.

What are the responsibilities of casework agencies in the field of public relations? Mr. Elliott E. Cohen in a paper on "Social Work Public Relations in the Changing Community," presented at last year's National Confer-

ence of Jewish Social Welfare** spoke of public relations work as "a problem of communication." He described the job of a public relations program as "setting up and keeping flowing a twoway process of communication between [the agency] and the public, a process in which the public must play a large part not merely as a passive student of our wisdom, but as a partner whom we must continually talk to and who must continually talk to us . . . and who can be made to undertake a large part of the public relations function himself." Mr. Cohen concludes that public relations work is a "two-way interpretation process," in which our understanding of the community is as important as is the community's understanding of us. This statement advances our comprehension of public relations toward a greater awareness of those whom we address. It evokes doubts in a public relations practice that considers lack of information about social work on the part of the public the sole source of all of our public relations problems and the correction of this deficiency its sole objective. It includes in the scope of our public relations the other partner, the community, as a factor with active interests in us as well. It leaves unex-

^{*} Presented at the National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare, Atlantic City, May, 1948.

^{**} Published in "The Jewish Social Service Quarterly," September, 1947, page 31.

plored, though, what these active inter- us with the real weakness of our public ests are and how they make themselves relations program; that is, its seeming felt, and it leaves unchallenged the premise that our part in the process is interpretative in nature.

It may be propitious for an attempt to re-think our community relations responsibilities to begin with a critical examination of the objectives we seem to have accepted without challenge. In the area of community relations we seem to think essentially like industry and commerce. We endeavor to procure an ever increasing number of consumers for our ever increasing or at least changing services. Community relations seem to serve as promotional channels toward this end. In fact, we sometimes talk of "selling" our services and it was with the extension of our recently developed counseling services to a new group of clients, that the prospect of "selling" these new services to new people gave fresh impetus to the casework practitioners' interest in public relations. By adding marital counseling and parent-child counseling to our traditional services, we also added to our interest in public relations. By now we see in a community member-of whatever financial or social status-not merely a potential contributor, or a potential referral source, but also a potential client. With that addition the parallel to industrial community relations interests seems to be complete. Indeed, many of our publications for general consumption-the black and white dramatization of need and service for examplediffer from those of industry and commerce merely by the use of a different terminology. In order to adjust this difference, we have turned to commercial public relations experts. They have taught us much about communication channels, but they also have confronted

identity with commercial public relations. The Federated Jewish Agencies in Buffalo consulted a commercial public relations expert for the preparation of the interpretative program of last year's annual meeting. In our eagerness to bring across to the public the nature of our services we attempted to transcribe into simple every-day language the technical terms in the material handed to him. Apparently we were so successful that our public relations expert saw fit to remind us that we did not intend-after all-to address an audience of morons. It is not the use of simple language, but the use of persuasive language that denotes the skill of the commercial community relations expert. It is precisely the persuasive method and the promotional intent of commercial community relations practice that elucidates its inapplicability to social work.

Promotion involves the imposition of one's will upon someone else. Even if we conceive of imposition in its most literal meaning, that is unattended by any force, it would be inconsistent with the methodology of the casework profession as well as with the nature of its relationship to the community to impose its will upon the public. In the casework process with the client we are adamant in our conviction that our effectiveness rests on restraint from imposition of our will upon the client; in fact, we consider our ability to conduct our part in the process in a way that the client is set free to assert his own will, as an essential contribution of our profession to the functioning of society. The applicability of the same principles to our relations to the community depends upon the nature and objectives of

The Jewish Social

these relations. For the broad field of -at least structurally-more the concommunity planning and organization their relevance to the relationship between the profession of social work and the community was established in a paper by Mr. Kenneth L. M. Pray under the title "When is Community Organiration Social Work Practice?"* The question of their appropriateness for the specific field of the casework agency's community relations correlates with the question of the integration of the casework practice into the functioning of the community. If the method of casework based upon restraint from imposition is an integral part of the mutual interest the community and the profession have in each other, there should be no room for any other way of relating between casework agencies and community.

What is the community's interest in the functions of casework? And what is the interest of the casework profession in the community? Is the community no more than our supporter, retaining the right to limit our policies through restricting its contribution? Or are its interests dynamic enough to permeate our concern with the type of help we offer to our clients and perhaps even with the principles that govern the helping process? The thought seems not at all attractive, if we recall the demands of the ill-famed contributor, whose contribution is given merely as a loan, who is never able to truly part with it, and who comes to claim it by his insistence on personal control over its disposition. He constitutes a problem of pathology in community relations and he is cern of the fund raising agency than that of the casework agency.

However, even contemplating what we may call normal community relations, the thesis that community interests find active expression in or through the casework process is not concordant with the usual definition of casework as a method of helping. Our emancipation from the therapeutic professions seems still so incomplete that we-like theyremain absorbed in the development of skill and techniques. We tend to lose sight of the common and unique criterion of all casework services as designated to function in a particular area and for a particular purpose. Having a method of helping as such is not a distinguishing criterion of our profession. Several other professions are equipped to do likewise. The differentiating factor is to be found in the derivation, the binding character, and the innate purpose of the standards which social services represent, standards which are set by the community and brought into application by the community through the channels of social work-standards which determine the structure of our agencies and the extent, the intent, and the limits of our services.

Society through the varied channels by which it expresses itself, through the manifold impulses which create and sustain our agencies and their services consigns to the casework agency the job of helping those who desire to use our services for the attainment of greater satisfaction within the framework of our society. Society's interest in the availability of such services arises from its concern with the existence of avenues through which harmonious interrelationships between individuals and community can be realized. Providing for

^{* &}quot;When is Community Organization Social Work Practice?" by Kenneth L. M. Pray, 1947 Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, Columbia University Press, New York, 1948, pages 194 to 204.

their availability is a component part of a community's functions, a communal charge upon which rests progress and productive functioning of a democratic social organization. It is this direct and immediate interest of society, making itself felt in the casework process, that constitutes its "community roots" and its "three-dimensional" character, if we wish to give this particular emphasis to the concepts which Dr. Taft developed in the pamphlet "Counseling and Protective Service as Family Case Work."* This does not mean that other helping professions do not also apply prevailing standards of society but they use them only if their helping interest in their clients suggests doing so, whereas in social casework these standards and their deliberate implementation through specific services are an essential factor in the dynamics of helping. Their use in therapeutic processes is a matter of technique, a reflection of the helping interest of the therapist in his patient; their use in the casework process is the intended consequence of the community "mandate" by which social work operates, and a source of its effectiveness. Only meeting with society as it actively asserts its interests, not the one-sided use of an inanimate service, however carefully defined and limited, can facilitate an experience which helps the client toward a more satisfying use of himself within the social setting in which he lives. This is a thought that impressed itself upon me rather forcefully as a worker in a military psychiatric setting. The realization that the individual interest extended to the soldier-client through the services of a military Mental Hygiene Clinic was as much the expression of the army's total functioning as was his

exposure to its collective procedures had great meaning for him. I am well aware of the difference between a social organism as closely structured and directed as the army and a social organism with a dispersed structure and a diversified direction as society in general presents. I know that to many of us society seems too intangible an entity for a close tie-up of our actual practice with its functioning.

Yet, in some areas, we have found our way through the seemingly entangled maze of that complex entity community and have established procedures which derive their standards and their effectiveness unmistakably from our identification not only with the client but with society as well. Holding ourselves identified with the social goal of preserving family life, we have accepted as our responsibility in family casework the inclusion of every member of the family who may be affected by our services. Only the client who can meet the concern of the agency with the interests of the family as a whole can establish his eligibility for service. The basis for this concern with the family as a whole, the authority to withhold service, if its use would injure the interests of other family members, has its root in the agency's communal identification. The agency's interest reaches beyond the individual and extends to the partners of the client's social relationships. Respect and consideration for their rights as well as for those of the immediate client is the agency's responsibility as an integral part of society.* The client, exposed to this manifestation of the agency's social concern, is afforded the

opportunity to examine his own social identifications.

An application of the principles presented by this paper may serve to demonstrate how real the correlation of casework services with the interests of society are. Furthermore, it may serve to exemplify the relevancy of another casework principle that is as innately a part of our relationship to the community as it is a part of our relationship to the client. I refer to the emphasis of casework on its growth-stimulating effect rather than on its responsibility for results. Conceiving of itself with such a limited goal it need not encompass all of the personal problems of a client, but provides the opportunity for change and growth by setting in motion the forces that are involved in change through their engagement in the use of the service. Our community identification responds to such focus on process as well. The social intention of our service is conveyed to the client not through an artificial and strained effort to confront him with the problem of his own identification with the total community, but rather through his engagement in that part of social living which is associated with the service he uses. However limited such engagement may be, the client's striving in this direction activates his movement toward broader social adjustment.

It is our responsibility to define our services from the standpoint of their social utility. For this purpose, perhaps, we need to give more thought and attention to the community's composition and to the avenues through which it forms its standards. We may need to draw as liberally on the science of sociology as we have drawn on the science of psychology. Defining and offering our services with awareness of their thera-

peutic and sociological qualities is the responsibility of the casework agency toward the community, toward the client, and toward itself. In relation to the community, it involves help with the conversion of the impulses that create and sustain our agencies. Our community relations job is precisely this. Our problems in community relations work arise from the tension and struggle that is intrinsic in the process of helping to translate undifferentiated impulses into constructive and mature action. The ability and the skill to be helpful in such processes is the hallmark of our profession.

It seems that we have gone deep into basic casework concepts in order to define the essential nature of the casework agency's community relations program. It seemed necessary to do this, in order to free ourselves from the traditional idea that community relations are no more than a problem of interpretation and of the agency's self-propagation. We must orient ourselves to acceptance of the community's active partnership in the community relations process. I believe that the thinking I have presented along these lines establishes the community's and the agency's corresponding roles in this process and enables us to discuss community relations work as part of our job itself and not as a loosely connected adjunct to our profession.

Seen in the light of this reasoning the staff's responsibility and its ability to participate in such a program by virtue of its professional designation rather than for extraneous promotional reasons, appears to be transparent. The staff's share in the community relations program parallels its share in the total program of the agency of which it is an inseparable part. There are many aspects of community interests collateral to the caseworker's professional activity.

^{*} This interest of casework which goes beyond the individual himself seems to me to be the most notable distinguishing feature of casework, more striking than the differentiation between the concern with the total personality and the concern with a specified personal problem.

^{*&}quot;Counseling and Protective Service as Family Case Work; A Functional Approach," Pennsylvania School of Social Work, 1946.

As he partakes in forming and defining ent in these cases suggests the inclusion the services, he shares in the agency's communal responsibility. He does so as he contributes to the administrator's efforts to help the board carry its policymaking and program-forming functions. Most of all, he does so as he contacts referral sources, collaterals, references, physicians, lawyers, and other experts. Considering their interests in a casesituation merely as a disturbing encroachment on the casework job would deny their right to the very impulse that supports and sustains our services. Considering them merely as "potential clients" would deny the sincerity of our interest in their contribution to the agency's functions, for which we have contacted them. How many of the "references" we contact in foster home finding and adoption work are really permitted to make the contribution to the service which we have called upon them to make? Do we not often resent and misdirect, or, worse than that, completely neglect their impulse to be helpful, so that their information becomes a matter of one-sided identification with the client, rather than a matured expression of their impulse to realize their progressive social goals through the support of the services of the agency in which they have legitimate interests as members of the community?

There are many other implications of this concept of community relations as it pertains to the staff's responsibility. There are, for example, cases which entail what we could, perhaps, somewhat loosely term "community relations counseling."* Effective help to the cli-

of the other partner to the relationship in which the client has come to an impasse. A case in which "the other partner" is the local chapter of a national organization came to our agency recently. A young refugee, who had been brought from Palestine to this country by this chapter for academic training on a scholarship arrangement, applied for help with clothing needs. Though such needs of refugees can be met by our agency, this service on the usual relief and community-adjustment basis did not concur with the meaning and significance of this young student's request. Our standards of relief and their attending eligibility requirements are geared to the client's permanent integration into the community. As such they conflicted with this student's understandable expectation that someone would meet the commitments on which he had relied when he made his current plans. Help to this student inevitably led to the problem of his relationship to the chapter and charged the worker with the task of facing the chapter with the agency's position and functions within the community. The agency's position constituted a challenge for the chapter to reexamine its own communal responsibility. The agency's helpfulness in this process of cooperation between the chapter, student, and agency depends on the acceptance of the chapter's desire to be helpful, however misdirected this desire may have been when the chapter left the student with such need.

Such cases give us the responsibility for interpretation of the agency's functions to another communal organization. The focus here is not interpretation of a defensive nature, but the functional relationship of two organizations to

quests and needs. Such interpretation should avoid the demanding guardianship role that we tend to assume—in whatever subtle disguise—in relation to other communal groups or individuals whom we contact about the needs and problems of a client. Staff workers are engaged in community relations work in such situations by reason of their role in serving the client.

The agency's responsibility toward the community, however, extends beyond the helping function in those cases that have matured into requests for direct service. The community is entitled to know of our service, and we have an obligation to make it known, aside from our activity in specific cases. Larger agencies employ community relations specialists in this part of their community relations program. If its objectives were promotional in nature and if the needed skill would entail persuasion, the small agency that cannot support a separate public relations department would have to resign itself to the recognition that it could not discharge this aspect of its responsibilities. Its practitioners trained to discipline themselves to a professional attitude of restraint from control could not be expected to alternate their orientation and skills depending on the character of their contacts. However, if the objectives are viewed in accordance with the principles we have developed, the practitioner's professional skill submits to the requirements of this part of the program as well. The use of our skill on a job that demands help of a programatic nature, divorced from a concrete and familiar service, may require new skills, and may therefore present as much a problem to a practitioner as the change from one functional field to another

each other in view of the client's re- presents. The professional equipment of the worker however will help him to meet this challenge.

> A brief example of such a programactivity may serve to illustrate this claim: About a year ago we were invited by a Jewish camp in Buffalo to lend a worker for assignment to the problems it had encountered in handling difficult campers. The camp planned that a caseworker would take over responsibility for such campers and would help them with the adjustment problems they evidenced. The camp realized the existence of an unmet need and was ready to carry a responsibility that was only partly its own. Knowing that our agency's functions include service with some of the needs the camp felt called upon to meet, it desired to use an agency worker and to extend its program to cover this need. We could identify with the camp's desire to be helpful, though we could not offer our services in the requested manner. We recognized that it was the camp's job to help campers with the problems they encountered in their adjustment to camp life as such as distinguished from problems that were focused on other relationships and factors, but we could not lend a worker to the camp for a job that could be done only through its own organization. It was necessary, though, for us to engage in a process with the camp through which the two agencies could define and carry their different responsibilities. It led to our cooperation with the camp in meeting a need that had existed in the community and that had searched for channels through which it could be satisfied. We provided a worker who could help the camp through an educational program with the discharge of its respon-

^{*} I have discussed effects of such "community factors" on the casework process in a paper published in "The Jewish Social Service Quarterly," March, 1948, page 302.

STAFF PARTICIPATION IN A COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROGRAM

sibilities both within the camp itself stimulate sound development. Conduct. and in the arrangement of referrals to other community resources. The result of this process was the intensive activation of our child-parent counseling program and ultimately the addition of a staff member. It was a hoped for result, but not its objective. The objective was to help an undifferentiated impulse to mature into constructive action, a job that employs casework skill.

Similar to the dynamics of the functionally oriented casework process, the dynamics of the functionally oriented community relations process are apt to

ing our community relations program in compliance with these principles permits apportioning of the community relations responsibilities of the agency to executive, supervisor, and staff in accordance with the usual distribution of functional responsibilities, but requires forbearance of the close control that promotional methods afford and challenges us to entrust the growth of our agen. cies to the effectiveness of the same processes and methods that our clients have learned to trust for their development and growth.

APPLICATION OF THE RORSCHACH IN A JEWISH **VOCATIONAL AGENCY***

By JOSEPH L. TAYLOR Jewish Family Service, St. Paul, Minn.**

HIS paper will discuss some aspects of current thinking about the use of the Rorschach in a IVS and will present case material to illustrate the application of the test in a vocational agency. Beginning with a review of negative feeling toward the Rorschach, we hope to provide a framework within which we may evaluate various shades of opinion. It is felt that the case material will implement the recommendation made during the Regional IVS Conference of last year that future discussions of the Rorschach include case illustrations to provide data for evaluating the contribution of the test to vocational agencies.

Correspondence¹ with JVS agencies in several cities and a review of last year's conference meeting on the subject of the Rorschach reflects the following negative attitudes toward the use of the test in a vocational setting.

General agreement exists among all groups which accept or reject the Rorschach that the test is an excellent

diagnostic tool and that it is extremely helpful in detecting personality disturbance. There is a group which sees the chief contribution of the Rorschach in testing for emotionally disturbed conditions with a view toward making psychiatric referrals. This very partial acceptance of the Rorschach uses it only as a screening device and reflects an essentially negative feeling toward a wider application of the test in actual vocational terms. Some groups feel that Rorschach data is helpful chiefly in the guidance and placement of emotionally disturbed clients. Here we find a limited rather than a negative use of the Rorschach. A more clearly negative view contends that the Rorschach is a valuable clinical tool, but one which belongs in a psychiatric diagnostic situation rather than in a vocational agency. Stated another way, this view holds that if we use the Rorschach for exploration of personality factors in situations where we suspect emotional involvements, we are in a psychiatric area outside the function of a JVS. Still another negative view maintains that the Rorschach adds nothing to an understanding of personality which can not be gained through clinical observation, life history data and other tests in standard use, and that the vocational counsellor should be able to detect personality disturbance without using the

Service Quarterly

^{*} Paper delivered at Mid-West Conference of JVS agencies, Chicago, Illinois, January 9, 1948.

^{**} At the time Mr. Taylor delivered this paper, he was Chief Social Worker, VA Medical Rehabilitation Center, Ft. Thomas, Ky., and Psychological Consultant, JVS, Cincinnati, Ohio.

¹ The correspondence was initiated by Mr. George Newburger, Executive Director of the JVS, Cincinnati, Ohio.