

SALARIES AND QUALIFICATIONS OF CHILD WELFARE WORKERS IN 1941

BY

RALPH G. HURLIN

Director, Department of Statistics

Russell Sage Foundation



NEW YORK

RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION

1943

Price, 25 cents

STATEMENT CONCERNING PUBLICATIONS OF RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION

The Russell Sage Foundation was established in 1907 by Mrs. Russell Sage "for the improvement of social and living conditions in the United States of America." In carrying out its purpose the Foundation maintains a staff which, among other duties, conducts studies of social conditions, authorized by the General Director, where new information, its analysis and interpretation seem necessary in order to formulate and advance practicable measures aimed at improvement. From time to time the Foundation publishes the results of these studies in book or pamphlet form.

In formulating the problem for study, in mapping out a plan of work on it, in collecting facts, in drawing conclusions, and in the presentation of findings, authors of Foundation studies, who are always either members of the staff or specially commissioned research workers, have the benefit of the criticism and advice of their colleagues in the organization. Full freedom is given research workers for the final decision on all of these steps, and in presenting and interpreting both factual material and conclusions in their own way. While the general responsibility for management of the Foundation is vested in the board of trustees, the responsibility for facts, conclusions, and interpretations rests with the research workers alone and not upon the Foundation, its trustees, or other members of the staff. Publication under the imprint of the Foundation does not imply agreement by the organization or its members with opinions or interpretations of authors. It does imply that care has been taken that the research on which a book is based has been thoroughly done.

SALARIES AND QUALIFICATIONS OF CHILD WELFARE WORKERS IN 1941

THIS study was made for the purpose of revealing current tendencies affecting the salaries of professional and houseparent workers in child welfare agencies. It was undertaken at the request and with the co-operation of the Child Welfare League of America, and the results are descriptive of agencies associated in the League rather than of all child welfare organizations in the United States. The data relate to the year 1941. A preliminary report of the findings was issued to the participating agencies in July, 1942.

Although chiefly concerned with salary levels and the reasons for variations about these levels, the study was also planned to provide information concerning other characteristics of child care personnel. The findings, therefore, record tendencies relating to salaries, and also to such other factors as age and sex of the workers, extent of professional training and experience, and length of service with the present employing agency. The last item is of special importance inasmuch as it reflects the rate of staff turnover, which here as elsewhere in social work appears to be unduly high. Since all the salary data need to be interpreted in the light of the characteristics of the personnel to which they apply, the information concerning these other factors is presented in the report before salaries are considered.

Scope of the Study

Two reasons explain the decision to limit the study to the group of full member and affiliated agencies comprising the Child Welfare League of America. One was the lack of a current list of the 2,300 or more child care agencies in the United States, which it would have been desirable to canvass completely, or from which a probably representative sample might have been chosen for study. The other was the recognized difficulty of obtaining, in any inquiry of this sort, the detailed data needed from all the agencies selected for study.

Since it was not practicable to attempt to select and obtain data from a cross-section of all child welfare agencies, it was decided to focus the study on the League membership. At the outset it was hoped that all these agencies would participate. Later, when it appeared that this was unlikely, decision was made to continue effort to obtain the co-operation of the fully accredited members of the League, but to omit further requests for data from the affiliated agencies. As a result, the study is actually one of a special group of 203 agencies. They include all but 18 of the accredited League members that have children under care, and in addition the most interested

third of the affiliated agencies and five additional agencies that are affiliated with one of the members.

Although small, the group is an important one. Presumably, these agencies maintain better than average standards of work and at least somewhat higher than average personnel standards. In general, they are the more influential child welfare agencies in their areas, so that the facts concerning them should be of significance for, even if not representative of, all child welfare agencies.

Collection of Data

With a few exceptions the data were obtained through correspondence. When the study was proposed early in 1941, a schedule was prepared and was used in a series of field visits by members of the League's staff. The data so obtained served at once the purpose of the short surveys of the agencies visited and were later used in this study. The schedule, consisting of one page only, called for a carefully limited series of facts about one worker. The information could be entered either by each worker concerned, or, if the personnel records were adequate, by the office of the reporting agency. In most instances the data were supplied by the workers themselves.

Requests for participation in the study were sent to the agencies following a meeting of the League in June, 1941. At that time the administrative need for new information concerning salary tendencies was discussed and the plan proposed for the study was endorsed. Letters were then sent from the League office asking for report, on an enclosed card, of the number of workers in the positions to be studied. As replies were received, copies of the schedule were sent in duplicate for each reported worker, together with a brief explanatory letter.

Information was requested concerning each member of the paid staff who was employed, at the time the schedules were received, either in a professional capacity or in immediate supervision of children in institutions. No information was sought concerning workers in clerical or maintenance positions. Most of the workers for whom data were returned were in social work positions, but members of other professions were reported, including physicians, dentists, psychologists, dietitians, nurses, and teachers. On most points, however, the data were numerous enough to give useful results only for the social work and houseparent positions.

Although schedules were returned within a few weeks by a majority of the agencies, more than six months was allowed for the collection process in order to include as many of the full member agencies as possible. Most of the data were returned during July, August, and September, and relate to those months. But, as already noted, some schedules were obtained in the early field visits, and some, although filled out for an earlier month, were returned as late as January, 1942.

The fact that the data of different agencies apply to different periods within the year probably does not affect the results to an important extent.

Child care agencies were not increasing their staffs during this year. There was some shortage of trained social workers throughout the year, but it probably was not greater than that which had existed for several years. The expansion of war service agencies, which later accentuated the shortage, had scarcely begun by the end of 1941. Moreover, although the cost of living was increasing during this year, very few salary adjustments to meet cost-of-living increases had been made by social work agencies by the end of the year.¹ It seems probable, therefore, that the results would not have been significantly different if the data had been reported uniformly for one date in the year.

The Reporting Agencies

The 203 participating agencies include 147 fully accredited League members, 51 affiliated agencies, and, as already noted, five other indirectly associated agencies.

Both governmental and private agencies are represented, but in unequal proportions, as shown in Table 1. The smaller number of public agencies is composed largely of child welfare divisions of state departments of public welfare, some of which reported only workers employed at the state level, while others reported workers in county offices. The 26 public organizations constitute about one-eighth of the total number of agencies and reported about a fifth of the 2,664 full-time workers studied.

Three chief types of direct service to children are represented by these agencies, namely, protective service, foster home care, and institutional care. Placement and care of children in foster family homes constitute the chief

TABLE 1.—AGENCIES AND WORKERS INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

Auspices	Agencies	Workers
Public:		
State	19	384
City or county	7	136
Total, public	26	520
Private	177	2,144
Public and private	203	2,664

function of most of the reporting agencies in both groups. Although institutional care is the whole function of only 21 of the private organizations, 54 others maintain institutions for either permanent or temporary care of children. Only three of the public organizations reported any institutional personnel. At least ten of the reporting private agencies and one division of a city public welfare department are either solely or chiefly protective in function, but more than 40 others of the private agencies combine protective and child placing functions in their programs.

The agencies vary materially in size. Nine of the private agencies have only one full-time professional position, while five private agencies and

¹ It is probable that many agencies did increase salaries in the following year because of the rise in cost of living. This should be recalled in examining the salary data presented later.

one public reported more than 50 full-time professional or houseparent workers. The average number of full-time professional or houseparent workers per agency was 13.

It should be emphasized that the small number of the public agencies, as well as the fact that only part of them contributed data concerning workers at the county or city level, makes their figures less useful for examination of trends than those of the private agencies. This needs to be borne in mind in examining the later tables. On this account, as well as for the purpose of contrasting the two groups, care has been taken to present data separately for the public and private agencies in most of the tables. It is of interest to note that generally the tendencies they show are very similar.

Geographical Distribution of Agencies and Workers

Since the study is of a selected group of agencies, it is especially important to indicate the geographical distribution of the data used. This is done in Table 2, in which, for the public and private agencies separately, both agencies and full-time workers reported are distributed by region.

TABLE 2.—GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION OF PARTICIPATING PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES AND OF FULL-TIME WORKERS REPORTED

Region	Public		Private	
	Agencies	Workers	Agencies	Workers
New England	3	106	25	244
Middle Atlantic	5	79	52	727
East North Central	3	83	36	504
West North Central	2	44	20	150
South Atlantic	9	160	19	241
East South Central	3	37	3	20
West South Central	6	64
Mountain	2	14
Pacific	1	11	13	161
Hawaii	1	19
Total	26	520	177	2,144

The representation is largest in the Middle Atlantic and East North Central regions, in which the total number of child welfare agencies and institutions is considerably larger than in the other areas. The South Atlantic and New England areas stand next, while the other regions are less well represented. The individual states contributing the largest numbers both of agencies and of workers are New York and Pennsylvania. Twenty-nine agencies in New York supplied data for 511 workers, while 20 in Pennsylvania reported for 245 workers. Public agencies reported from 19 different states, and private agencies from 39 states and Hawaii.

Classification of Workers by Position

The classification of workers by position is important for two purposes. It should indicate the proportions in which workers having different functions are required to carry on the services of the agencies studied. It also

provides the basis for analysis of salaries and other characteristics of workers by position or function. In this study the first of these purposes is served only roughly, partly because some of the agencies did not report all their institutional personnel.

Unfortunately, accurate classification of workers by position is difficult to obtain, because of the differences in functions of workers having similar titles and also the variety of titles used for the same function. Even more than in most other fields of social work, it appears, there is lack of standardization of position titles among child welfare agencies. Therefore, it was not desirable to rely on a position classification based upon titles alone.

To assist in obtaining a useful classification by position, the schedule called for two pieces of information concerning each worker. One was the title as used in the agency. The other was the approximate percentage distribution of the worker's time among the following types of work:

Administration	Nursing
Supervision of caseworkers	Institutional child care
Supervision of students	Teaching
Casework	Other

Of the two items, the distribution of the worker's time was regarded as most important, and in cases of doubt the classification was usually determined by the function to which most time was given. However, the evidence of the position title, and also the titles and functions of the other workers reported by the agency, were also taken into account in making the doubtful classifications. On some schedules information concerning the distribution of time was omitted, and in the more doubtful of these instances further information was obtained either from members of the League's staff or from the agency. For a large majority of the workers, position titles, even though varied, were consistent with the information concerning function, so that it seems probable that the position classification is approximately accurate with respect to duties actually performed. It needs to be emphasized, however, that it is intended to be a classification by principal function, and that not infrequently, particularly among small agencies, the functions of usually distinct positions overlap or intergrade. When workers indicated an even division of time between two types of function, as, for example, between supervision of caseworkers and casework, preference was given to the function of greater responsibility.

Table 3 records, again for the public and private agencies separately, the position classification of the full-time workers, and also the division of workers by sex in each position category. In this table, the position categories are arranged in three major divisions: social work, other professional, and child supervision. Much the largest proportions of the workers reported by both groups of agencies are in the social work positions—over 90 per cent for the public agencies, and over 75 per cent for the private agencies. The contrast in these proportions is not significant since it results chiefly from the difference in representation of institutions in the two groups.

Perhaps the most important fact revealed by Table 3 is that in the two groups of reporting agencies combined there are as many as 2,100 positions for which, presumably, technical social work training would be desirable. Of these positions, 1,468, or 70 per cent, were classified as casework positions, indicating that their occupants were giving their time, either wholly or chiefly, to direct casework service for children.

TABLE 3.—FULL-TIME WORKERS REPORTED, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES SEPARATELY, BY POSITION AND SEX

Position	Public agencies			Private agencies		
	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
<i>Social work positions</i>						
Executives	3	18	21	53	109	162
Assistant executives	15	32	47
Supervisors of training	..	7	7
Supervisors of casework	6	61	67	12	177	189
Heads of branch offices	3	46	49
Inspection and licensing workers	1	21	22
Casework consultants	..	37	37
Caseworkers	37	280	317	153	998	1,151
Activities directors and recreation workers	9	5	14
Public relations workers	3	4	7
Research workers	1	1	2	..	1	1
Other	2	1	3	1	4	5
Total, social work	50	426	476	249	1,376	1,625
<i>Other professional positions</i>						
Physicians	2	..	2	2	1	3
Psychologists	1	2	3	4	4	8
Nurses, graduate	..	10	10	..	70	70
Teachers	3	11	14	19	36	55
Dietitians	18	18
Other	6	6
Total, other professional	6	23	29	25	135	160
<i>Child supervision positions</i>						
Houseparents	2	13	15	24	299	323
Practical nurses	36	36
Total, child supervision	2	13	15	24	335	359
Grand total	58	462	520	298	1,846	2,144

It will be noticed that the number of executives recorded in the table is less than the number of agencies participating in the study. The difference is explained by failure to obtain schedules for the executives of 20 of the participating organizations. In the case of agencies having other than child care functions, data for only the child care personnel were requested, and in several instances the executive's schedule was omitted on this account. In the case of four agencies whose executives are religious workers, schedules were withheld presumably because the position entailed no salary or only a nominal one. In one agency the executive position was vacant. Another had no paid executive, board members exercising this function. Two agencies, in adjoining cities, had one executive in common.

In this connection it should be explained that, in the case of the child care divisions of state or county departments of welfare, the head of the

children's division was classified as the executive for the purpose of the study, whereas in the private organizations having two or more departments, the worker in charge of child care services was classified either as an assistant executive or a supervisor of casework. The 47 assistant executives of private agencies recorded in Table 3 are not, however, all heads of separate departments; a few are assistant directors of large agencies providing general child care services, others are heads of institutions maintained by child placing agencies, and still others are assistant heads of institutions.

Supervisors of training were reported by seven of the child welfare divisions of state agencies, where their services relate to training programs for workers in local offices. Only one worker was found among the private agencies having a probably similar function, and this worker was classified as a supervisor of casework. Similarly, the three or four workers reported by private agencies whose duties were chiefly supervision of students were classified as supervisors of casework, since these positions appear to be more similar to those of other casework supervisors than to the training positions in the public agencies.

The category, supervisors of casework, is intended to include the workers who have immediate responsibility for the quality of work of a staff of caseworkers. It includes supervisors of different rank in the larger agencies, as well as supervisors in both large and small agencies. Forty-nine heads of branch offices, reported by 15 of the private foster care and protective agencies, are separately classified, even though in many instances their function was more largely supervision of casework than general administration.

The inspection and licensing workers were reported by 12 different state agencies. They are a small and considerably varied group. In some states, these workers appear to be concerned only with the formal licensing of institutions, agencies, and, in some instances, foster homes. Workers are also included here whose function is to maintain field contacts with institutions, either for the purpose of inspection to insure observance of law or to provide consultative service.

The 37 workers classified as casework consultants were reported by only nine of the state agencies. This was the most commonly occurring title for these workers. Other titles were: social service consultant, child welfare supervisor, field representative, and field worker. The content of these positions also varies considerably. They usually involve some direct casework, some inspection and some community organization or public relations. The chief component of the position, however, is commonly that of consultation concerning casework program and practice with the staffs of local child welfare agencies. Usually, the function of these workers was reported as chiefly supervision of casework, but the workers were classified as casework consultants rather than casework supervisors because of our desire to limit the latter category to workers having responsibility for the work of caseworkers within an agency. The salaries of the state agency workers

classified as casework consultants proved to be intermediate between those of caseworkers and supervisors of casework, which is consistent with the intermediate nature of their function.

The other position categories appearing in Table 3 under the heading, social work positions, indicate the sparse representation of such specialized workers in these agencies. However, the fact that the table includes only full-time workers reduces the size of these categories somewhat, as does the fact that in agencies providing other than child care services such functions as publicity and research are usually not located in the child care division. It is, perhaps, worth recording that only 14 workers could be recognized as having the specialized function of direction of children's activities or recreation in the institutions included in the study. Seven of the private agencies reported full-time workers engaged in publicity, money raising, or interpretation. Only three research workers were reported, of whom two were engaged in studies of adoptions in two public agencies.

The schedules of most of the large number of workers classified as caseworkers bore this title, with occasionally the modifying term, senior or junior, these adjectives clearly having different significance in different agencies. Other titles that were recorded more or less frequently on the schedules for these workers were:

Visitor	Field worker	Social worker
Interviewer	Worker	Psychiatric social worker
Investigator	District worker	Intake worker
Agent	Children's worker	Adoption worker
Field representative	Child welfare worker	Homefinder

The first 11 of these titles do not suggest differences in degree of specialization of the casework function. Instead they seem to indicate lack of standardization of titles occurring within, as well as between, agencies. In several instances, in fact, as many as five or six of the first 11 titles occurred on schedules filled out by different workers in the same agency who recorded casework as their whole function.

The last four titles in the list do suggest specialization of function and separate tabulations were made for workers bearing these titles. It became evident, however, that most of the agencies having workers with corresponding functions had reported them merely as caseworkers. Thus, only three agencies reported adoption workers, and five listed psychiatric caseworkers.

The miscellaneous social work positions include a vocational counselor in one protective agency, a court representative whose function was not considered casework in another, and a school relations secretary in an agency in which protective work is part of a general casework program.

The omission of part-time workers also affects materially the number of professional workers shown in the table in other than social work positions. More part-time than full-time physicians and psychologists were recorded and no full-time dentist was reported. The count of teachers is

much smaller than was expected, which may reflect the present tendency of private institutions to make use of public education facilities.

Of the 80 workers classified as graduate nurses, a majority were reported as giving their time solely to the function of nursing, which in institutions may mean either supervision of the infirmary or bedside nursing, or both. Some of these workers, however, are engaged primarily in supervision of the health of children and in health education. Other graduate nurses were employed as caseworkers and are so classified in the table. Eighteen workers in institutions were reported as dietitians. The scattered other professional positions include one dental hygienist, an occupational therapist, and several librarians.

Under the heading, child supervision positions, we have placed workers whose schedules showed institutional child care, as distinct from administration, casework, or nursing, as their only or primary function. Workers reporting nursing as a primary function who were not graduate nurses have also been included here. Except for the practical nurses, these workers are combined in the category, houseparents. Their reported titles, however, vary. Many were reported as house, or cottage, fathers or mothers. The title, matron, was frequently used. Other titles for these positions were: governor or governess, boys' or girls' supervisor, counselor, and in some of the protective agencies, attendant. Although matrons whose primary function was indicated as child supervision are included in this group, a few workers returned as sewing-room, kitchen, or laundry matrons were not included at all. Similarly, workers reported as housekeepers, cooks, or maids were omitted from the study, even though in some cases part of their duty may have been supervision of children.

Classification of Workers by Sex

The child care personnel of these agencies, and probably of child welfare agencies generally, is composed predominantly of women. Of the total number of workers in this study, only 356, or 13 per cent, were men. Of the 2,101 workers in social work positions in the public and private agencies combined, 299, or 14 per cent, were men. These closely similar proportions may be contrasted with 36 per cent, the proportion of men found among nearly 70,000 employed social workers enumerated in the federal occupational census in 1940. On the other hand, in a study of private family casework organizations in 1936, we found 6 per cent of social work positions occupied by men.¹

Of the men reported in the present study, more than half were in casework positions, most of them being employed by agencies engaged in protective work. The proportion of men among caseworkers was 13 per cent.

In executive and assistant executive positions in the private agencies

¹ "Salaries in Private Family Casework Organizations in March, 1936," in *The Family*, December, 1936, pp. 251-256.

men were relatively numerous. There were, however, only three men among the heads of the public agencies reporting. It is of interest to find as many as 18 men among the supervisors of casework in the two groups of agencies.

A surprisingly small number of men were reported as occupying houseparent positions. Only 26 were classified in this category, which is only 8 per cent of the number of houseparents recorded. This very small proportion may not be representative of the general situation, yet the suggestion is strong that generally the number of men employed in these positions is much lower than is desirable.

Age Classification of Workers

Age is a factor which has material influence on salaries. For every worker advancing age up to some point means increase of experience contributing to usefulness. But beyond that point, which varies for different workers and for different sorts of work, increase of age and experience ceases to be advantageous, and eventually becomes a disadvantage. The age distribution presented in Table 4 has, therefore, definite relation to salaries, and is also of much interest on its own account.

In this table the category, other professional workers, has been omitted and the less frequent social work positions, shown separately in Table 3, are combined. It should be noted that the age group, under 35, is shown both as a total, for comparison with the two following 15-year age groups, and also subdivided into five-year groups, in order to indicate where employment begins in the several position categories.

The table reveals a distinctly favorable personnel situation. As a group these agencies were manned by a relatively young working force, yet workers under 25 years of age were not numerous. Of the workers in professional social work positions in both public and private agencies, more than half were under 35 years of age; only 12 per cent, 50 years or over; and only 24 workers, or 1 per cent, 65 years or over. Only 143 workers in social work positions, or 7 per cent, were reported as under 25 years, and almost all of them were caseworkers.

These proportions could not be much affected had the age data been obtained for the 20 workers in social work positions who failed to supply this item. The data on experience indicate that they were older workers. Should all of them prove to have been 65 years or over, the proportion for this age group would be only 2 per cent.

The age distributions for social work positions in the reporting public and private agencies are very similar.

The houseparent workers were older, but an unexpected proportion of younger workers was found in these positions. Of the 323 houseparents reported by private agencies, 24 per cent were under 35 years, and 15 per cent under 30 years. At the other extreme, 35 per cent were over 50 years.

TABLE 4.—FULL-TIME WORKERS IN SOCIAL WORK AND CHILD SUPERVISION
POSITIONS, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES SEPARATELY,
BY POSITION AND AGE

Position	Years of age								Total
	Under 25	25 to 29	30 to 34	Total under 35	35 to 49	50 to 64	65 or over	Not re- ported	
Public agencies									
<i>Social work positions</i>									
Executives	1	1	11	8	1	..	21
Supervisors of training	2	2	3	1	..	1	7
Supervisors of casework	..	1	18	19	36	12	67
Inspection and licensing workers	..	3	1	4	9	8	1	..	22
Casework consultants	..	1	11	12	20	4	..	1	37
Caseworkers	22	92	81	195	95	24	2	1	317
Other	..	1	3	4	1	5
Total, social work	22	98	117	237	175	57	4	3	476
<i>Child supervision positions</i>									
Houseparents	..	1	1	2	7	2	4	..	15
Private agencies									
<i>Social work positions</i>									
Executives	..	5	8	13	79	58	8	4	162
Assistant executives	..	6	6	12	21	9	4	1	47
Supervisors of casework	..	14	40	54	107	20	2	6	189
Heads of branch offices	1	4	15	20	20	7	1	1	49
Caseworkers	116	367	283	766	298	78	5	4	1,151
Other	4	6	5	15	7	4	..	1	27
Total, social work	121	402	357	880	532	176	20	17	1,625
<i>Child supervision positions</i>									
Houseparents	27	20	32	79	121	105	9	9	323
Practical nurses	12	6	1	19	8	4	2	3	36

Length of Service with Present Agency

Time with employing agency has some bearing on the salary received. Most agencies pay newly employed workers less than the usual wage for the position, with the expectation of granting increases. Some agencies have formal probation periods, varying from a few months to a year, after which salary is increased if the worker stays. Some agencies advance salaries regularly for a time. In interpreting the salary data, therefore, it is desirable to know to what extent the workers in the various position categories were recently employed.

The information on tenure is important also because it provides an index of staff stability. Shortage of qualified workers and the payment of marginal or submarginal salaries have together over a long period tended to produce high rates of turnover of social work personnel. Yet relatively little attention has been given to the effect of high turnover on the efficiency of social work. The present study suggests that this is a subject that deserves careful consideration by child care agencies, both governmental and private.

The workers in professional social work and houseparent positions are classified by tenure in Table 5. The table does not contain sufficient information for determining actual rates of turnover, but the proportion of workers with the present agency less than a year is probably not very far

from the full number of replacements made by these agencies in the year prior to reporting for the study.

TABLE 5.—FULL-TIME WORKERS IN SOCIAL WORK AND CHILD SUPERVISION POSITIONS, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES SEPARATELY, BY POSITION AND TIME WITH PRESENT AGENCY

Position	Years with agency						Total
	Under 1	1 but under 3	3 but under 5	5 but under 10	10 or more	Not reported	
Public agencies							
<i>Social work positions</i>							
Executives	..	3	4	4	10	..	21
Supervisors of training	..	2	5	7
Supervisors of casework	6	8	16	19	18	..	67
Inspection and licensing workers	2	6	1	5	8	..	22
Casework consultants	9	5	7	13	3	..	37
Caseworkers	68	59	74	74	41	1	317
Other	..	3	..	2	5
Total, social work	85	86	107	117	80	1	476
<i>Child supervision positions</i>							
Houseparents	2	5	8	..	15
Private agencies							
<i>Social work positions</i>							
Executives	16	21	20	27	78	..	162
Assistant executives	7	6	6	8	20	..	47
Supervisors of casework	21	28	32	53	55	..	189
Heads of branch offices	6	11	4	10	18	..	49
Caseworkers	322	291	228	159	151	..	1,151
Other	7	3	5	4	8	..	27
Total, social work	379	360	295	261	330	..	1,625
<i>Child supervision positions</i>							
Houseparents	96	62	41	69	50	5	323
Practical nurses	21	6	3	1	5	..	36

Among the public agencies 22 per cent of the caseworkers had been with the employing agency at the time of reporting less than one year, and for social work positions above that of caseworker, taken together, the proportion is 11 per cent. Among private agencies, 28 per cent of the casework positions had been filled within a year, and for the higher positions together the proportion is again 11 per cent. For houseparents in private institutions, the proportion is 30 per cent.

The conclusion to which these figures point is that it is the tendency of these child care agencies to replace in the course of a year a very large portion of the personnel which is directly responsible for the care of children. The proportion found for the private agencies is considerably higher than that for public agencies, but in both cases it is high. It seems inevitable that so high rates of turnover of caseworkers and of houseparents must influence materially the quantity and quality of service given by the agencies.

If the shortage of social work personnel was increasing in the year preceding submission of the schedules, greater competition for workers may have increased the proportion of recently hired workers above normal. It seems doubtful, however, if the proportions found are abnormal. It is worth

recording that in a study of replacements in private family agencies in 1938 the rate of replacement found for caseworkers was similar to that for caseworkers in private child care agencies in this study.¹

Professional Education of Social Work Personnel

In Table 6 the workers in social work positions are classified with respect to the extent of their training in schools of social work. Since the length of courses and types of recognition granted have varied greatly, it was necessary to ask, as a basis for classification at this point, for several items of information, including: (1) name of the school attended; (2) degree or certificate received; (3) year in which recognition was received; (4) if the course was incomplete, what work remained; (5) whether the course was undergraduate, or, if graduate, of one year or of two years.

The information returned leaves no doubt that generally these agencies want for their professional positions workers who have had professional training. Both the classification of workers by education and the difference in salaries of workers with and without formal training point to this conclusion. Here again the distributions of the workers in public and private agencies are generally similar, although a considerably larger proportion of the workers in private agencies have had substantial professional training.

Of the 1,625 workers in social work positions in private agencies, 36 per cent had completed the two-year graduate course or had obtained masters degrees in a somewhat shorter course, while 28 per cent reported credit for some part of the two-year course, and 5 per cent had completed a one-year course. Of those with partial credit for the two-year course, about a quarter had completed the work with the exception of the required thesis. Taking these groups together, just under 70 per cent had some graduate school of social work training. Three per cent reported only undergraduate courses, and 7 per cent scattered or occasional courses. This leaves 20 per cent for whom no school of social work training was reported. For some workers information was lacking concerning education and they have been included in the table with those reporting no school of social work training.

The corresponding figures for the workers in public agencies are: two-year graduate course completed or masters degree for a shorter course, 22 per cent; two-year course incomplete, 34 per cent; one-year graduate course completed, 6 per cent; undergraduate course, 5½ per cent; scattered courses, 9½ per cent; no school of social work training or information not reported, 22 per cent.

Of the workers with no school of social work training, a large proportion had entered social work before formal training was common, but it is also true that an important number of them are beginning caseworkers. A few of the reporting agencies, it would appear, are now maintaining a policy of apprentice training.

¹ "Recent Hiring Practices of Private Family Agencies," in *The Family*, October, 1939, p. 182. The rate for caseworkers was 29 per cent.

TABLE 6.—FULL-TIME WORKERS IN SOCIAL WORK POSITIONS, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES SEPARATELY, BY POSITION AND SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

Position	Two-year graduate course		One-year graduate course		Under-graduate course	Occa-sional courses	None or not reported	Total
	Com-plete ^a	Incom-plete	Com-plete	Incom-plete				
Public agencies								
<i>Social work positions</i>								
Executives	4	6	1	1	2	..	7	21
Supervisors of training	3	3	1	7
Supervisors of casework	25	14	7	1	2	10	8	67
Inspection and licensing workers	4	5	1	3	9	22
Casework consultants	8	19	4	..	1	1	4	37
Caseworkers	56	116	16	2	20	31	76	317
Other	3	1	1	5
Total	103	164	29	4	26	45	105	476
Private agencies								
<i>Social work positions</i>								
Executives	41	29	7	..	7	32	46	162
Assistant executives	5	7	2	2	1	3	27	47
Supervisors of casework	97	46	5	..	6	17	18	189
Heads of branch offices	17	11	5	..	1	5	10	49
Caseworkers	429	356	62	5	36	61	202	1,151
Other	2	5	1	2	17	27
Total	591	454	82	7	51	120	320	1,625

^a This category includes some workers who obtained a masters degree in a social work course of less than two academic years.

As many as 56 different schools of social work in the United States, two in Canada, and two European schools are represented by the workers who had received professional social work training. The six schools attended by 75 or more workers and the number of workers citing them are:

New York School of Social Work	352
University of Chicago, School of Social Service Administration	240
Pennsylvania School of Social Work	158
Western Reserve University, School of Applied Social Sciences	103
Smith College, School of Social Work	93
Simmons College, School of Social Work	87

These six schools account for 61 per cent of the workers who had attended professional schools.

Eighty-four per cent of the workers in professional social work positions in private agencies and 77½ per cent of those in public agencies had completed four years of college education. Included in these proportions are many who have done graduate work other than in social work.

Of the 2,101 workers in social work positions, only 188 were without college education and many of them had had some other formal training—70 in normal schools and 38 in schools of nursing. Other workers who reported these types of training had also attended college. The workers who had

attended neither college nor school of social work are for the most part older workers. In the private agencies, for example, only one such worker was reported who was under 40 years of age.

Education of Houseparents

The small salaries paid to workers in the houseparent positions do not justify expectation of much educational preparation on the part of these workers. Moreover, the function does not require the type of education called for by the professional social work positions. Although one graduate of a two-year school of social work was reported as a houseparent, inquiry disclosed that the worker was so employed only temporarily in preparation for a different type of position. Nine other houseparents were reported as having credit for part of a graduate school of social work course, while three had completed an undergraduate course.

In Table 7 the 323 workers in private agencies who were classified as houseparents are distributed by the extent of their formal education. They, it should be recalled, are workers whose function is direct oversight of children in institutions; they do not include workers reported as teachers.

TABLE 7.—EDUCATION OF HOUSEPARENTS IN PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

Extent of education	Number
College and graduate work	26
College, 4 years	43
College, less than 4 years	63
Normal school	25
School of nursing	20
Other education beyond high school	1
High school only	97
No high school	8
Education not reported	<u>40</u>
Total	323

That 21 per cent of the workers in these positions had completed four years of college and that many of them had graduate credit seems significant. Well over half of the houseparents had had at least some college work, or else school of nursing or normal school training. The number for whom less than high school education was reported is very small, but for 13 per cent of these workers no information was given about education and it is possible that most of them had little education. Again, it should be noted that the number of workers reported in these positions is small, so that these data should be interpreted cautiously.

Salaries of Social Work Personnel

The salary data for the principal social work position categories are summarized in Table 8. Concerning this table, it should be explained first that it includes only workers who did not receive maintenance as part of com-

pensation. They are a very large majority of the professional social workers reported. To present salary information separately for them is preferable to combining with their salaries the estimated full value of compensation of workers receiving maintenance. The difference between the numbers of workers in this table and in the same categories in the earlier tables is not quite accounted for by the number of workers receiving maintenance, inasmuch as salary data were omitted from a few of the schedules returned.

The table shows for each position the median, the two quartile, and the two extreme salaries. The median salary is the middle one, when all are arranged in order of size. Between the two quartiles is the middle half of all the salaries. The extreme salaries need to be used with much caution, since they may be explained by entirely exceptional circumstances, or even by incorrect data. Thus, the explanation of the lowest salary for caseworkers in private organizations may be that this worker also received maintenance, although receipt of maintenance was not recorded on the schedule.

The executives' salaries range from very small to very substantial amounts, depending largely, it is probable, on the size of organization to be administered. The smallest executive salary, \$1,620, is that of the worker in charge of a private agency employing no other professional worker, but this is an exceptionally low salary even for an agency of this size. Usually the salary of the professional worker in such an agency is above the average for caseworkers.

TABLE 8.—SALARIES OF FULL-TIME WORKERS IN SOCIAL WORK POSITIONS NOT RECEIVING MAINTENANCE, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES SEPARATELY, BY POSITION

Position	Number of workers	Annual salaries				
		Lowest	Lower quartile	Median	Upper quartile	Highest
<i>Public agencies</i>						
Executives	20	\$1,920	\$2,750	\$3,250	\$4,690	\$7,500
Supervisors of training	7	1,740	..	3,150	..	3,500
Supervisors of casework	65	1,800	2,190	2,400	2,700	4,500
Inspection and licensing workers	22	1,680	2,100	2,310	2,400	2,940
Casework consultants	37	1,620	1,980	2,100	2,220	2,700
Caseworkers	309	1,020	1,380	1,620	1,800	2,700
<i>Private agencies</i>						
Executives	122	1,620	2,750	3,500	4,500	10,200
Assistant executives	19	1,200	2,125	3,264	4,750	6,500
Supervisors of casework	183	1,644	2,170	2,400	2,758	5,000
Heads of branch offices	48	1,500	1,905	2,400	2,650	3,600
Caseworkers	1,096	840	1,500	1,700	1,860	3,000

The important influence of both size of agency and sex on the salaries of executives is illustrated in later tables. In examining the executives' salaries here, it should be recalled that the public agency executives are mainly heads of child care divisions of departments of welfare and also that only three of the 21 for whom schedules were returned are men. The private agency executives in Table 8 are, with a few exceptions, heads of child

placing and protective agencies, most institutional executives having been omitted here because of receipt of maintenance.

The salaries of assistant executives of private agencies also show wide variation, again depending largely on the amount of administrative responsibility attached to the position. As stated earlier, the nature of these positions varies greatly. Here again the institutional positions have been omitted because of receipt of maintenance.

Table 8 indicates that the reporting public and private agencies tend to pay their casework supervisors about the same salaries. The medians for both groups are \$2,400, and the quartiles differ very little, indeed. Some of the supervisors with low salaries are workers combining casework with supervision, but on the other hand, some of the most poorly paid supervisors were reported as giving full time to supervision of casework.

The supervisors of training in the public agencies are paid within the range of the supervisors of casework, but their median salary is much higher than the median for the latter group. The median for the varied group of inspection and licensing workers, \$2,310, is close to that of casework supervisors, but the highest salaries for these workers are much lower than the top casework supervisors' salaries.

While supervisors of training in the public agencies have been retained as a separate group, a special group of private agency workers, which in the preliminary report was treated separately, has now been included in the category of supervisors of casework. These workers were at first classified as directors of casework. They are workers, chiefly in the larger foster care agencies, who are immediately in charge of relatively large casework staffs. Their positions are comparable to those of directors of casework in the larger private family agencies. Only 12 of these positions were recognized, of which all but one were occupied by women. The salaries varied from \$2,400, which is the median supervisor's salary, to \$5,000, the highest supervisor's salary reported. The median of the 12 salaries was \$3,800, which may be compared with \$4,150, the median for eight directors of casework found in the study of family casework agencies in 1936.

The salaries of the public agency casework consultants varied from that of a not well-paid caseworker to the upper quartile salary for supervisors of casework. But with few exceptions these workers are paid more than the upper quartile salary of caseworkers.

Heads of private agency branch offices tend to be paid like supervisors, the median salary being the same as the median for supervisors.

These figures would indicate that caseworkers in private agencies tend to be paid somewhat better than those in public agencies. It seems probable that this is generally true, but it is unsafe to make the general conclusion from the present data. The median salary for 1,096 private agency caseworkers was \$1,700, while that for 309 caseworkers in public agencies was \$1,620.

In both groups of agencies an important number of high salaries was reported for caseworkers. The top quarter of the public agency caseworkers

were paid between \$1,800 and \$2,700, and of the private agency caseworkers, between \$1,860 and \$3,000. Many of the better paid caseworkers shared the supervisory function in some degree, but others reported their function as wholly casework. Equally deserving of attention, however, is the frequency of caseworkers in both groups who are paid salaries too low to be at all commensurate with the qualifications usually assumed to apply to the casework position. A quarter of the caseworkers' salaries in public agencies were at or under \$1,380, and a quarter of those in private agencies were at or below \$1,500. These low salaries help to explain the high rate of turnover for this position.

Salaries of Men and Women Executives

In Table 9 the salaries of the 39 men and 83 women executives of private agencies are compared. It is clear that the men received generally higher compensation, but as is shown in the next table, the men are more frequently executives of larger organizations. Where the size of organization is the same, however, men tend to be paid considerably better than women.

TABLE 9.—SALARIES OF EXECUTIVES OF PRIVATE AGENCIES, NOT RECEIVING MAINTENANCE, BY SEX

Sex	Number of workers	Annual salary				
		Lowest	Lower quartile	Median	Upper quartile	Highest
Men	39	\$2,500	\$3,600	\$5,300	\$7,425	\$10,200
Women	83	1,620	2,700	3,300	3,678	8,000

It is worth noting that the median salary for the women executives of private agencies, \$3,300, is not very different from that for the 18 women executives of state or city welfare departments, which is \$3,100. Concerning the highest salary in the table, it should be said that some of the executives for whom data were not reported undoubtedly receive higher salaries.

TABLE 10.—MEDIAN SALARIES OF EXECUTIVES OF PRIVATE AGENCIES, NOT RECEIVING MAINTENANCE, BY SIZE OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF AND SEX

Size of professional staff	Number of executives			Median salaries		
	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total
1 worker	1	7	8	..	\$2,400	\$2,450
2 to 4 workers	4	19	23	\$2,880	2,700	2,700
5 to 9 workers	7	32	39	3,600	3,068	3,240
10 to 19 workers	11	18	29	5,000	3,606	4,000
20 to 39 workers	12	6	18	7,200	4,300	6,500
40 or more workers	4	1	5	8,000
Total	39	83	122	\$5,300	\$3,300	\$3,500

Influence of Size of Agency on Executives' Salaries

Lacking information concerning amount of budget or number of children under care, which might be preferred as an index of size of organization, we

have used for this purpose the number of paid professional workers on the staff. Table 10 classifies the 122 private agency executives and gives median salaries by size of staff and by sex. Even though the data are few, the table leaves little doubt that the influence of both these factors is pronounced in the case of the executives' salaries.

Salaries of Specially Designated Caseworkers

Salary figures for workers whom we have classified as caseworkers because of information given concerning function but whose schedules carried special titles are of some interest. They are presented in Table 11. Great reliance should not be placed on them, however, since the numbers of workers in the several categories are small and also because it is certain that other workers having corresponding functions were reported only as caseworkers.

TABLE 11.—SALARIES OF SPECIALLY DESIGNATED CASEWORKERS IN PRIVATE AGENCIES, NOT RECEIVING MAINTENANCE

Title reported	Number of workers	Annual salary				
		Lowest	Lower quartile	Median	Upper quartile	Highest
Psychiatric worker	16	\$1,650	\$1,860	\$2,100	\$2,100	\$2,400
Casework supervisor ^a	28	1,500	1,800	1,950	2,320	2,400
Intake worker	24	1,440	1,700	1,800	2,100	2,400
Homefinder	51	1,200	1,600	1,800	1,890	2,400
Agent	15	1,380	1,620	1,740	1,800	1,980
Field representative	25	1,200	1,590	1,620	1,755	1,920

^a By title, devoting more than half of time to casework.

Several comments should be made about these figures. The few psychiatric workers were reported by only five different agencies, most of them by one New York City organization. The title, agent, was reported by only four organizations and most of these workers were also reported by a New York City organization. The most frequently occurring title in the table is that of homefinder. Caseworkers were so identified by 41 different agencies, in some of which the homefinder was among the better paid caseworkers, whereas in others this was one of the more poorly paid positions.

The 28 caseworkers carrying the supervisory title were found in 22 agencies and the 24 intake workers in as many different agencies. Only eight agencies returned the title, field representative, these workers proving to be less well paid than the others included in the table, or than caseworkers generally.

Estimation of the Value of Maintenance

Except for child supervision workers, the number of workers in the several position groups reported as receiving maintenance as part of salary was small. For the executives and assistant executives of institutions, moreover, what is included in full maintenance may vary materially, so that no tabulation of their salaries has been attempted.

Although very few of the caseworkers reported receipt of maintenance, use has been made of their salary data for the purpose of illustrating a method of estimating the value of maintenance. Only 19 caseworkers receiving full maintenance were found. They were employed by 15 different private organizations. The variation of the cash portion of their salaries is shown in Table 12. The second line of the table gives the difference between their median and quartile salaries and the corresponding figures for private agency caseworkers who do not receive maintenance. The difference between the two median salaries is \$560. Were the sample of caseworkers receiving maintenance considerably larger, this comparison would be more significant. But in the absence of a more dependable figure, this one may perhaps be accepted as a rough measure of the value of maintenance.

TABLE 12.—CASH SALARIES OF CASEWORKERS IN PRIVATE AGENCIES, ALSO RECEIVING MAINTENANCE AS PART OF SALARY

	Number of workers	Annual salary				
		Lowest	Lower quartile	Median	Upper quartile	Highest
Caseworkers receiving full maintenance	19	\$720	\$930	\$1,140	\$1,500	\$1,950
Difference from salary for private agency caseworkers shown in Table 8	570	560	360

Thirty-one private agency caseworkers were reported as receiving lunches only in addition to the cash salary. The median salary was \$1,700, or the same as for private agency caseworkers receiving no maintenance.

Influence of Professional Education on Salaries

Classification of the salary data separately by length of experience and extent of training shows that each of these factors has large influence on amount of compensation. It is desirable, however, to take both factors into account at the same time. To do this adequately, data are needed for more workers than are available in this study; nevertheless the tabulations were carried through and the results, given in Table 13, illustrate clearly enough the general trend. Some of the median salaries in the table will be found to be for so few workers that they would deserve little consideration by themselves, but they fit into the pattern of the medians based on larger numbers.

Table 13 is an abbreviation of the full tabulation, data being presented for only selected lengths of social work experience and for only three extent-of-education categories. The second of the education groups, two graduate years, thesis lacking, did not appear in Table 6, in which workers were classified by extent of professional training, but is part of the category, two-year graduate course incomplete, which does occur there. The whole of this latter group is not used in the present table because of the wide variation in extent of training which it represents. Completion of the two-year graduate course except for submission of thesis, however, indicates a fairly definite amount of training and hence is useful for comparison of

salaries. Students frequently defer completion of the thesis in order to accept a position sooner, and employing agencies may or may not feel that failure to satisfy this final requirement should affect the salary paid. The present data indicate that on the average lack of the thesis reduces the salary, and this result has been found also in our examination of salaries of family casework agencies.

TABLE 13.—MEDIAN SALARIES OF WORKERS IN SOCIAL WORK POSITIONS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE AGENCIES, NOT RECEIVING MAINTENANCE, BY LENGTH OF SOCIAL WORK EXPERIENCE AND EXTENT OF SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK TRAINING

Length of social work experience and extent of school of social work training	Number of workers	Median salary
Less than 1 year of experience:		
Two-year graduate course completed	39	\$1,620
Two graduate years, thesis lacking	5	1,500
No school of social work	36	1,080
3 years of experience:		
Two-year graduate course completed	54	1,740
Two graduate years, thesis lacking	8	1,620
No school of social work	15	1,320
5 years of experience:		
Two-year graduate course completed	63	1,920
Two graduate years, thesis lacking	14	1,800
No school of social work	7	1,620
9 to 11 years of experience:		
Two-year graduate course completed	78	2,000
Two graduate years, thesis lacking	17	1,920
No school of social work	42	1,680
14 to 16 years of experience:		
Two-year graduate course completed	52	2,600
Two graduate years, thesis lacking	11	2,400
No school of social work	35	1,800
19 to 21 years of experience:		
Two-year graduate course completed	23	2,700
Two graduate years, thesis lacking	3
No school of social work	27	2,000
24 to 26 years of experience:		
Two-year graduate course completed	8	3,100
Two graduate years, thesis lacking	0
No school of social work	14	2,450
30 or more years of experience:		
Two-year graduate course completed	1
Two graduate years, thesis lacking	0
No school of social work	29	2,700

In this table are included workers in social work positions of both public and private agencies. Account is not taken of either sex or position. The purpose here is to test whether, when length of experience is approximately the same, workers with more school of social work training tend to obtain better salaries than workers with less of such training. Or in other words, experience being similar, are the workers with more training at an advantage in competing for the better paying positions? The answer is definitely affirmative.

It should be explained that the corresponding table in the preliminary re-

port of the study was for private agency workers only, and was carried through only 15 years of experience. The inclusion of the public agency workers gives somewhat larger numbers on which to base the median salaries, but does not change the general picture. Inclusion of the workers with longer experience adds to the information of the previous table by showing that as experience increases beyond 15 years median salaries increase both for the workers with and for those without formal professional training. But the increase is earlier and greater for the workers with formal training. Care should be taken, however, in interpreting these results concerning the older workers, and it is possible that the earlier table, which omitted the workers with long experience, gave a more accurate impression of present tendencies. For it is only comparatively recently that the general desirability of school of social work training for social work positions has been widely accepted, or that many schools have been available to provide training. Twenty years ago social work agencies were generally recruiting untrained workers and giving apprenticeship training.

It is also true that earlier school of social work courses were briefer than the present ones, so that few of the older workers in this study could have completed a two-year graduate course as long ago as 20 years, although some, having had substantial experience prior to school training, may have completed such courses more recently. For several reasons, then, it is likely that the salaries being paid older workers today may not be indicative of trends that will affect the younger workers now in the field.

Table 13 indicates that workers who in 1941 were starting in the casework positions in these agencies received on the average \$1,620, if they had full credit for the graduate course; \$1,500, if the full course requirements had been completed except for the thesis; but only \$1,080, if they had no school of social work credit. The median salaries advance for all three education groups relatively rapidly up to five years, and less rapidly over the next five or six years of experience. In the category, 14 to 16 years of experience, both groups of workers with training show large advance in salary over those with 9 to 11 years of experience, but the advance is slight for those without school preparation. Beyond 15 years of experience few workers were found in the group with thesis lacking, and two-year graduates with more than 25 years of experience were very few.

Geographical Influence on Salaries

In the preceding discussion no attention has been given to the influence of region or that of size of place on salaries. Both are important. Complaint is often made that graduates of schools of social work gravitate to the more favored regions and especially to the larger cities, and are not available elsewhere. There are many reasons to account for the attractiveness of the large cities, including cultural advantages, greater opportunities for professional contacts, more varied types of work, more opportunities for promotion. In addition agencies in the larger cities generally pay better salaries.

This is not always the case, of course, but as a rule in smaller cities and rural areas positions are scheduled at salaries lower than those in large cities. Social work agencies commonly ask, for example, when deciding what the salary for a position should be, "What is the average for such positions in cities of our size?" This question ignores the fact that the smaller places are competing for the well-qualified workers with the larger ones, which in addition to larger salaries can offer other advantages.

In comparing salaries by region and size of city in Tables 14 and 15, attention is again limited to the private agency personnel. This is because most of the public agency workers in the study are concentrated in a few organizations and places, so that if included their influence would be unequally distributed.

TABLE 14.—MEDIAN SALARIES OF SUPERVISORS OF CASEWORK AND OF CASEWORKERS IN PRIVATE AGENCIES, NOT RECEIVING MAINTENANCE, BY REGION

Region	Supervisors of casework		Caseworkers	
	Number	Median salary	Number	Median salary
New England	19	\$2,300	142	\$1,800
Middle Atlantic	78	2,600	388	1,800
North Central	61	2,400	358	1,680
Southern	18	2,150	128	1,560
Mountain and Pacific	5	64	1,620
Total	183 ^a	2,400	1096 ^a	1,700

^a Total includes workers in one agency in Honolulu not included above.

Table 14 compares salaries of supervisors and caseworkers in five large regions which are combinations of the familiar Bureau of the Census areas. Other factors, including sex, experience, education, and size of city, are disregarded here. The comparison is, therefore, of limited usefulness, but has some value as suggesting, though not proving, geographical differences. Salaries of workers in both supervisory and casework positions appear to be definitely lower in the Southern states than elsewhere. Caseworkers' salaries in New England and both caseworkers' and supervisors' salaries in the North Atlantic states appear to be higher than elsewhere. The fact that these are very large regions means, of course, that there may be much variation within the areas.

Table 15 suggests that there are important differences in salaries for the supervisory and casework positions in private agencies among the larger cities. But again the number of agencies represented is small; at least three reported from each of the specified cities and the number is nine for New York. The cities are arranged in order of size.

Differences in the average extent of training and average length of experience of the workers in these positions affect the median salaries, particularly those for caseworkers, but to a considerable extent at least, these differences reflect the employment policies of the agencies concerned.

In weighing these data for individual cities, it should be recalled also that

cost-of-living increases since 1941 are particularly likely to have changed salaries in the larger cities.

TABLE 15.—MEDIAN SALARIES OF SUPERVISORS OF CASEWORK AND OF CASEWORKERS IN PRIVATE AGENCIES, NOT RECEIVING MAINTENANCE, IN SPECIFIED LARGE CITIES

City	Supervisors of casework		Caseworkers	
	Number	Median salary	Number	Median salary
New York	42	\$2,650	191	\$1,920
Chicago	15	2,500	79	1,800
Philadelphia	13	2,400	69	1,620
Detroit	8	2,600	63	1,200
Cleveland	10	2,300	44	1,680
Baltimore	6	2,300	44	1,680
Boston	7	2,300	70	1,830
Pittsburgh	7	2,500	34	1,800
Minneapolis-St. Paul	9	2,100	34	1,500

Salaries of Houseparents

With few exceptions these workers receive maintenance as part of their compensation, so that, whereas the salary data already cited represent full compensation, those for houseparents are the cash portion of the salary, to which the value of maintenance should be added.

The cash salaries of the workers classified in these positions varied widely, the range being from \$300 to \$1,460. If the value of maintenance for houseparents were to be estimated uniformly at \$500, which may be too high, the range of the full salaries would become \$800 to \$1,960. The higher of these extreme salaries is exceptional, and it is possible that the worker receiving it should have been classified as an assistant institutional executive rather than as a houseparent. But salaries as low as \$300 for women houseparents were reported by several institutions in widely separated places. The salaries of the men houseparents were higher than those of women. The median cash salary of the relatively few men reported was \$840, or \$70 per month, while for the considerably larger number of women it was \$660, or \$55 per month. That many women houseparents care for young children may help to explain their lower average salary.

Both education and geography, as well as sex, appear to influence the houseparent salaries significantly. The geographical classification is given for women houseparents only in Table 16. The same large regions are used here as in Table 15. Both the number of agencies and the number of workers are too small to make the figures very dependable, but the table illustrates that there is wide variation in these salaries in each area. This table again indicates that salaries are lower in the South than elsewhere.

When the women houseparents are classified by education, they give the following median salaries: with college and graduate credit, \$780; four years of college, \$720; some college but less than four years, \$660; either normal or nursing school training, \$660; high school or less, \$660; education not reported, \$642.

TABLE 16.—CASH SALARIES OF WOMEN HOUSEPARENTS IN PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS, ALSO RECEIVING FULL MAINTENANCE, BY REGION

Region	Number of workers	Annual cash salary				
		Lowest	Lower quartile	Median	Upper quartile	Highest
New England	27	\$420	\$660	\$720	\$900	\$1,320
Middle Atlantic	69	300	600	720	900	1,460
North Central	67	420	576	660	780	1,260
Southern	76	300	480	600	690	1,200
Mountain and Pacific	31	300	600	840	945	1,080
Total	270	300	540	660	810	1,460

The workers who were classified as practical nurses had salaries not very different from those of most of the women houseparents. The range of the cash salaries of 26 of these workers who also received maintenance was from \$300 to \$1,200, the median falling at \$624. Although as already explained, the practical nurses recorded nursing as their chief function, it is not improbable that the duties of these workers resemble rather closely those of the women houseparents caring for younger children.

Salaries of Nurses and Dietitians

Salary data for two other groups of workers reported in the study are perhaps worth recording. Of 70 graduate nurses employed by private agencies who specified nursing as their whole or chief function, 26 did not receive maintenance as part of compensation. Their reported salaries varied from \$720, which is exceptionally low, to \$2,200, with the median at \$1,700, or the same as the median for caseworkers in private agencies. The other graduate nurses received either full maintenance or some meals. The 36 receiving full maintenance had cash salaries varying from \$600 to \$1,800, with the median at \$1,020.

The dietitians' salaries were surprisingly low. Eighteen such workers were reported. All received full maintenance and their cash salaries ranged from only \$480 to \$2,400. The latter salary is quite exceptional, however, the next highest being only \$1,560. The median was \$900. The information concerning education indicates that most of these workers have not had much formal preparation for this technical function, which may explain the generally low salaries.